

WILEY

A NEW THEORY OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

Author(s): Vincent McNabb

Source: *Blackfriars*, SEPTEMBER, 1923, Vol. 4, No. 42 (SEPTEMBER, 1923), pp. 1086-1100

Published by: Wiley

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43810309>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Wiley is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Blackfriars*

JSTOR

A NEW THEORY OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

THE following statements of doctrine occur in the book *Mysterium Fidei*, by the Rev. Maurice de la Taille, S.J. (Paris : Gab. Beauchesne, 1921).

(1) Coena igitur et Crux inter se complent. In coena incoeptum est sacrificium illud quod in cruce erat consummandum.

(2) Reperitur immolationis realitas in passione mortis. At in symbolica immolatione coenae elucet potissimum oblationis liturgicae proprietas.

(3) Unum proinde numero fuit sacrificium redemptionis in cruce et in coena.

Non computandum unum sacrificium preliminarium in coena ; alterum in cruce succidaneum.

Sed in coenaculo incruenta oblatio fiebat cruentae immolationis in Calvaria perpetiendae.

(4) Unitas illa ex oblatione eucharistica et immolatione cruenta non est . . . in genere rei ; sed profecto est in genere signi.

Est unitas in genere sacrificii ; et sacrificium ut tale est inter signa recensetur.

(1) The Last Supper and the Cross are complementary. At the Last Supper was begun that sacrifice which was to be consummated on the Cross.

(2) The reality of Immolation is found in the suffering of Death. But in the symbolical immolation of the Last Supper is especially shown the quality of the liturgical Oblation.

(3) Hence the Sacrifice of redemption on the Cross and at the Supper was one.

Nor must it be reckoned a preliminary sacrifice at the Supper ; and another subsequent on the Cross.

But in the Supper room there was made the unbloody Oblation of the bloody Immolation to be made on Calvary.

(4) This unity from the eucharistic Oblation and the bloody Immolation is not in the order of *things*, but in the order of *signs*.

It is a unity in the order of Sacrifice ; and Sacrifice, as such, is to be classed as a sign.

A New Theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

Quemadmodum etiam in sacramento eucharistico non est forma consecrationis cum speciebus sacramentalibus unum quid in genere rei sed in genere signi seu sacramenti tantum.

(5) In genere signi non sunt considerandae illae duae partes ut mere integrantes (quemadmodum sunt corporum partes quantitativae vel homogeneae);

sed omnino ut constitutivae (quales sunt in corporibus partes essentiae)

(6) Quarum una, Oblatio scilicet, se habet per modum formae determinantis;

altera autem, scilicet Immolatio, per modum materiae, portans atque subjectans rationem formalem

(7) Sicut enim in Eucharistia videmus speciem panis vel vini permanentem determinari ad esse sacramentale (seu significativum ac demonstrativum praesentiae Christi) per formam consecrationis transeuntem, et accepta inde ratione formali esse ipsum (ut dicunt) sacramentum tantum;

Sic in sacrificio Christi passio tota ad mortem usque, determinatur ad esse sacrificale per oblationem eucharisticam Christi, unde accepta ratione formali, habet ut sit et dicatur sacrificium ipsum redemptionis (pp. 101, 102).

Even as in the eucharistic sacrament the form of consecration and the sacramental species are not one in the order of *things*, but only in the order of *signs* or *sacraments*.

(5) In the order of signs these two parts are not to be considered as merely integral (like the quantitative or homogeneous parts of bodies);

but decidedly as constitutive (like the essential parts of bodies).

(6) Of these (parts) one, viz. the Oblatio, is after the manner of the determining form;

the other, viz. the Immolation, is after the manner of the matter which carries, and is the subject of, the formal part.

(7) In the Eucharist we see the permanent species of bread and wine determined to a sacramental existence (i.e. so as to signify and point towards the presence of Christ) by the transient form of consecration, and having thereby received their formal part they are the sacrament only.

Even so in the sacrifice of Christ all the passion unto death is determined to a sacrificial existence by the eucharistic oblation of Christ, whereby it receives its formal part and is and should be called the sacrifice of redemption.

Blackfriars

(8) Cui unquam in mentem venerit, tum demum Christum egisse respectu suae Passionis sacerdotem secundum ordinem Melchisedech cum aut milites in horto prosterneret, aut voce magna morti proximus exclamaret? Quibus sacris operationibus Domini nostri quantumvis venerandis, quantumvis etiam salubribus, non tamen importabatur proprium et quasi specificum exercitium sacerdotii novi atque aeterni (p. 30).

Non est autem per se notum aliquod sacrificium, nec proinde aptum signum, nec proinde sacrificium ullum si sit indeterminatum ex toto se quoad *esse sacrificale*.

Est autem indeterminatum si potest haberi idem sine sacrificio. Non igitur Passio Domini ex complexu isto satis specificatur in genere sacrificii proprie dicti (p. 31).

Into whose mind has ever come the thought that Christ then exercised His priesthood, according to the order of Melchisedech with respect to the Passion either when He overthrew the soldiers in the garden, or, nigh to death, He cried out with a loud voice? These sacred deeds of our Lord, however worshipful and salutary, do not imply a proper and, so to say, a specific exercise of the new and eternal Priesthood.

A sacrifice that, in itself, is wholly indetermined to a *sacificial existence*, neither is manifest of itself—nor is it therefore a fitting sign—nor consequently is it a sacrifice.

But it is indetermined if it can exist without being a sacrifice. Therefore the Passion of our Lord, from this circumstance, is not to be classed in the order of sacrifices properly so-called.

Père de la Taille's book is so full of the best form of modern scholarship that we feel it a duty to call his attention to the mistaken view embodied in the above statements.

Some preliminaries must be set down:

(a) Sacrifice is twofold; internal and external. The internal sacrifice is the cause of the external sacrifice; the external sacrifice is the sign of the internal.

The internal sacrifice is a sacrifice *per se*; the external sacrifice is not a sacrifice *per se* but by reason of the internal sacrifice.

A New Theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

St. Thomas says : ' Man's good is threefold. There is *first* his soul's good ; which is offered to God in a certain inward sacrifice of devotion, prayer and other interior acts ; *and this is the principal sacrifice*.

' The second is his body's good ; which is, so to speak, offered to God in martyrdom, abstinence and continence.

' The third is the good which consists of external things ; and of these we offer a sacrifice to God directly when we offer our possessions to God immediately, and indirectly when we share them with our neighbour for God's sake ' (*Summa*, Eng. tr., 2a, 2ae, Qu. 85, Art. 3, ad. 2m).

(b) The essence of the sacrifice is the *love* (or *charity*) of the sacrifice. As charity is the form of all the supernatural virtues, it is especially the form of the supernatural virtues of religion which give to God the worship of soul and body.

' This voluntary enduring of the Passion was most acceptable to God as coming from *charity*. Therefore it is manifest that Christ's Passion was a true sacrifice ' (3a, Qu. 48, Art. 3).

Christ's flesh 'is a most perfect sacrifice . . . Fourthly, because being the offerer's own flesh it was acceptable to God on account of His *charity* in offering up His own flesh ' (ibid., ad. 1m).

' Christ's Passion was indeed a malefice on His slayers' part ; but on His own it was the sacrifice of one suffering out of *charity*. Hence it is Christ who is said to have offered the sacrifice ; and not the executioners ' (ibid., ad. 3m).

(c) ' The sacrifice which is daily offered in the church is not distinct from that sacrifice which Christ Himself offered, but is a commemoration thereof (St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, 3a, 22, 3, 2m, Eng. tr.).

Blackfriars

‘We therefore confess that the sacrifice of the Mass is and ought to be considered *one and the same sacrifice* as that of the cross; for the victim is one and the same, namely, Christ our Lord Who offered Himself, once only, a bloody Sacrifice on the altar of the Cross’ (*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, Eng. tr., Pt. II : The Sacrament of the Eucharist).

‘In that divine sacrifice which is offered up in the Mass, there is contained and offered up in an unbloody manner the same Christ Who on the altar of the Cross offered himself once in a bloody manner.’ (Council of Trent, Sess. xxii, *De Sacrificio Missae*, cap. 1).

(d) Many bodily or psychological acts are *one* moral act when the will directs them to one moral end.

A moral act is *one and the same* moral act when the will is not changed; but remains either formally or virtually uninterrupted (*cf.* St. Thos., 2 Dist., 42, Art. 1 : Billuart, *De Pecc.*, Diss ii, Art. IV).

(e) ‘From the beginning of His conception Christ merited our eternal salvation; but on our side there were some obstacles, whereby we were hindered from securing the effect of His preceding merits. Consequently, in order to remove such hindrances, it was necessary for Christ to suffer’ (3a, Qu. 48, Art. 1, ad. 1m).

‘Christ’s passion has a special effect, which His preceding merits did not possess; not on account of greater charity, but because of the nature of the work which was suitable for such an effect, as is clear from the arguments brought forward above on the fittingness of Christ’s Passion’ (ibid., ad. 3m).

These principles enable us to see the reasonableness of the church’s teaching on the unity of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

A New Theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

The *essence* of the external Sacrifice is the love of the human will of our Blessed Lord. St. Thomas says that the first act of the created will was a sacrificial act of the great High Priest meriting from God the redemption of the world. Thus the Incarnation as accepted rather than any one act of the Incarnation was the essential act of sacrifice.

But St. Thomas reminds us that there is a double perfection (*a*) of the form or essence and (*b*) of the end. The *first* and fundamental act of sacrifice of Jesus Christ was His accepted life and His accepted laying down of life by a violent death. The *second* and perfect act of sacrifice was the actual laying down of His life. 'Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends' (Jo. xv, 13). Hence the Essence of the Redemptive Sacrifice was the internal offering of the Sacrifice of Calvary; but the perfection was the external offering or actual giving. Now this internal offering of the Sacrifice of Calvary was the first movement of the created will of Jesus Christ; the external offering or actual giving was the actual Passion and Death of Jesus Christ.

The sacerdotal sacrifice of Calvary is therefore constituted (*a*) by the internal offering which the created will of Jesus had made at its beginning and had never withdrawn; and (*b*) by the actual and voluntary offering, oblation, giving, or immolation of His human life in His Passion. Again, the Blessed Eucharist, which is a Sacrament, inasmuch as it gives invisible grace under visible signs, is also a sacrifice 'inasmuch as it *represents the Passion of Christ, wherein Christ offered Himself a sacrifice to God*' (Eph. v, 2), (3a, Qu. 79, Art. 7). Not that every representation of the Passion of Christ is *the* Sacrifice of the Passion of Christ; otherwise a Passion play would be, not merely *a* sacrifice (as indeed it may well be); but *the* Sacri-

Blackfriars

fice of Calvary. The Blessed Eucharist is not merely a Sacrifice; but *one and the same* Sacrifice with that of Calvary.

‘The Sacrifice of the Mass is *substantially* (quoad substantiam) the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross because in each the Priest is the same, and the Victim is the same, Christ. But it differs only in the *mode* of offering, inasmuch as on the Cross it was a bloody sacrifice; on the altar, unbloody’ (Billuart, *Summa, De Eucharistia*, Dissert. 8, Art. 1, Obj. 1).

Billuart has a profound thought in answer to the objection that the Mass is not itself a Sacrifice, but the commemoration and representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross. He says: ‘The commemoration and representation of a Sacrifice, especially if it contains the “thing” (rem) of a Sacrifice, can be itself a Sacrifice. But in the Eucharist it contained the same Victim as was immolated in the Cross; only the mode of offering being different. *Hence it is a commemoration of the bloody Sacrifice; and at the same time it is an unbloody Sacrifice.* Even so the Paschal Lamb was at once a figure of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and in itself a Sacrifice’ (ibid., Obj. 3).

Billuart, also, in proving that the Mass is a true sacrifice and not a mere representation or commemoration of the Cross, argues as follows: ‘Christ when instituting the Eucharist perfected (perfecit) a true sacrifice when He offered Himself under the species of bread and wine. But it was the Mass that He wrought and commanded His apostles and their successors to work (fecit et facere praecepit) when He said, “Do this in commemoration of Me . . .” The Fathers assert that Christ at the Last Supper when instituting this Sacrament also truly sacrificed’ (ibid., Prov. 3). The Last Supper was thus a perfect Sacrifice with all that was necessary to a Sacrifice. It was also *the* Sacrifice of the Cross because it was the

A New Theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

representation beforehand of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

It differed not substantially but only modally from the Holy Mass as now offered. Jesus offered Holy Mass before His death; as in His name, His priests offer Holy Mass after His death. Each rite is (a) a complete Sacrifice; (b) this Sacrifice is one and the same with the Sacrifice of Calvary. Billuart says: '(the Mass) does not differ essentially from the Sacrifice of the Last Supper; because not only is the victim the same and the offerer the same, but the unbloody mode of offering is the same. It differs only accidentally in some circumstances; namely, at the Last Supper He was offered mortal, now immortal; at the Last Supper by Himself, now by His priests; at the Last Supper was represented His Passion as future, now as past' (ibid., Art. 2).

We must now give our reasons why we think that the statements occasioning this paper are false.

(a) The first reason we may state syllogistically: 'Any statements which implicitly deny that the Last Supper is one and the same Sacrifice with the Sacrifice of Calvary is false.'

But Père de la Taille's statements implicitly deny that the Last Supper is one and the same Sacrifice with the Sacrifice of Calvary.

Therefore Père de la Taille's statements are false.

The *major* hardly needs proof. It seems to be the common opinion of Theology that the Last Supper was the Holy Sacrifice of Mass. The essence of the Sacrifice in both cases is the 'Representation' of the Sacrifice of Calvary offered up by the charity of the Sacred Priest and Victim. The Last Supper is an antecedent representation. The Holy Mass is a subsequent representation. But the Holy Mass is 'one and the same Sacrifice with the Sacrifice of Calvary.'

Blackfriars

The *minor* of our syllogism is the crucial point to be proved. Therefore let the minor be proved.

Whoever asserts that the Last Supper on Holy Thursday is to the Sacrifice of Calvary on Good Friday (*a*) as a constitutive part, and (*b*) by way of *form*, whilst the Good Friday Passion and Death are by way of matter (*cf.* Statements 5 and 6) implicitly denies that the Last Supper is one and the same as the Sacrifice of Calvary.

To explain: In saying that the Last Supper and the Calvary Immolation are not integral or quantitative parts, but essential parts, Père de la Taille is recalling the doctrine of St. Thomas. 'A part is two-fold: essential and quantitative. The essential parts are naturally the form and the matter, and logically the genus and the difference' (*Summa*, Eng. tr., 3a, Qu. 90, Art. 2). But if $X-$ and $Y-$ are related to each other as matter and form to constitute XY , then certain things must be said which seem fatal to Père de la Taille's statements. We can assuredly say ' $X-$ and $Y-$ constitute one and the same' (XY). And if we understand that we were speaking of $X + Y$ we might say ' X and (meaning plus) Y are one and the same' (meaning XY).

But we cannot say:

$X-$ is one and the same as $Y-$

Y is one and the same as $X-$

$X-$ is one and the same as XY

$Y-$ is one and the same as XY .

For example, as the *body* and *soul* constitute the man and are essential parts of the man, we can say 'Body and soul constitute the man.' Or, if understood with the forementioned conditions, 'Body and soul are one and the same' (man).

But we cannot say:

The Body is the Soul

The Soul is the Body

A New Theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

The Body is the Man

The Soul is the Man (*cf. Summa*, 1a, Qu. 75, Art. 4).

If, therefore, the Last Supper is the essential formal part, and the Passion and Death are the essential material part of the Sacrifice, then we cannot say :

‘The Last Supper is one and the same Sacrifice as the Sacrifice of Calvary’; nor ‘The Passion and Death are one and the same Sacrifice as the Sacrifice of Calvary’ (because the Passion and Death are not the whole but merely the material part).

These conclusions, which follow necessarily from the statements of Père de la Taille, are nothing short of an *evacuatio Crucis*. They are a denial of the mind of the Church on the redemptive Sacrifice of Calvary.

(b) A confirmation is to hand in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. From the words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent it is clear that Holy Mass is a Sacrifice, and one and the same Sacrifice with the Sacrifice of Calvary.

But if the Last Supper is *one* Sacrifice with Calvary merely because it is the *formal* part, then on what grounds must we say that Holy Mass is one and the same Sacrifice with Calvary? If we say, because it is a formal part of Calvary, then an essential unity can have two substantial forms. Moreover, if the formal and ritual *oblation* of the Sacrifice is necessary for the Sacrifice, then this oblation need not precede but can follow the Immolation.

If, however, the Mass is one and the same Sacrifice, not because it is the formal essential part—then why must the Last Supper be *one* only because it is the formal part?

(c) The Last Supper was the *Sacrament* of the Holy Eucharist. In other words, Our Blessed

Blackfriars

Lord's Body was present under the species of bread; His Blood was present under the species of wine. Now if, according to Père de la Taille (and St. Thomas), the Sacrifice is perfected by the Consecration alone, the Last Supper is a true and perfect Sacrifice.

Everything necessary for the Sacrifice is present—Oblation, and the separate Consecrations of the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. It is quite evident that the Last Supper was a Sacrifice, no more and no less than Holy Mass. Therefore, unless we are to say that Holy Mass is only an essential part of a Sacrifice, we must also say that the Last Supper was a true and complete Sacrifice.

But if so—what Sacrifice could it have been except the Sacrifice of Calvary?

(*d*) Père de la Taille says: 'In *genere signi* these two parts (the Last Supper and the actual Passion) must not be considered as merely integral (even as the quantitative or homogeneous parts or bodies), but wholly as constitutive (such as, in bodies, are the parts of the essence).

'Of which parts one, namely the *Oblation*, is after the manner of the determining form; but the other, namely the *Immolation*, is after the manner of the matter which carries and is subject to the formal cause' (Sup. 6).

In other words, the Last Supper on Holy Thursday was (not the Sacrifice of the Mass!) but the formal and ritual offertory (*Oblatio*) to be followed on Good Friday by the Immolation of Calvary. These two really distinct acts made up *one* Sacrifice.

Now to anyone who reads the accounts of the Last Supper in Mt. xxvi, 26-29, Mk. xiv, 22-25, Lk. xxii, 19-20, I Cor xi, 23-25, it will be evident that the only external Oblation are the words of Consecration. But these Consecration words whereby the bread and wine

A New Theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

are changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are the Immolation!

From this most certain fact flow certain conclusions fatal to Père de la Taille's thesis.

If it is accepted that this Consecration, or unbloody Immolation, is the ritual Offering (Oblatio), then *à fortiori* the bloody Immolation of Calvary is the ritual Offering or Oblation. But Père de la Taille denies that the Immolation of Calvary is the Oblation.

If, however, it is said that there is a real ritual Oblation (wherever it is) and Consecration or Immolation in the Last Supper, but that there is no real ritual Oblation on the Cross, then the Sacrifice of the Last Supper is more perfect than the Sacrifice of the Cross.

These two conclusions are so evidently false that we must affix the note of false to their premisses, *viz.*, that the Last Supper is the formal essential part, and the Passion and Death of our Blessed Lord is but the material essential part of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

(e) Moreover, whatever the Last Supper is, the Holy Mass is; because these two differ not substantially but modally.

Now if the Last Supper is but an essential constituent of the Calvary Sacrifice, and not one and the same Sacrifice with the Calvary Sacrifice, the Holy Mass is not one and the same Sacrifice with the Calvary Sacrifice.

This may account for Père de la Taille's words in speaking of the opinion of S. Paschasius Radbertus: 'Immolatio igitur semel acta realiter in passione, quotidie peragitur figuraliter in Sacramento' (p. 309, col. 2). This seems to deny that in Holy Mass there is a real, as distinct from a figurative, immolation. This would be to deny that the Holy Mass was *both* a *commemoratio* of the Sacrifice of Calvary and also one and the same sacrifice. If there is only a figura-

Blackfriars

tive and not also a real immolatio, the Mass is not the real Sacrifice of Calvary, but the *nuda commemoratio* condemned by the Council of Trent.

(f) Our last disproof of Père de la Taille's thesis we look upon as the strongest. The thesis of Père de la Taille is that the Last Supper is the formal essential part and the Passion and Death of Jesus is the material essential part which together (and not singly) make up the Sacrifice of Calvary.

If there is one Evangelist who seems concerned to bring out the fact that Jesus was a priest and that His death was the act of sacrificial redemption, it is St. John. It is St. John alone (Jo. I, 29) who records the words of the Baptist: 'Behold the Lamb of God. Behold Him Who taketh away the sin of the world.' It is St. John alone who *twice* records the words of Caiaphas the High Priest, 'It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people' (xi, 50; xviii, 4). It is St. John alone who records the last words of the Priest and Victim of the Cross, *τετέλεσται*, 'It is consummated' xix, 30). It is St. John alone who records how 'one of the soldiers with a spear opened His side, and immediately there came out blood and water' (xix, 34). All these texts present us with an Evangelist who is deeply concerned to show that the Passion and Death of Jesus was *the* redemptive. *Yet St. John does not mention the Last Supper!* If this last is the formal essential part of the Sacrifice, then St. John, who is so deeply concerned with the Sacrifice, has deliberately left out its formal essential part.

The foregoing arguments seem sufficient to cast doubts upon the truth of this new theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But it may be said that the foregoing arguments leave untouched the authorities

A New Theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

which are brought in proof of the theory. To this we reply :

(1) It has been very difficult, if not impossible, to find in the book any authorities supporting the thesis of the book. Perhaps we could explain ourselves by the following remarks.

(2) We hold that in the Last Supper there was a sacerdotal and sacrificial Oblation; because we hold, with the Fathers and the theologians, that the Last Supper was a true, proper and complete Sacrifice, and that it was one and the same with the true, proper and complete Sacrifice.

(3) We hold that Jesus only once offered Himself (and that in a bloody manner) on the Cross. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας (For this He did *once* in offering Himself) Heb. vii, 27.

Οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενηχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας (So also Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many) Heb. ix, 28.

(4) Now it would seem clear that, if Christ offered Himself once, and equally clear that He offered Himself at the Last Supper, we must conclude that *the one* sacrificial and sacerdotal offering of our Lord's death was not on Good Friday on the Cross, but on Holy Thursday at the Last Supper.

(5) But we have already seen that the Last Supper, like the Holy Mass, is a true, proper and complete Sacrifice, and that it is substantially though not modally one and the same Sacrifice with the true, proper and complete Sacrifice of the Cross. The Last Supper has therefore all that belongs to a Sacrifice, *viz.*, Oblation and (unbloody) Immolation. It is an unbloody antecedent representation, as the Holy Mass is an unbloody subsequent representation of the bloody Sacrifice (with the bloody Oblation and Immolation) of Calvary.

Blackfriars

Père de la Taille quotes authorities to show that there was real sacerdotal oblation at the Last Supper. We are grateful to him for this industry in compiling them. They are the main wealth of his book. But they do not prove his theory. His theologian readers will be moved when he brings one authority who states clearly that there was only one real sacerdotal offering, and that this was, not on the Cross on Good Friday, but in the Supper Room on Holy Thursday. Meanwhile, until such an authority is forthcoming we may be allowed to say, 'Nego sequelam' to the wealth of authorities produced.

(6) But so great are the straits into which Père de la Taille's theory has led its learned advocate that it entangles him in what seem to be contradictions with himself. Thus he says, 'The Fathers indirectly suggest that the Sacrifice of the Passion was offered at the Last Supper, when, distinguishing the sanctification (oblation) from the slaying (mactation), they attribute the latter to the deicide Jews, *but reserve the former to Christ consecrating the bread and wine at the Last Supper* (p. 40).

These words seem to contradict Père de la Taille's theory by lending support to what we have urged above (*d*), viz., that the only trace of Oblation in the inspired records of the Last Supper are the words of Consecration! But the double Consecration is an unbloody representation of the bloody Immolation, and is the essential Immolation of the Sacrifice of the Mass. If, then, the representative Sacrifice has identity of Oblation and Immolation, why must the real, actual and bloody Sacrifice demand a separate Oblation which makes both the Last Supper and the Passion and Death of our Lord essentially incomplete as a Sacrifice (*in genere sacrificii*)?

VINCENT McNABB, O.P.