

Lyons. The horrors of war were devastating the fair land of France. Three times had a regiment of the enemy received orders to march on Lyons, and three times did the foe turn aside as if some invisible hand had stayed their march. Then it was in the hour of the most imminent danger that, as of old, the Archbishop, the priests and people gathered round the altar at Fourvière and there bound themselves by solemn vow to erect a new sanctuary if Our Lady would intercede to protect the city and Diocese of Lyons from the hands of the enemy. The gracious Queen of Heaven accepted her children's vow. The invading armies were stayed at the very gates of the city, which, as we have seen, was not once molested during the whole course of the war. The magnificent basilica which to-day dominates the city is a glorious proof of how nobly the people redeemed their vow. In all France there is no grander temple than that raised by the faithful of Lyons to the glory of God and to testify to all time their gratitude to God's Immaculate Mother for the protection so signally accorded to their city.

There is no shrine in France held in higher veneration than that of Fourvière. From all parts pilgrims turn their steps to this favored spot. The sick, the sorrowful, weary wayfarers on the thorny high road of life, fainting beneath their loads, those who are starting forth on an untried career, filled with hope, all alike go to lay their griefs, their pains, their hopes and fears at the feet of her who is the Sweet Mother of Mercy. And Mary is pleased by the wondrous favors she accords to manifest how pleasing to her is the homage which her children render to her at the ancient shrine of Fourvière.

E. LEAHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

ST. THOMAS OF AQUIN AND THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

THE object of the present paper is to set before the reader a plain statement of the teaching of St. Thomas (1) concerning the nature of sacrifice and (2) concerning the relation of the Holy Mass to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

I.

It is admitted on all hands that the Angel of the Schools holds a place of preëminence among Catholic theologians. In loftiness of intellect, depth and subtlety of thought, logical cogency of reasoning,

clearness and precision of statement, he stands quite alone, at least since the days of Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil, the Gregories and the great Augustine. Coming after these, he absorbed their learning, and it is scarce too much to say that he shines among the lesser luminaries of his own age, and of every age since his own, like the sun among the planets which borrow from him their radiance. He has done more than any other one man to build up on enduring lines the stately superstructure of Catholic theology. Even on questions that he does not treat of professedly we can turn to him with confidence for light and guidance, so far reaching and fruitful are his principles and so rich in suggestion his remarks by the way.

St. Thomas treats of sacrifice in the *Summa*, 2a, 2ae, q. 85. It is a dictate of reason, he there observes, that man should, after the manner that befits his nature, profess his dependence upon the Supreme Being and do Him homage. Now an instinct of his nature prompts man to express his feelings by means of sensible signs, for it is from sensible things that he derives his knowledge. Hence reason itself bids him take certain of the things that belong to the world of sense and offer them to God in token of subjection and worship due, just as vassals pay tribute or render homage to their liege lords in recognition of his lordship over them. Such offering as this has the character of a sacrifice, and therefore the law of nature dictates the offering of sacrifice.¹ But the law of nature does not determine what sacrifice is to consist in, or how it is to be offered. It is custom, or positive divine enactment, that determines this.²

Next the saint proceeds to give precision to the notion of sacrifice. The offering of sacrifice, he says, is an act that takes its moral worth from the fact of its being done in honor of God. It is thus referred to a special virtue, religion, to wit. The acts of the other virtues, too, may be directed to the honor of God, as when one gives of his goods in alms for God's sake, or for the honor of God submits to bodily suffering; and so far forth as this they may be called sacrifices. But it is only such acts as derive their whole moral worth from their being performed in honor of God that are called sacrifices in the proper sense.³

The distinction here made is a very helpful one. It enables us to see that what is often quoted as St. Augustine's definition of sacrifice, "every good work done with a view of uniting us with God in holy fellowship," is not, and indeed was not meant to be, a definition at all. For such good works as almsgiving, fasting, etc., have a moral value of their own apart from their being performed for the honor

¹ *Ib.* a. 1, c.

² *Ib.* ad 1um.

³ *A.* 3, c.

of God, and are not special acts of the virtue of religion, but of charity and penance. Sacrifice, on the other hand, is a special act of the virtue of religion, and has no moral value save such as accrues to it from the end to which it is directed. We are enabled to see, in the next place, why the distinctive note of sacrifice lies in the destruction of the thing offered. To make an offering to God of that which has worth in itself is not an act of religion, strictly speaking, but of justice, or liberality. Religion may dictate the act, but it is justice or liberality that elicits it. On the contrary, the destruction of the thing offered, while liberality may prompt or justice dictate it, is an act elicited by the virtue of religion and possesses no value or meaning save such as it has from the purpose for which it is done. Add to this that, as sacrifice symbolizes the feelings proper to man in presence of his Sovereign Lord and Judge, the distinctive note of sacrifice is to be found in that which most aptly symbolizes these feelings. Now an offering as such is the symbol of esteem or friendship. Destruction alone fittingly expresses man's sense of his own nothingness and of the extreme penalty which his sins deserve.

St. Thomas, as any one who has studied him knows, often opens his mind more fully in his answers to the objections which he is in the habit of stating against his own thesis than he does in establishing the thesis. And so in the present instance we have this bit of luminous exposition, *ad 3um a. 3, q. 85*, in answer to the objection that many things are offered to God, such as devotion, prayer, tithes, first fruits, gifts, and that therefore sacrifice does not appear to be the distinctive act of the virtue of religion: "Sacrifices are properly so called when something is done to the thing offered, as when animals were slain and burnt, and bread is blessed, broken and eaten. And this the word itself implies, for sacrifice gets its name from the fact that man does something sacred. On the other hand, when something is offered to God and nothing is done to it, it is called an offering simply; as money, or bread is said to be offered when placed on the altar and nothing is done to it. Hence every sacrifice is an offering, but not conversely. As for first fruits, they are offerings, in that they are handed over to God, as we read in *Deut. xxvi*. But they are not sacrifices, since nothing is done to them. Tithes, again, are neither sacrifices nor offerings, properly speaking, for they are not given to God directly, but to those who minister at His altars."

Here we have a clear distinction between "sacrifice" and "oblation," or "offering." Something must be done to the thing offered before it can be called a sacrifice. What it is that must be done to it is pretty plainly shown by the examples given in the text—it must be destroyed or consumed in the worship of God. But if there can be

any doubt on this score, it is set at rest by the words of the saint in the first article of the question that follows. "Everything that is handed over for the worship of God," he there says, "is known as an *offering*. When the thing so handed over has to be consumed in the sacred rite of which it is the material element, it is both an offering and a sacrifice. . . . But if it remains intact, to be employed in the worship of God, or is given over to those who serve at the altar for their own use, it is an offering, not a sacrifice."⁴

Sacrifice, then, according to St. Thomas, may be defined as a sacred rite in which the thing offered to God is consumed in token of man's total dependence upon Him and to pay Him the supreme homage that is due to Him. Immolation, not oblation, is the essential note of it. And it belongs to religion as its distinctive act, as something wholly and peculiarly its own. Religion alone gives to destruction as such a moral value and a meaning. This doctrine of sacrifice, which is the doctrine taught down to our own day in all text-books of theology, was not invented by St. Thomas, as some recent writers have alleged. He did but set it up on a philosophical foundation and formulate it more distinctly. In the light of his teaching we can see that the "offering" theory exhibits only the generic concept of sacrifice. Sacrifice in its initial stage is an offering. On the other hand, the "banquet" theory confounds sacrifice proper with the feast upon the sacrifice. In the sacrificial rite as a whole we may thus distinguish a beginning, middle and end. It begins as an offering, takes on its specific character as an immolation and ends as a banquet.

II.

St. Thomas treats only in an incidental way of the inner nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross. To eyes of faith the Mass is simply the Sacrifice of Calvary continued in the Church, renewed in mystery, and St. Thomas lived in the ages of faith. "As in the Fathers, so in the theologians of the Middle Ages," remarks an Anglican writer who made a special study of the subject, "there is no fully developed and accurately defined theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and this absence of specific definitions is found together with belief that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, that it is commemorative of the Passion and that it is offered in union with the heavenly offering of Christ. Underlying the statements of this belief was the evident conviction that there is one abiding sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, offered on the Cross in the life surrendered unto death, presented in His risen and ascended majesty by our Lord in heaven, and pleaded at the altar

⁴ Q. 86, a. 1, c.

by the Church on earth in union both with the Passion and Death of our Lord and with His heavenly offering."⁵ So, too, another Anglican writer builds on quoted testimonies of the Fathers his affirmation that "in the first six centuries of the Church's life the Eucharist was looked upon as a sacrifice because it renewed the Sacrifice of the Cross."⁶ That St. Thomas accepted, simply and literally, this faith of the Fathers, without any attempt at a rational analysis of it, must be plain to any one who has read him carefully.

We have seen that he finds the distinctive note of sacrifice in the destruction of the thing offered. Now will anything short of real destruction satisfy the requirements of his definition, for the thing offered has to be "consumed" in the worship of God? This is the principle which he expressly lays down, and everything that he says of the Sacrifice of Christ must be read in the light of it. Conformably to this principle he makes the Sacrifice of Christ consist in His Passion and death. "It is manifest," he concludes in one place, "that the passion of Christ was a true sacrifice."⁷ "Though the passion and death of Christ," he elsewhere says, "is not to be repeated, the virtue of that sacrifice, once offered, endures forever."⁸ From the fact that Christ's passion is not to be repeated he infers the oneness of His Sacrifice, and quotes the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, c. x.: "By one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."⁹ That the offering in the Eucharist does not at all take from the unity of Christ's Sacrifice he plainly implies, where he says that "the sacrifice daily offered in the Church is not other than that which Christ Himself offered, but is the commemoration of it."¹⁰ By these words he does not mean merely that the victim is the same; he is speaking of the sacrifice itself, not of the Victim. And this is put beyond the possibility of cavil by what we read in the sixth article of the same question, where he inquires, "Whether the priesthood of Christ was after the order of Melchisedec?" If he regarded the Mass as a distinct sacrifice from that of the Cross, here surely was the place for him to say so. But far from saying so, he says, at least by necessary implication, the very opposite. The passage must be given word for word:

"In the priestly office of Christ two things are to be considered, namely, Christ's Sacrifice and the participation of it. As far as regards the sacrifice itself, the priesthood of Christ was in a more

⁵ "The Holy Eucharist: an Historical Inquirer" (*The Church Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1901, p. 97).

⁶ "The Eucharistic Sacrifice," by the Rev. Dr. Mortimer, p. 228.

⁷ 3a, q. 48, a. 3, c.

⁸ *Ib.* q. 22, a. 5, ad 2um.

⁹ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁰ *Ib.* a. 3, ad 2um.

marked way prefigured by the priesthood of the Mosaic Law, through the shedding of blood, than by the priesthood of Melchisedec, in which there was no blood-shedding. But as far as regards the participation of the sacrifice, and its effect, in which the preëminence of Christ's priesthood over that of the law is especially manifested, it was more distinctly foreshadowed by the priesthood of Melchisedec, who offered bread and wine, figuring, as St. Augustine observes, the unity of the Church, which springs from the participation of Christ's Sacrifice. *Hence also it is that in the New Law the true Sacrifice of Christ is communicated to the faithful under the forms of bread and wine.*"¹¹

The meaning of this passage, of which I have italicized the last sentence, is plain. The bearing of it on the question in hand is likewise obvious. St. Thomas here teaches that the priesthood of Christ is one and the Sacrifice of Christ is one. This one priesthood and one sacrifice were foreshadowed in the foregoing time by a twofold priesthood and a twofold sacrifice. The Mosaic sacrifices foreshadowed the Sacrifice of Calvary; the Melchisedec sacrifice foreshadowed the Eucharist. But the Eucharist, viewed by itself and apart from the bloody immolation on Calvary, is not a sacrifice, but the participation of the One Sacrifice once offered. For "in the New Law the true Sacrifice of Christ is communicated to the faithful under the forms of bread and wine." This means, if words have any definite meaning at all, (1) that the Eucharist as a sacrifice is not other than "the true Sacrifice of Christ," which is the Sacrifice of the Cross, and (2) that the Eucharist reproduces and is "the true Sacrifice of Christ," else those who partake of the Eucharist would not be partaking of "the true Sacrifice of Christ."

The teaching of St. Thomas concerning the Eucharist as a sacrifice might be summed up in the words in which St. Cyprian expresses the faith of the primitive Church: "The Passion of Christ is the sacrifice that we offer." What is offered in the Mass is "the Blood of the Passion of Christ."¹² "In the consecration of the Blood mention is made of the effect of the Passion, rather than in the consecration of the Body, which is the subject of the Passion. And this is indicated by the fact that the Lord says, *which shall be delivered for you*, as if He said, *which shall be subjected to the Passion for you.*"¹³ So again: "The effect (of the Eucharist) is to be reckoned by that which it represents, which is the Passion of Christ. Hence the effect which the Passion of Christ produced in the world this sacrament produces in the individual man."¹⁴ And again: "The paschal lamb

¹¹ *Loc. cit.* ad 2um.

¹² Q. 78, a. 3, ad 8um.

¹³ *Ib.* ad 2um.

¹⁴ Q. 79, a. 1, c.

was the most striking figure of this sacrament, in regard of the Passion of Christ, which is represented by this sacrament."¹⁵ And once more: "It may be said, in short, that the consecration of this sacrament, and the acceptance of this sacrifice, and the fruit of it, proceed from the virtue of the Cross of Christ, and therefore wherever mention is made of any of these the priest makes the sign of the cross."¹⁶ One other passage of the *Summa* must be given at length:

"In a twofold way the celebration of this sacrament is called the immolation of Christ. It is so called, in the first place, because, as St. Augustine says to Simplicianus, 'Images are usually called by the names of those things of which they are images, as when looking at a picture or wall painting we say, This is Cicero, and this is Sallust.' Now the celebration of this sacrament, as has been said before, is a sort of image representative of the Passion of Christ, which is the true immolation of Him. Hence the celebration of this sacrament is called the immolation of Christ. Because of this St. Ambrose says, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'In Christ the sacrifice was offered once, fraught with an everlasting power to save. What, then, do we? Do not we offer sacrifice every day? Yes, but for a memorial of His death.' In another way (the celebration of this sacrament is called the immolation of Christ), so far as regards the effect of the Passion of Christ, because by this sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Lord's Passion. Wherefore in a certain sacred prayer of the Mass for Sunday it is said, 'As often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is made, the work of our redemption is carried on.' So far as concerns the first way, then, it may be said that Christ was immolated even in the typical sacrifices of the Old Testament. And so it is said in the Apocalypse, *whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, who was slain from the foundation of the world.* But so far as concerns the second way, it is peculiar to this sacrament that in the celebration of it Christ is immolated."¹⁷

It will be observed that the saint here speaks of the "immolation," not of the "offering" of Christ, and this, as it would appear, for two reasons; first, because with him immolation, not offering, is the essential note of sacrifice; secondly, because the offering of Christ in the Eucharist can be in no way doubtful, assuming the Real Presence, whereas the immolation of Him is not obvious and might even be open to question. To ask whether Christ is immolated in the Eucharist is to ask whether He is offered in sacrifice there. And

¹⁵ Q. 80, a. 10, ad 2um.

¹⁶ Q. 83, a. 5, ad 3um.

¹⁷ Ib. a. 1, c.

the answer of the saint is, Yes, in a twofold way; first, in that the Mass is a symbolic representation of the Sacrifice of Calvary, and secondly, in that the Mass applies to men the fruit of Christ's Passion, and so carries on the work of our redemption. Thus it is the real immolation of Christ that makes the Mass the distinctive Sacrifice of the New Law, for there was a mystical immolation of Him in the sacrifices of the Old Law as well. But the real immolation of Him took place on Calvary, and Christ having risen from the dead, dieth no more. Therefore it is the bloody immolation on the Cross, of which the sacrificial efficacy is everlasting, that is still operative in the Mass and makes the Mass a real sacrifice. Hence the Mass, not being really other than the Sacrifice of the Cross, has no sacrificial fruits of its own, and does but apply to men the fruits of the sacrifice once offered on Calvary. One has but to glance at the decree of the Council of Trent, sess. 22, to see how closely the Tridentine Fathers followed this teaching of St. Thomas concerning the Holy Mass.

In his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews the saint insists upon the oneness of the Sacrifice of the New Law, and declares expressly that the Mass is one with the Sacrifice of the Cross. On c. 9, v. 23 he writes: "In like manner the Apostle says *with sacrifices*, in the plural number. On the contrary, the Sacrifice of Christ is but one, for *by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified* (c. 10, v. 14). I answer, Though it is one in itself, it was foreshadowed in the Old Law by many sacrifices." Again, v. 26, he identifies the Sacrifice of the New Law with the Sacrifice of Calvary: "First the Apostle gives two reasons why the sacrifice is not repeated in the New Law; then he explains them, *And as it is appointed unto men once to die . . . so Christ was offered once*. He says, then: *But now once at the end of the ages He hath appeared to take away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.*" Once more, on c. 10, v. 1, he comments as follows:

"Hence in c. 9, v. 12 the Apostle, discoursing on the efficacy of the Sacrifice of Christ, attributes to it everlasting efficacy, saying, *having obtained eternal redemption*. Now that which has everlasting efficacy suffices to take away all sin, future as well as past; and therefore is not to be repeated. Hence Christ by one sacrifice cleansed forever them that are sanctified, as will presently be said. And if it be objected to this that we offer daily, I reply that we do not offer other than that which Christ offered for us, His Blood, to wit. Hence ours is not another sacrifice, but is the commemoration of that sacrifice which Christ offered, as we read in Luke, xxii., 19: 'This do for a commemoration of Me.'"

One other point must be touched on which reveals under another

form the persuasion of St. Thomas that the Mass is not a distinct sacrifice from that of Calvary, but the self-same. It is the prominence which he gives to an aspect of the Eucharist that has become greatly obscured since the sixteenth century. "The Eucharist," he says, "is the perfect Sacrament of the Lord's Passion, containing as it does Christ who suffered (*Christum passum*)."¹⁸ Again, "Christ who suffered is contained in this sacrament."¹⁹ The words have been already cited in which he speaks of it as "the participation of the Sacrifice of Christ," and says that "the true Sacrifice of Christ," *i. e.*, the Sacrifice of the Cross, "is communicated to the faithful under the forms of bread and wine." The Mass, therefore, reproduces the Sacrifice of Christ on Calvary under the appearances of bread and wine in order that the faithful may partake of it. This aspect of the Eucharist St. Paul also sets in clear relief where he says: "The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord? . . . Behold Israel according to the flesh; are not they that eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? . . . You cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils." (I. Cor. viii., 16-21.) The same is presented by St. Augustine, too, in a striking way when he says of his mother that she "never for one day absented herself from the altar, whence she knew that victim to be dispensed by which the handwriting that was against us is blotted out;"²⁰ and no less strikingly by St. Chrysostom: "Hence (from the wounded heart of Christ on the Cross) the mysteries have their origin; so that you should draw near the wondrous cup as if you were going to drink from the Saviour's opened side."²¹

The Victim of the Eucharist is thus the Victim of Calvary, not the victim of some other sacrifice. How, indeed, where Priest and Victim are numerically one, can there be two sacrifices? And surely this is a great and consoling fact, to be deeply pondered and to be duly thankful for and to be preached in season and out of season, that God's gift to us in the Eucharist is no other than the Victim by which the handwriting that was against us is blotted out.

"I can imagine nothing that speaks to one's life's need more than the conception of being associated with the perpetual pleading of the eternal sacrifice; it is there that the importance of the Eucharist comes in. In the Eucharist we have the assurance of the divinely appointed pledge and symbol of being identified with the eternal

¹⁸ 3a q. 73, a. 5, ad 2um.

¹⁹ Q. 74, a. 6, c.

²⁰ "Confessions," c. 9.

²¹ Hom. 84, in cap. 19 Joannis.

Sacrifice of the Lamb of God. And so I cannot conceive of it as being a mere commemorative rite. It is in some mysterious sense a real sharing of the Body and Blood of a living Christ, who is the eternally perfect Sacrifice."—Rev. C. G. Lang (Anglican) at the Fulham "Round Table" Conference.

ALEXANDER MACDONALD.

St. Andrew's, Nova Scotia.

WITHIN THE PENUMBRA OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE SINCE THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.
By *Johannes Janssen*. Translated by A. M. Christie. Vols. IX. and X.
London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Price of both volumes, \$6.25 net.

THESE two volumes, representing volume fifth of the original German edition, bring down the great history of Janssen to the goal which he had set himself, viz., the opening of the Thirty Years' War. The remaining three volumes are devoted to the study of the social conditions of Germany during the century following the Lutheran insurrection. For the first time, therefore, the English-speaking public have now at hand a thorough, reliable history of this most important epoch, written dispassionately by a master hand. Nothing now remains except to see to it that Janssen's History be placed in every public library throughout the land. This must be demanded in the interest of historical truth and fair play. Any one who is familiar with the German historical literature of the past thirty years knows how powerfully, if gradually and silently, Janssen's work has influenced and enlightened Protestant public opinion in the Fatherland as to the true nature of the so-called Reformation.

The translation of a work like Janssen's, swarming as it does with long quotations of sixteenth century writings and documents, is by no means an easy task, and requires an intimate acquaintance not only with the language, but also with the religious, political and social conditions of that age. We cannot, therefore, be surprised if at times the talented translator fell short of that ideal perfection which we could have wished to find in a strictly scientific work. But we deem it our duty to testify that, as a general rule, Miss Christie has acquitted herself of her difficult task in a way that challenges our admiration. We regret that a contrary impression has gone abroad, and we can assure our readers that, with solitary exceptions here and there, they will find in this rendition Janssen's thought put accurately