

Priestly Renewal, Eucharistic Revival: The Place of the Corpus Christi Liturgy in Aquinas's Sacramental Theology

JOSE ISIDRO BELLEZA
University of Cambridge
Cambridge, U.K.

Introduction

Among many well-catechized Catholics, the following two points—at first seemingly unrelated—have become common knowledge: first, that Christ instituted the sacramental priesthood at the Last Supper; and second, that St. Thomas Aquinas authored the Office hymns and Mass sequence for the Solemnity of Corpus Christi.

The magisterial sources for the first point are clear. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* notes: “In order to leave them a pledge of this love, in order never to depart from his own and to make them sharers in his Passover, [Christ] instituted the Eucharist as the memorial of his death and Resurrection, and commanded his apostles to celebrate it until his return; ‘thereby he constituted them priests of the New Testament’” (§1337). This recent formulation positively reworks a famous Tridentine canon: “If any one should say that by the words, ‘Do this in memory of me,’ Christ did not establish the apostles as priests, or that he did not ordain them and others as priests to offer his Body and Blood, let him be anathema.”¹ That the Council of Trent found it necessary to clarify this doctrine by anathematizing the contrary certainly testifies to the controversial nature of this Catholic position in wake of the Reformation; yet, the Council Fathers’

¹ Council of Trent, session 22, *De Sacrificio Missae*, can. 2.

position—as is so often the case with dogmatic pronouncements—is not a simple articulation of an uncontroversial yet implicit belief held within the Catholic communion.

With regard to the second point: after some decades of scholarly doubt,² Aquinas's composition of Corpus Christi's poetic texts seems to be better appreciated by laity and scholars alike,³ many of whom find in the beloved hymns commonly sung at adoration and Eucharistic processions a beautiful and edifying distillation of St. Thomas's teaching on the Blessed Sacrament. However, the place of the Corpus Christi liturgy within the historical development of Aquinas's own thoughts on the priesthood and Eucharist is perhaps less acknowledged.⁴ The aesthetic and spiritual appeal of the hymns,

² In the 1940s, legitimate doubts concerning the Thomistic provenance of the Corpus Christi liturgy were raised by Cyrille Lambot, "L'office de la Fête-Dieu: Aperçus nouveaux sur ses origines," *Revue Bénédictine* 54 (1942): 61–123; see also Lambot and Irénée Fransen, *L'Office de la Fête-Dieu primitive: Textes et mélodies retrouvés* (Maredsous, Belgium: Éditions de Maredsous, 1946). The problem turns on William of Tocco's relatively late attribution of these texts to Thomas.

³ James Weisheipl answered Lambot's concerns convincingly in *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Works* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1974), 177–83. Yet it is the work of Pierre-Marie Gy which has established beyond reasonable doubt St. Thomas's authorship of the Corpus Christi liturgy: "Office du Corpus Christi et s. Thomas d'Aquin: état d'une recherche," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 64 (1980): 491–507; "L'Office du Corpus Christi et la théologie des accidents eucharistique," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 66 (1982): 81–86; "Office liegeois et office romain de la Fête-Dieu," in *Actes du Colloque de Liège: Fête-Dieu*, vol. 1 (1246–1996), ed. Andrew Haquin (Louvain-la-Neuve: Institute d'Etudes Medievales de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1999), 117–26. For more recent discussions on the relationship of Thomas to the origin of Corpus Christi, see Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 185–95; Barbara R. Walters, "The Feast and Its Founder," in *The Feast of Corpus Christi*, ed. Barbara R. Walters, Vincent Corrigan, and Peter T. Ricketts (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 3–50; Jan-Heiner Tück, *A Gift of Presence: The Theology and Poetry of the Eucharist in Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Scott G. Hefelfinger (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2018), 163–73. On the authenticity of the hymn *Adoro te*, see Jean-Pierre Torrell, "L'authenticité de l'*Adoro te devote*," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 67 (1993), 79–83; Torrell, "*Adoro te devote*: La plus belle prière de saint Thomas," in *Recherches thomasiennes: études revues et augmentées* (Paris: Desclée, 1999), 367–75; Robert Wielockx, "*Adoro te devote*: Zur Lösung einer alten Crux," *Annales theologici* 21 (2007): 101–38.

⁴ Works of Aquinas (except the Corpus Christi liturgy) cited in this paper are as follows: commentary on book IV of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* = *Scriptum* in main text and *In IV sent.* in notes (Latin ed. Roberto Coggi [Bologna: Studio Domenicano, 1999], vols. 7–9); *Summa contra gentiles* = *SCG* (Latin ed. Pietro Marc, Ceslas Pera, and

compounded by their frequent usage, may tend to obscure the importance of the historical context which informs Aquinas's unique compositional, poetic, and doctrinal directions. Hidden behind the impressiveness of the saint's artistic execution, I argue, lies a parallel to the well-developed doctrinal synthesis of priesthood and Eucharist articulated in *Summa contra gentiles* [SCG] IV. In what follows, I examine excerpts from the sequence for Mass *Lauda Sion Salvatorem* and matutinal hymn *Sacris solemniis* to show how, already in the Orvieto period (1261–1265), Aquinas laid the foundations for sacramental doctrines expressed with more precision not only in the two *Summae*, but in the dogmatic teaching of the Council of Trent on the relationship between the Eucharist and Holy Orders. I will also highlight the unique and even innovative nature of Aquinas's positions by way of contrast with St. Bonaventure's sacramentology.⁵ I will conclude by offering some reflections, drawn from Aquinas's synthetic treatment of Eucharist and Holy Orders, on the inseparability of priestly renewal and Eucharistic revival.

From the *Sentences* Commentary to the *Summa theologiae*

In his commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard (the *Scriptum*), Aquinas, like his contemporaries, follows the broad tradition in locating the institution of the Eucharist at the Last Supper.⁶ This point is rightfully uncontroversial on account of its clear biblical background,⁷ and is repeated by the Angelic Doctor in *Summa theologiae* [ST] III.⁸ However, in the *Scriptum*, Aquinas links the institution of the Eucharist with the institution of the priesthood, saying that Christ “gave priestly power *with regard to its principal act* before the Passion at the Last Supper, when he said, in Matthew 26:26, ‘take and eat,’ to which Luke 22:19 adds ‘Do this in commemoration of me.’ But after the resurrection, he gave the disciples priestly power *with regard to its secondary act*, which is to bind and loose.”⁹ Thus, in his early work, Aquinas already suggests—although not with the same precision or emphasis seen in later works—a nuanced theology of the priesthood which

Pietro Caramello [Turin: Marietti, 1961], vols. 2–3); *Summa theologiae* = ST (Latin in Leonine ed.). All translations are original.

⁵ Works of Bonaventure are taken from Quaracchi edition of his *Opera Omnia*, vols. 4 (1899) and 5 (1891).

⁶ Aquinas, *In IV sent.*, d. 8, q. 1, a. 3, ad q. 3 (Coggi ed., 7:572); cf. Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, d. 8, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (Quaracchi ed., 4:186).

⁷ See, e.g., Matt 26:26 and Luke 22:19.

⁸ ST III, q. 73, a. 5, resp. (Leonine ed., 12:142–43).

⁹ Aquinas, *In IV sent.*, d. 24, q. 2, a. 3, ad 2 (Coggi ed., 9:82; emphasis added).

distinguishes between the principal and secondary acts of ordained ministry. Although he does not use more definitive language here (e.g., “the sacrament of Holy Orders was instituted at such-and-such event”), the implication of his references to Matt 26 and Luke 19 are unavoidable: properly speaking, the power of exercising the principal sacerdotal act—to offer Christ’s Body and Blood—was given to the apostles at the Last Supper, while the forgiveness of sins is a secondary power later added to the principal. Note that Aquinas’s words form part of a reply to an objection; his main concern here is to affirm his judgment in the body of the article that “the principal act of the priest is to consecrate the Body and Blood of the Lord.”¹⁰ This close bond between Eucharist and priesthood was already affirmed earlier in the previous article, where Aquinas wrote that “the sacrament of Order is ordered to the Eucharist, which is the ‘sacrament of sacraments,’ as Dionysius says, . . . and thus the distinction of the orders is understood according to their relation to the Eucharist. For the power of order is the consecration of the Eucharist itself, or to some ministry ordered to that consecration.”¹¹ Here, however, Aquinas is principally concerned with the distinction between the various orders,¹² not the distinction between the powers of priesthood itself.

In the *Scriptum*, Aquinas does not yet pinpoint the exact nature of the relationship between the primary and secondary powers, nor does he identify an exact moment of the priesthood’s institution; thus, in this period, his work may admit of a reading in favor of what we might call a “progressive institution” of the priesthood—that is, an institution taking place over a period of time according to Christ’s temporally disparate concession of powers. This latter conception, as we will later show, also seems to be the position of St. Bonaventure.

In the *ST*, however, St. Thomas uses language that more closely

¹⁰ Aquinas, *In IV sent.*, d. 24, q. 2, a. 3, sol. (Coggi ed., 9:82).

¹¹ *In IV sent.*, d. 24, q. 2, a. 1, q1a. 2, sol. (Coggi ed., 9:70).

¹² The close link between the sacramental treatise of the *Scriptum* and the posthumously compiled supplement to the *ST* is evident on this very question: cf. *ST Supp.*, q. 37, a. 2, resp.: “For the power of order is either for the consecration of the Eucharist itself, or for some ministry ordered toward it. If considered in the first way, this is the order of priests. Therefore, when they are they ordained, they receive the chalice with wine and the paten with bread, receiving the power to consecrate the body and blood of Christ” (Leonine ed., 11:377). See also *ST Supp.*, q. 37, a. 4, resp.: “The consecration carried out in the sacrament of order is ordained to the sacrament of the Eucharist, as said before; [consecration of the Eucharist] is the first of any act of order, according to that which is more proximately ordained to the sacrament of the Eucharist. And accordingly, one order is superior to another, according to the act which is more proximately ordered to [the Eucharist]” (Leonine ed., 11:381).

approximates the dogmatic pronouncement of Trent cited above. “Just as the power to eat this sacrament is given to the baptized,” he writes, “so is the power to consecrate this sacrament *in persona Christi* granted to the priest at his ordination; thus is he placed by the Lord at the same grade as those [i.e., the apostles] to whom it was said, ‘Do this in commemoration of me.’ And therefore it should be said that it is proper to a priest to confect this sacrament.”¹³ The notion of Eucharistic consecration as the priest’s principal duty is thereby affirmed in Aquinas’s later period. Moreover, the close link between Christ’s command “do this” and the Church’s ordination of priests is made more explicit, for Thomas does so without reference to the power to bind and loose; this formulation in the *ST* rules out the notion of a “progressive institution.”

Thus, at both the beginning and end of Aquinas’s career, we find the idea that Christ established the Eucharist at the Last Supper, a position held in common among Aquinas’s contemporaries. In his later years, however, Aquinas seems to adopt the additional opinion that, by the same act of instituting the Eucharist, Christ also instituted the priesthood, since the Church’s rite of ordination raises the ordained to the same status given to the apostles at the Last Supper. The later Thomas thus arrives at what will later become defined dogmatic teaching. His own development on this matter points not only to the ongoing crystallization of his own positions in the realm of sacramental theology, but also to fluid nature of the *status quaestionis* during his lifetime.

The Orvieto Period: *Summa contra gentiles* IV

If, in the *Scriptum* and the *ST*, Aquinas expounds on the simultaneous dual institution of priesthood and Eucharist, it is in fact in the middle period of his theological activity when he articulates in more detail the link not only between Holy Orders and the Eucharist in themselves, but also in relation to the other priestly powers. During his time as conventual lector in Orvieto (1261–1265)—more precisely in 1264–1265—St. Thomas produced a sacramental treatise in *SCG* IV, chs. 58–78.¹⁴ Concerning the relationship between the priesthood’s principal and secondary powers, Aquinas writes:

¹³ *ST* III, q. 82, a. 1, resp. (Leon. ed., 12:261).

¹⁴ For these dates, see Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: The Person and his Work*, vol. 1, trans. Robert Royal, rev. ed. (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 101–4, 328.

Since the power of Order is directed to the dispensation of sacraments, and the Eucharist is the most noble and perfect of them all, . . . it follows that the power of Order must be considered principally with reference to that sacrament. . . . Since the power of order extends to the confection of Christ's body and its distribution to the faithful, it follows that the same power should extend to the preparation of the faithful so that they be made apt and worthy to receive this sacrament. . . . Thus, the power of Order must extend to the forgiveness of sins, by the dispensation of those sacraments ordered to remission of sin, like baptism and penance.¹⁵

More than simply enumerating primary and secondary powers as he did in the *Scriptum* or summarily linking the establishment of priesthood and Eucharist in the *ST*, Aquinas bestows greater specificity to his *SCG* doctrine by setting forth the proper ordering between those powers. First, the Eucharist is the "most noble and perfect" sacrament, while the forgiveness of sins given through Baptism and penance is understood as ordered to the reception of the Eucharist. He thereby identifies a *participative relation* between the perfection of the Eucharist, on one hand, and the preparatory necessity of both Baptism and penance on the other. The font and the confessional have their full *raison d'être*, one could say, only by virtue of their ordination to and participation in the perfection given through the sacrament of the altar. In the same chapter, Thomas accordingly enumerates, in proper descending order, the powers of the priesthood with reference to the individual actions of Christ, who "bestowed on the disciples the consecration of his Body and Blood, saying 'Do this in commemoration of me'; he handed them the power to remit sins, according to John: 'whose sins you forgive are forgiven'; he joined to them the task of teaching and baptizing, as in Matthew: 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them.'"¹⁶ These are not individually separate powers considered univocally and aggregated into a single human subject; they rather consist in inferior powers (baptizing and absolving) ordered toward a superior power (the offering of the Eucharistic Christ). The power to consecrate the Lord's Body and Blood is the *conditio sine qua non* for the secondary powers, and priesthood thus principally and properly consists in offering sacrifice, and consequently to baptizing and absolving. We can therefore draw the inference that, for Aquinas in *SCG* IV, the priesthood is established definitively, to quote his vespertine hymn, in

¹⁵ *SCG* IV, ch. 74, nos. 4096–97.

¹⁶ *SCG* IV, ch. 74, no. 4092.

supremae nocte coenae. The notion of a “progressive institution” of the priesthood is now excluded—an exclusion repeated, as we have seen, in *ST* III.

The Orvieto Period: Composing the Corpus Christi Liturgy

The foregoing discussion of *SCG* IV is crucial because it helps us contextualize another important contribution produced by Aquinas in the same period: the Mass and Office of Corpus Christi. Owing to the constraints of this paper, we will consider only excerpts from the sequence *Lauda Sion* and the hymn for Matins *Sacris solemniis*, but to adequately understand these poetic texts *ad mentem Divi Thomae*, an excursus on the distinctly canonical-priestly spirit underlying Aquinas’s compositional choices will be helpful.

Excursus: The Sacerdotal Background of Aquinas’s Poetry

The reform of clerical laxity, one of the most prominent themes of the reform movement named after Pope St. Gregory VII (†1085), unfolded in various ways, not least of which was the growth of new religious orders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Older, richly endowed monasteries had become targets of criticism, while the increasing influx of noble progeny into powerful abbeys and cathedral chapters led to a heightened suspicion of clergy. A desired return to apostolic simplicity was taken up by reforming Benedictines like Saints Gregory VII and Peter Damian, both of whom fought vigorously against simony and clerical sexual depravity; the now-millennium-long codification of priestly celibacy in the West arose largely from their efforts.¹⁷ Under the impulse of Roman reform, laymen like Francis of Assisi or priests like Dominic de Guzman and Norbert of Xanten continued the Gregorian project of purifying the Church well after the passing of Gregory. In the case of Norbert and Dominic, these efforts took shape in a new form of life. Between the extremes of a purely contemplative life (typified by monastics), and a largely active life (represented diversely by Franciscans and seculars), such men sought a balance between the two by adopting a life in common under a rule like monks, while establishing their houses in urban settings so as to serve the people through external apostolates. A renewed broad tradition of canons regular (to include Augustinians, Dominicans, and Norbertines), bound by the Rule of St. Augustine rather

¹⁷ For a summary of this history, see John A.F. Thomson, *The Western Church in the Middle Ages* (London: Arnold, 1998), 81–109; for a more detailed treatment, see Phyllis G. Jestice, *Wayward Monks and the Religious Revolution of the Eleventh Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

than that of Benedict, constituted a concrete response to the new social context which demanded a new synthesis of action and contemplation.¹⁸

In practice, the Gregorian Reform and its later repercussions in Capetian France exhibited features that suggest an attempt to re-establish clerical credibility. A crucial aspect of this effort was a renewed insistence on the indispensable nature of priesthood and sacraments. In the decades following the investiture controversy between Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV (†1106), French kings also attempted to place their favorites on episcopal thrones without regard for the virtue or competence of their nominees, drawing the ire of canons regular like St. Ivo of Chartres (†1115); Ivo, mentor to some of the original Victorines like William of Champeaux and Hugh of Saint-Victor, engineered the ascension of his protégés to important sees in order to block the encroachments of King Louis VI (†1135) on the rights of the Church. The famous Abbey of Saint-Victor was established in this milieu by William of Champeaux (†1122); from its foundation in 1113, its promotion of the Gregorian Reform in Paris sought to reassert to both king and commoner the necessity of *good priests*—and thereby, the correct administration of the sacraments—for the good of the Church and society.¹⁹

The liturgy did not pass through this period unaffected, and at Saint-Victor, the intellectual fervor and robust priestly charism fostered by Ivo's students produced adaptations to the abbey's conventual liturgy which clearly bore the aims of the reform in mind. Adam of Saint-Victor's sequence *Laudes crucis attollamus*, sung on the two feasts of the Holy Cross, reveals the Victorine liturgy as an expression of canons' position within their political environment. The purpose of these Victorine sequences "is to tell a history of events on earth, especially a history of priests and priesthood, of feasts and sacraments."²⁰ Margot Fassler's description of the structure and content of *Laudes crucis* places into sharp relief the polemical Victorine spirit.

The sequence text has four clearly discernible sections: (1) an exordium, (2) a history of the cross through Old Testament typology, (3) an expression of the powers of the cross in contemporary life, and (4) a final prayer addressed to Jesus. Although this poem resembles most early medieval sequences in its basic structure, each of the individual parts is different from what would be expected in an earlier

¹⁸ On the continuity of the Gregorian Reform and the rise of religious (canonical and mendicant) orders, see Thomson, *The Western Church*, 110–24.

¹⁹ Margot Fassler, *Gothic Song: Victorine Sequences and Augustinian Reform in Twelfth-Century Paris* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 187–206.

²⁰ Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 65.

piece. . . . And just as its purpose is different, so too is its subject and mode of presentation. This is a poem about the cross and its power, flowing through the sacraments of the church to the people.²¹

Whereas earlier sequences from tenth- and eleventh-century France were simpler and shorter commentaries on the *alleluia* verse of the Mass,²² the “Victorine sequences,” many authored by Adam of Saint-Victor, represent a new, expansive genre of Latin poetry and music. The use of Old Testament typology to illustrate both *historical* and *present effects* of the Cross’s power stands firmly within the Victorine project of vindicating the role of the Church and her priests. Whereas the “old” sequence for the Holy Cross, the eleventh-century *Alte vox canat*, presented the Cross simply as appearing in a heavenly vision,²³ in Adam’s *Laudes crucis*, the Cross dispenses the grace of Christ here and now.²⁴ The newer sequence’s attention to history—not only to that of Scripture,²⁵ but also to that of the triumph of Constantine over Maxentius and the rescue of the True Cross by Heraclius²⁶—sets it apart

²¹ Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 65–66.

²² Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 38–46.

²³ For the text of *Alte vox*, see Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 54–55.

²⁴ For the text of *Laudes crucis*, see Adam of Saint-Victor, *Sequences*, with introduction, text, translation, and notes by Juliet Mousseau, R.S.C.J. (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 110–15.

²⁵ For example, see lines 28–45 of *Laudes crucis* for clever references to various episodes in Exodus and to the story of Elijah and the widow in 1 Kgs 17:

Non sunt nova sacramenta,	These sacraments are not new,
nec recenter est inventa	neither is this religion of the Cross
crucis haec religio.	newly discovered.
Ista dulces aquas fecit,	[This Cross] made the waters sweet,
per hanc silex aquas iecit	and by the work of Moses,
Moysi officio.	the rock gave forth water.
Nulla salus est in domo	There is no salvation in this house
nisi cruce munit homo	unless man arms his lintels
superliminaria,	with the Cross;
neque sensit gladium	whosoever does this
nec amisit filium,	neither feels the pain of the sword
quisquis egit talia.	nor loses his son.
Ligna legens in Sarepta	Gathering the wood in Zarephath,
spem salutis est adepta	the poor little woman
pauper muliercula.	secures hope of salvation.
Sine lignis fidei,	Neither the flask of oil
nec lechythus olei	nor the fine flour holds power
vellet nec farinula.	without the wood of faith.

²⁶ *Laudes crucis*, lines 46–52:

from earlier pieces like *Alte vox* because it returns to a more patristic mode of exegesis, one that sees the types of the Old Covenant fulfilled not only in Christ but also in the events of Church history.²⁷ However, Adam does not simply regurgitate patristic themes; he presents new reinterpretations appropriate to his age. His literary corpus is a poetic expression of the typically threefold “Augustinian-Victorine exegesis” which received its definitive form in the work of Adam’s master, Hugh of Saint-Victor: the historical, allegorical, and tropological senses of Scripture unfold in that order, such that contemplation and study of concrete history help lead the Christian to right action.²⁸ While this mode of exegesis is nothing new, the “systematic use of Old Testament typology for the sacraments and priests”²⁹ through the medium of liturgical poetry is an entirely Victorine development. Following this, we can note another important feature of *Laudes crucis*: this sequence not only speaks generally about the necessity of sacerdotal mediation, but directly addresses the very clerics charged to sing the sequence at Mass. The opening lines exhort “those of us who exult in the special glory of the Cross” and “we, who believe” in the power of the Cross.³⁰ This significant

In scripturis sub figuris
ista latent, sed iam patent
crucis beneficia.

Reges credunt, hostes cedunt,
sola cruce Christo duce
unus fugat milia.

²⁷ *Laudes crucis*, lines 53–60:

Ista suos fortiores
semper facit et victores,
morbos sanat et languores,
reprimat daemonia.
Dat captivis libertatem,
vitae confert novitatem.
Ad antiquam dignitatem
crux reduxit omnia.

Hidden in Scripture under figures,
the blessings of the Cross
are now made known.
Kings believe, foes yield,
by the one Cross, Christ the one leader,
puts thousands to flight.

[The Cross] always makes its own
to be stronger and victorious,
healing the sick and weakly,
repelling demons.
It grants freedom to captives,
and confers newness of life.
The Cross returns all men
to their ancient dignity.

²⁸ See Hugh of Saint-Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidei*, prologue (PL, 176:183–86) and 2.8 (PL, 4:462–72); *Commentarium in hierarchiam coelestem* 2 (PL, 175:935–56); *De Scripturis et Scriptoribus Sacris* 5 (PL, 175:13–15); *De arca Noe morali* 1 (PL, 176:619–34).

²⁹ Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 66.

³⁰ *Laudes crucis*, lines 1–6:

Laudes crucis attollamus
nos, qui crucis exsultamus
speciali gloria.
Dulce melos tangat caelos,
dulce lignum dulci dignum

Let us, who exult in
the special glory of the Cross,
raise the Cross’s praises.
Let its sweet melody touch the heavens
for we believe the sweet wood

usage of the second person plural in the hortatory opening, the mention of *servi crucis* and *assistentes crucis*,³¹ and the presence of a greeting (*ave*) and farewell (*vale*) at the beginning and end (respectively)³² all serve to depict something of the concrete liturgical celebration of the Feasts of the Holy Cross at Saint-Victor: pieces of the True Cross reserved at the abbey were carried in procession while the choir of clerics sang praises of the Cross's power, offering both a hail and a farewell as the relics entered and left the scene.³³ The image offered is one of a vibrant priestly-sacramental hierarchy: the canons as well as the *sacramenta* of the Cross dispense the healing power of God to all the Christian faithful. Fassler rightly interprets this exaltation of sacerdotal and sacramental power as an expression of the canons' opposition to the overreach of secular rulers.³⁴

By the time St. Thomas reached Paris in the mid-thirteenth century, the influence and prestige of the abbey of Saint-Victor was secured, not only through the work of masters like Richard, Hugh, and Peter Lombard, but also through their liturgical practices, some of which influenced other liturgies in Western Europe. Specifically, the influence of Adam's *Laudes crucis* is no mean detail. This sequence was found not only in the liturgical books of the four major liturgical centers of Paris (Notre-Dame, Saint-Victor, Sainte-Genevieve, and Saint-Denis); by the end of the twelfth century, it was sung "throughout Europe, a sequence of international fame."³⁵ Whether Thomas had already heard *Laudes crucis* before arriving at Paris is unclear. Nevertheless, by the time Pope Urban IV charged him to compose the Office and Mass for the universal Corpus Christi feast in 1264, Thomas

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">credimus melodia.</p> <p>³¹ <i>Laudes crucis</i>, lines 10–15, 68–72:</p> <p>Servi crucis crucem laudent
qui per crucem sibi gaudent
vitae dari munera.
Dicant omnes et dicant singuli:
ave, salus totius saeculi,
arbor salutifera.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">...</p> <p>Assistentes crucis laudi,
consecrator crucis, audi
atque servos tuae crucis
post hanc vitam vereae lucis
transfer ad palatia.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">is worthy of a sweet melody.</p> <p>Let the servants of the Cross praise the Cross,
who rejoice that through the Cross
they have been given the gifts of life.
Let each and every one declare:
hail, O salvation of all ages,
O saving tree.</p> <p>O consecrator of the Cross,
listen to those present,
and after this life
bring the servants of your Cross
to palaces of true light.</p> |
|--|--|
- ³² *Laudes crucis*, lines 14, 61.
- ³³ Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 290–320.
- ³⁴ Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 243–89.
- ³⁵ Fassler, *Gothic Song*, 78.

had already run the *cursus academicus* of a Parisian master, having drawn from the wells of Victorine texts for nearly two decades while inhaling the liturgical air breathed by Adam of Saint-Victor. Moreover, his vocation as a Dominican friar places him within the same tradition of clerical-canonical life as Adam,³⁶ such that the attention to the importance of fixed sacramental signs and sacerdotal mediation formed part of their shared ethos. It is thus worth examining more deeply the fact that the sequence composed by Thomas, *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, is a contrafaction of *Laudes crucis*; that is, Thomas's sequence was deliberately modeled on the structure, form, rhyme scheme, and melody as Adam's.

It would be unfortunate to consider Thomas's nod to Adam only a matter of style, given the socio-political matrix informing the genre of Victorine sequences. Nevertheless, in many major commentaries on Aquinas's poetry, Adam receives only passing reference; the true significance of this contrafaction is missed by many otherwise eminent contemporary commentators on the Corpus Christi liturgy.³⁷ By choosing a nearly exact emulation of the form of *Laudes crucis*, Thomas shows that his vision is closely aligned with Adam's. If the justification of a necessary sacramental order was a chief Victorine preoccupation, the establishment of a universal Eucharistic feast represents a radical intensification of that focus—a situation to which Thomas responded fittingly in Adam's style. No wonder that *Lauda Sion* retains the same fourfold structure of *Laudes crucis*—exordium, biblical

³⁶ On the origin of the Dominicans as canons regular (as well as their debt to the Premonstratensian constitutions), see G. R. Galbraith, *The Constitution of the Dominican Order, 1216 to 1360* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1925), 15–36, 175–79; William Bonniwell, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy* (New York: Wagner, 1944), 9–27. Moreover, the two decrees of Honorius III confirming the establishment of the Dominicans in Toulouse—*Religiosam Vitam* (December 1216) and *Nos Attendentes* (January 1217)—refer to the Preachers as an *ordo canonicus* under the Rule of St. Augustine. The prologue of the Primitive Constitutions (before the 1240 reform of Raymond of Peñafort) does likewise. Dominic himself began his clerical life as a Norbertine at Santa Maria de la Vid and later a cathedral canon of Osma. I thank Augustine Thompson, O.P., for these insights.

³⁷ None have considered the importance of Adam's influence on Thomas's doctrinal-poetic productions: neither Gy ("Office du Corpus Christi et s. Thomas"; "L'Office du Corpus Christi et la theologie des accidents"; "Office liegeois et office romain"), nor Weisheipl (*Friar Thomas d'Aquino*), nor Torrell (*Saint Thomas Aquinas*), nor Rubin (*Corpus Christi*), nor Walters, Corrigan, and Ricketts (*Feast of Corpus Christi*), nor Tück (*Gift of Presence*), nor Paul Murray, *Aquinas at Prayer: The Bible, Mysticism, and Poetry* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), nor Olivier-Thomas Venard, *A Poetic Christ: Thomist Reflections on Scripture, Language and Reality*, trans. Kenneth Oakes and Francesca Aran Murphy (London: T&T Clark, 2019).

typology, exposition of divine power in the present, and hopeful prayer to Christ. Thomas thus presents a universal focus for a feast of universal import, emphasizing the universal reach of Christ's priesthood in celebrations of Mass *toto orbe terrarum*. Nevertheless, while acknowledging its universal scope, *Lauda Sion* remains a "Victorine sequence," sung by priests and addressed to priests, and through them, to the faithful.

Lauda Sion Salvatorem & Sacris solemnibus

With this historical background in mind, we can proceed to examine how Aquinas's poetry³⁸ mirrors the priestly character presented in *Laudes crucis*. While Adam's sequence is perhaps clearer in its second person plural reference to the abbey's clerics, Thomas's address to his own brother priests in *Lauda Sion* is more subtle but nevertheless present.

Quod in cena Christus gessit
faciendum hoc expressit
in sui memoriam.
Docti sacris institutis,
panem, vinum in salutis
consecramus hostiam.³⁹

Poetically re-narrating the events of the Last Supper, here Thomas juxtaposes—as in *pars* IV of the *Scriptum*—Christ's command to "do this" (here expressed with the gerundive *faciendum*, implying the perpetual repetition of future celebrations) and the ordination of New Covenant priests. The Victorine second person plural reappears in reference to those who consecrate the gifts of bread and wine, while the ablative absolute *docti sacris institutis* further specifies the special status of these consecrators. As one instructed and instituted into Holy Orders, the Angelic Doctor reminds his fellow priests that they too possess the same power consigned to the apostles *in coena*. But, if in this verse Thomas simply draws a parallel between Christ's "hoc facite" and

³⁸ For the texts of the Corpus Christi liturgy, I refer to the edited version of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Latin 1143, in Walters, Corrigan, and Ricketts, *Feast of Corpus Christi*, 240–361.

³⁹ *Officium Corporis Christi*, Missa *Cibavit eos*, sequentia *Lauda Sion*, lines 25–30:

What Christ did at supper,
he commanded to be done
in his memory.
Let us, who have been instructed
in sacred things, consecrate
bread and wine into the offering of salvation.

the Church's "accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium,"⁴⁰ at Matins he makes the notion of a joint institution of priesthood and Eucharist more explicit.

Sic sacrificium istud instituit
cuius officium committi voluit
solis presbiteris, quibus sic congruit
ut sumant et dent ceteris.⁴¹

The internal rhyme of *sacrificium* and *officium* is a marvelous compositional move that poetically asserts a total equivalence between the *office* of priesthood (as a position) and the *task* of offering sacrifice in obedience to Christ. Similarly, the end rhyme of *instituit* and *voluit* suggests the unity of Christ's action, in that his institution of the Eucharist was inseparable from his desire to establish priests empowered to celebrate it perpetually.⁴² These observations cohere well with the judgments of *SCG* IV and *ST* III. With regard to the former, by explicitly enumerating the secondary powers of the priesthood as ordered to and consequent upon the principal power of Eucharistic consecration, Thomas gestures strongly toward the notion that priesthood is conferred *simpliciter* with the power of consecrating the Eucharist. In light of the aforementioned citation of *SCG* IV, the notion of a joint institution of the two sacraments at the Last Supper as articulated in *ST* III can be drawn almost as an immediate inference. *Sacris solemnibus*, then, anticipates not only the doctrine of the *ST* but also that of the Council of Trent nearly three centuries before its indiction.

Let us return to *Lauda Sion*, where the aforementioned priestly background casts an interesting light on the repercussions of the close link drawn by Thomas between Holy Orders and Eucharist.

Sumunt boni, sumunt mali,
sorte tamen inequali:
vite vel interitus.

⁴⁰ This is taken by Thomas and the medievals as the sacramental form for priestly ordination; see *ST* III, q. 82, a. 1, ad 1 (Leonine ed., 12:261).

⁴¹ *Officium Corporis Christi*, hymnus ad Maututinas *Sacris solemnibus*, lines 17–20:

Thus did he institute this sacrifice,
whose task he wished to entrust
only to priests, to whom it pertains
to consume it and give it to others.

⁴² For St. Thomas, Christ is a priest only insofar as he is man; see *ST* III, q. 22, a. 2, resp. (Leonine ed., 11:257), and a. 3, ad 1 (Leonine ed., 11:259).

Mors est malis, vita bonis:
 vide paris sumptionis
 quam sit dispar exitus.⁴³

Taken by itself, this appears to be a straightforward presentation of 1 Cor 11, wherein St. Paul labels those who receive the Lord unworthily as guilty of Christ's blood, thereby drinking condemnation upon themselves. Certainly this is an admonition valid for all the faithful, but this stanza is nevertheless best understood within its sacerdotal context. Medieval Victorine and Dominican priests, charged to attend choral Office and conventual Mass (in addition to the celebration of a personal Mass), were thereby bound to frequent (if not daily) Eucharistic reception. This was not the case for the laity, who rather received communion only on major feasts and thus could, in theory, more adequately prepare themselves. Because of this clerical regularity, reception of the sacrament by *presbyteri mali* remained a constant possibility in Thomas's own time. This may help us understand why *Lauda Sion*—a Victorine-style sequence directed firstly to priests—is the only poem in the Corpus Christi liturgy which mentions the punishment for unworthy reception. The old adage *corruptio optimi pessima* rings true, as Aquinas subtly reminds those men summoned to the highest vocation that the price for their failure is heavier than a millstone round the neck.

Sed Contra: St. Bonaventure's Sacramentology

Now we can briefly contrast the aforementioned aspects of St. Thomas's sacramental vision with the doctrine of an eminent contemporary, the Franciscan Scholastic and minister general Bonaventure of Bagnoregio. The Seraphic Doctor interestingly never names a single moment at which the priesthood was conferred upon the apostles. Wayne Hellmann and his co-authors interpret key texts in Bonaventure's commentary on the *Sentences*⁴⁴ to mean that Christ instituted the priesthood *per se ipsum*, that

⁴³ *Lauda Sion*, lines 49–54:

Both the good and bad partake,
 but their fates are different:
 either life or destruction.
 Death to the bad, life to the good:
 see how the same act of eating
 yields such disparate ends.

⁴⁴ J. A. Wayne Hellmann, "Bonaventure on Sacraments: Trinitarian Institution and Trinitarian Structure," in *Deus Summe Cognoscibilis: The Current Theological Relevance of Saint Bonaventure*, ed. Amaury Begasse de Dhaem et al. (Leuven: Peeters, 2018),

is, by the very fact of his Incarnation, not by a subsequent formal act. In fact, “In no place” in his commentary on distinction 24 or 25 of the first book “does Bonaventure maintain that [the sacrament of Holy Orders] is instituted by Christ, although he does mention this in passing when he treats of the institution of the Eucharist.”⁴⁵ By the time of the *Breviloquium* in the mid-1260s, Bonaventure has shifted: Christ instituted Holy Orders “first by giving power to bind and loose the sins of men, then power to offer the sacrifice of the altar.”⁴⁶ He reverses the order given by Thomas in *SCG* IV, and this divergence between the two scholastic giants should not be understated. Bonaventure’s mention of binding and loosing (as remissions of sins) refers to the pre-Resurrection episode in Matt 18, while Thomas’s proof text for *SCG* IV is the post-Resurrection appearance in John 20. Bonaventure accordingly believes that the authority to absolve was given prior to the Passion, whereas for Thomas (foreshadowing *ST* III), the apostles truly received the keys only after the Resurrection.⁴⁷

497–511, at 501–2; cf. Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, d. 8, p. 1, a. 2, q. 2, resp. (Quaracchi ed., 4:185–6), and d. 24, p. 1, a. 2, q. 3 (4:617–18). See also an extended treatment this topic in J. A. Wayne Hellmann, “Bonaventure: On the Institution of Sacraments,” in Jay M. Hammond, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, and Jared Goff, eds., *A Companion to Bonaventure* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 333–57.

⁴⁵ J. A. Wayne Hellmann, Timothy R. LeCroy, and Luke Davis Townsend, eds., *Works of Saint Bonaventure. Commentary on the Sentences: Sacraments*, vol. 17 (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2016), 389. Bonaventure also explicitly names the Eucharist as one of the three sacraments founded directly by Christ (along with Holy Orders and Baptism) in *Breviloquium* VI, 4.4 (Quaracchi ed., 5:269).

⁴⁶ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* VI, ch. 4, no. 4: “Instituit . . . ordinem vero, dando primo potestatem ligandi et solvendi peccata humani generis et potestatem conficiendi Sacramentum altaris” — “But Christ instituted orders first by giving the power of binding and loosing the sins of mankind, and the power of confecting the sacrament of the altar” (Quaracchi ed., 5:269).

⁴⁷ See also *ST* III, q. 84, a. 7, resp.: “But that which pertains to the office of ministers [Christ] established in Matt 16, where he said to Peter, ‘I will give you the keys to the kingdom of heaven,’ etc. He manifested the efficacy of this sacrament and the origin of its power in Luke, where he said before his Passion and resurrection that it was necessary to preach penance and remission of sins in his name to all peoples, for this sacrament has its efficacy by the power of the name of Jesus Christ who suffered and rose again for the remission of sins” (Leonine ed., 12:294–95). While the cited episode of Luke 22:47 took place before the Passion, Thomas’s commentary is clear in affirming that Christ was speaking of what would come after the Resurrection. This agrees with Thomas’s citation of John 20 in *SCG* IV, ch. 74, no. 4092, as well as with his general principle from *ST* III, q. 62, a. 5, resp. (Leonine ed., 12:26–27), that the sacraments derive their efficacy from the Passion, such that the power to absolve, for Thomas, was not properly established until the post-Resurrection appearance.

Both Bonaventure and Thomas, following Scripture, acknowledge that the powers of absolution and Eucharistic consecration were granted at different times, but the ways in which they describe how these powers relate *to one another* point to a further significant difference between their approaches to sacramental theology. The passage from the *Breviloquium* cited above lists absolution before Eucharistic consecration, but with no sense as to the ordering of one power to the other; I have furthermore found no place in Bonaventure where he ranks the various priestly powers or names a principal. Meanwhile, Thomas takes pains to show how Eucharistic consecration is the principal priestly power, with the other powers consequent upon it. This metaphysical ordering of the powers is notably echoed in Thomas's selection of John 20:23 as the scriptural warrant for the conferral of the power to absolve, within the context of enumerating the various sacerdotal powers: the metaphysical ordering of powers is expressed in the temporal sequence of their concession by Christ.

Not only does Bonaventure divide the institution of the priesthood temporally; he does the same when considering the Eucharist itself. In the same *Breviloquium* passage, the *Seraphicus* teaches that Christ "instituted the Holy Eucharist, by comparing himself to a grain of wheat, and, immediately before the Passion, by consecrating and giving to his disciples the sacrament of his Body and Blood."⁴⁸ Baptism receives a similar treatment, since Christ "first instituted Baptism by being baptized himself, then by determining the form of Baptism, and by making it universal."⁴⁹ Although Christ did not directly institute Confirmation according to Bonaventure, Christ "insinuated and gave rise to" this sacrament "by laying hands upon the little ones, and by foretelling that His disciples would be baptized with the Holy Spirit."⁵⁰ Here we observe what I have termed Bonaventure's "progressive institution" of the sacraments. By contrast, with regard to Eucharist, Baptism, and Confirmation, Thomas admits of no progressive institution, but rather suggests precise moments of establishment (Last Supper, Baptism by John, and Pentecost, respectively).⁵¹

⁴⁸ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* VI, ch. 4, no. 4 (Quaracchi ed., 5:269).

⁴⁹ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* VI, ch. 4, no. 4 (Quaracchi ed., 5:269).

⁵⁰ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* VI, ch. 4, no. 4 (Quaracchi ed., 5:269).

⁵¹ For Thomas on the institution of Baptism, see *ST* III, q. 66, a. 2, resp.: "It seems that a sacrament is instituted when it receives the power of producing its effect. This power was received by baptism at Christ's baptism. Thus baptism was truly instituted at that time, with respect to that sacrament itself" (Leonine ed., 12:64). For the institution of Confirmation, see *ST* III, q. 72, a. 1, ad 1, where Thomas takes his position against the Franciscan *Summa Halensis* and the early Bonaventure (both of whom in the early 1250s held that the Church instituted Confirmation after the apostolic age;

To assess these differences, I draw inspiration from the contributions of two Dominican theologians, Bernhard Blankenhorn and Reginald Lynch, on the notion of instrumental sacramental causality. As Lynch observes, the Seraphic Doctor seems to have great difficulty in articulating the relationship between divine power, on one hand, and its finite sacramental expressions, on the other. Bonaventure never develops the kind of robust analogical vision which Aquinas progressively perfects throughout his career, as Lynch summarizes: "Because Bonaventure is unable to articulate analogically the relationship between secondary instrumental causes and the principal causality of God, he shifts the focus of the conversation away from the instruments and toward the causality of the principal agent, resulting in a picture of the principal agent as cause in an all but univocal sense, the instruments being comparatively equivocal."⁵² In this part of his commentary on the *Sentences*, the Seraphic Doctor "admits that he has stretched the term 'causality' to its limits," says Blankenhorn. "Yet [Bonaventure] remains cautious and concludes by refusing to deny that there might be a greater power in the sacraments" than in the two theories proposed by him (i.e., dispositive causality and *sine qua non* causality).⁵³

Bonaventure's difficulty in conceiving of secondary causes ordered to a primary cause seems to be mirrored in his inability to consider the acts of the priesthood in relation to each other. Just as his notion of "cause" is univocal, so is his understanding of the notion of "priestly power" likewise univocal, such that the individual powers themselves are seen as "comparatively equivocal" (to adapt Lynch's phrase). This lack of analogical vision in Bonaventure, I suggest, points to an implicit metaphysical foundation as to why he simply names absolution and Eucharistic consecration as equivocal powers pertaining univocally to Holy Orders, with no sense of primary

cf. Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, d. 7), as well as against his Dominican brother Peter of Tarentaise (the future Pope Innocent V), who held for apostolic institution: "Christ instituted this sacrament, not by showing but by promising, see John 16: 'If I do not go away, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I do go away, I will send him to you.' He said this because the fullness of the Holy Spirit is given in this sacrament, which was not to be given before the resurrection and ascension of Christ; see John 7: 'The Spirit was not yet given, since Jesus was not yet glorified'" (Leonine ed., 12:125–26).

⁵² Reginald Lynch, *The Cleansing of the Heart: The Sacraments as Instrumental Causes in the Thomistic Tradition* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2017), 34; see Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, d. 1, p. 1, a. 1, q. 4, (Quaracchi ed., 4:23–24).

⁵³ Bernhard Blankenhorn, "The Instrumental Causality of the Sacraments: Thomas Aquinas and Louis-Marie Chauvet," *Nova et Vetera* (English) 4, no. 1 (2006): 255–94, at 261.

and secondary powers arranged in hierarchical participation.⁵⁴ Thomas, on the contrary, having lived the formative and maturing experience of the Orvieto sojourn, will ultimately reject with more philosophical rigor the Bonaventuran proposal of progressive institution, and is accordingly able to name both a proper sacerdotal power (Eucharistic consecration) and a primary moment of the priesthood's institution (the Last Supper).

In their own time, therefore, the respective positions of Thomas and Bonaventure represented two legitimate theological opinions whose competing conclusions had not yet been judged definitively by a general council. However, as the following section aims to demonstrate, the eventual determination of the Tridentine fathers⁵⁵ is much closer to the Angelic Doctor's proposal of a singular and joint institution of priesthood and Eucharist at the Last Supper, against the notion of progressive institution.

Trent on the Priesthood, Mass, and Aquinas

The final version of Trent's *Doctrina et canones de sanctissimo missae sacrificio*⁵⁶ was promulgated at the Council's twenty-second session on September 17, 1562. Compared to the more intense and protracted controversies which plagued the work for the twenty-third session, the development of the relevant decrees and canons on the Mass proceeded relatively quickly. A first set of draft *articuli* (theses for scholastic debate) was proposed for examination by the theological *periti* on July 19, culminating in the production of a new draft text on the Mass, comprised of four doctrinal chapters and twelve punitive canons, presented to the fathers of the Council on August 6. The pertinent July 19 *articulus* is the fourth: "Whether by the words 'Do this in

⁵⁴ Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, d. 24, p. 2, a. 2, q. 4: "Unde in sacerdotio est status, in quo est consummatio potestatis, et utraque potestas in ipso concurrir, scilicet conficiendi corpus Christi verum et absolvendi mysticum"—"Wherefore in the priesthood is the state wherein lies the consummation of power, and both powers, namely, the consecration of the true body of Christ and mystical absolution, concur in it" (Quaracchi ed., 4:635–36).

⁵⁵ Acts of the Council of Trent are taken from *Concilii Tridentini Actorum, Tomus Octavus; Pars Quinta; Complectens acta ad praeparandum concilium, et sessiones anni 1562 a prima (XVII) ad sextam (XXII)* [CTA 8], ed. Stephanus Ehes (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1919), *Concilii Tridentini Actorum; Tomus Nonus; Actorum Pars Sexta; Complectens acta post sessionem sextam (XXII) usque ad finem concilii, 17 Sept 1562–6154 Dec 1563* [CTA 9], ed. Stephanus Ehes (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924). All English translations are mine.

⁵⁶ CTA 8:959–62.

memory of me' Christ ordained that his apostles should offer his Body and Blood in the Mass."⁵⁷ There is not yet an explicit reference to priesthood.

An examination of the *interventi peritum* reveals a desire to link the words *hoc facite* to the establishment of the priesthood, as well as to the establishment of the Mass as a sacrifice. Alfonso Salmeron, S.J., offered the first intervention: "The Church always understood *hoc facite* as referring to sacrificing, wherefore the Canon says, 'we offer to your majesty,' and 'mindful of your words, O Lord'; and if *hoc facite* is understood to mean that Christ instituted the apostles as priests, so too did he institute the sacrifice, since *facite* means 'to sacrifice.'"⁵⁸ Francisco Torres agreed, saying that "Christ by these words *Hoc facite* established that priests should offer his Body," citing Dionysius the Areopagite, Clement of Rome, and the rite of ordination.⁵⁹ Antonio Solis likewise drew an equivalence between *facite* and *sacrificate*.⁶⁰ Thus a general consensus among the theologians arose: *Hoc facite* truly refers to the establishment of the sacrifice of the Mass, and thus also of the priesthood. Fernando Tricio de Arenanza,⁶¹

⁵⁷ CTA 8:962: "An illis verbis: hoc facite in meam commemorationem ordinaverit Christus ut apostoli offerent corpus et sanguinem suum in missa."

⁵⁸ Salmeron: "Et ecclesia semper intellexit *Hoc facite* de sacrificante, unde dicit in canone: *Offerimus maiestati tuae, memores verbi tui, Domine*, et si intelliguntur *Hoc facite*, ut instituerit apostolos sacerdotes: ergo et sacrificium; nam *facite* sacrificare est, etiam apud gentiles *facere vitulum*. Et cum dicit: *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, intelligitur sacrificando Eucharistiam in memoriam cruenti illius sacrificii in cruce" (CTA 8:724).

⁵⁹ Torres: "Christum illis verbis *Hoc facite* instituisse, ut sacerdotes offerent corpus suum; ita et interpretatur Dionysius cap. 3 Eccl. Hier. et Clemens I . . . et sic ecclesia semper intellexit, et ita in ordinatione sacerdotum id declarat" (CTA 8:725–26).

⁶⁰ Solis: "Praeterea Lucae 22:19 ait Christus: *Hoc facite*, scilicet quod ipse fecit, scilicet, accepit panem, benedixit, fregit, deditque, et verbum *facite* notat *sacrificate* corpus, quod pro vobis frangitur, datur, immolatur"—"Moreover, in Luke 22:19, Christ says, 'Do this,' which means to do what he did, namely, take bread, bless it, break it, and give it; and the word 'do' means 'sacrifice' the body, which is broken, given, and offered for you" (CTA 8:726).

⁶¹ Tricio: "Ergo est vera religio et verum sacrificium, quod quidem est oblatio Christi in missa, quod Christus constituit, Matth. 26, Luc. 22 in coena, cum inquit *Hoc facite* et corpus quod tradetur et sanguis qui effundetur, quae ad sacrificium pertinent. Et legi debet *traditur* et *funditur*, id est tunc: ergo et Christus tunc obtulit, et quod ipse fecerat praecepit faciendum apostolis et sacerdotibus"—"This is true religion and true sacrifice, which is the offering of Christ in the Mass, which Christ established in Matt 26 and Luke 22 at supper, when he said, 'Do this' and 'body which will be offered' and 'blood which will poured,' which pertain to the sacrifice. And the text should therefore read 'is offered' and 'is poured': for Christ offered at that time, and what he did he commanded to be done by the apostles and priests" (CTA 8:728).

Fernando de Bellosillo,⁶² Federico Pendasio,⁶³ Giovanni Francesco Lombardo,⁶⁴ and Gaspar del Villalpando⁶⁵ can be counted among the majority.

Interestingly and ironically, the minority position (*contra Thomam!*) was formed by two Dominicans; both the Portuguese friar Francisco Foreiro

⁶² Bellosillo: "Et sacrificia veteris legis erant vera sacrificia, quia repraesentabat sacrificium crucis: ergo eodem modo et missa, quae illud crucis repraesentebat. Quod etiam ex traditione probavit: Dionysius cap. 3 *Hier. Eccl.*; Cyprianus lib 2, ep 3; Augustinus 21, cap. 10 *de civitate Dei* et cap. 109 *Enchiridii* et 10 *de civ Dei* cap. 20; Ambrosius cap. [53] in *Christo* de constr. 2 dist.; Dionysius *super Matth.*; Chrysostomus; Tertullianus; concilium Niceanum cap. 14; Ephesini epistola ad Nestorium; Chalcedonense; Carthaginense 3, cap 24; sexta synodus generalis; Lateranense et Florentinum: missam sacrificium vocant . . . et verbis *Hoc facite* praecepit apostolis, ut offerent, quod et Paulus 1 Cor 11 non meminit alia benedictio, nisi illis verbis: *Hoc est corpus meum*"—"And the sacrifices of the old law were true sacrifices, for they represented the sacrifice of the Cross. The same applies to the Mass, for it represents the sacrifice of the Cross. This is proved from tradition [Here follows the list of authorities]. And by the words 'Do this' he commanded the apostles to offer the sacrifice, as Paul in 1 Cor 11 did not recall any other benediction except by those words 'this is my body'" (*CTA* 8:727).

⁶³ Pendasio: "Et verbis *Hoc facite* praecepit Christus ut apostoli sacrificarent, et innuit quoddam novum faciendum, quod per *Hieremiam* 31 praenuntium fuit, abro-vitque vetus sacrificium, et novum substituit"—"And by the words 'Do this' Christ commanded the apostles to make sacrifice, and implied that a new sacrifice is to be offered, as prefigured in Jeremiah 31: 'He will abolish the old sacrifice and in its place establish a new one'" (*CTA* 8:736).

⁶⁴ Lombardo: "Verbis illis *Hoc facite* Christum praecepisse, ut apostoli offerent, ut doctores omnes intelligunt. Et Levit 9:6 et 16 *facere* sacrificare est, et Paulus ait: *Fecit peccatum*, id est obtulit se pro peccatis, quod etiam apud gentiles habetur"—"With the words 'Do this,' Christ ordered the apostles to offer sacrifice, as all the doctors understand. And in Lev 9, 'to do' means 'to sacrifice,' as Paul said: 'He became sin [fecit peccatum], that is, he offered himself for our sins, and this usage is known among the gentiles'" (*CTA* 8:738).

⁶⁵ Villalpando: "Christum illis verbis *Hoc facite* ordinavit, ut sacerdotes offerent in missa corpus et sanguinem suum, et ita omnes doctores intelligunt, et Iacobus in sua missa idem asserit, cum ait: *Memores igitur praecepti tui, offerimus* etc. Ergo apostoli hoc idem intellexerunt, et in concilio Constantiensi damnatur error Ioannis Vicleff contrarium asserentis. Et Christus iubet fieri, quod fecit. Ipse enim consecravit et obtulit, cum dicat: *Hoc est corpus, quod pro vobis traditur*, eo scilicet tempore"—"Christ, by the words 'Do this,' ordained that priests should offer his body and blood in the Mass, as all the doctors understand, and as James [the Greater] in his Mass asserts, as he says, 'As we are mindful of your precepts, we offer,' etc. Thus the apostles understood the same, and in the Council of Constance the contrary error of John Wycliffe was condemned. And Christ ordered what he did to be done. He himself consecrated and offered the sacrifice, when he said, 'This is my body, which is given for you,' at the same time" (*CTA* 8:739–40).

and his illustrious Spanish confrere Pedro de Soto⁶⁶ were unsure that the words *Hoc facite* denoted a sacrifice at the Last Supper. Foreiro seems to go even so far as to explicitly oppose what he knows to be a patristic consensus, proposing instead that Christ's establishment of the priesthood "comes from tradition, not from the words *Hoc facite*."⁶⁷

The third Dominican among the *periti* charged with examining these canons, Camillo Campeggio, countered his brethren with clear, if brief, words.⁶⁸ Diego de Paiva overtly rebuked his countryman Foreiro ("contra ea, quae dicerat alius Lusitanus").⁶⁹ The majority was further joined by three Franciscans: Alphonso Contreras, O.F.M. obs.;⁷⁰ Juan Ramirez, O.F.M. obs.;⁷¹

⁶⁶ Soto: "Et quod illis verbis *Hoc facite* praeceperit Christus sacrificari, de hoc dubitat, cum non sit explicatum"—"And [Soto] doubts that by the words 'Do this' Christ commanded the sacrifice, for it is not explicit" (CTA 8:726).

⁶⁷ Foreiro: "Verbis *Hoc facite* non probari, Christum sacrificasse, neque dedisse apostolis potestatem offerendi. . . . Id habetur ex traditione, non autem ex verbis *Hoc facite*"—"By the words 'Do this' is proved neither that Christ offered sacrifice nor that he gave the power to offer it to the apostles. . . . This is proved from tradition, not from the words 'Do this'" (CTA 8:731–32).

⁶⁸ Campeggio: "Christus instituit illis verbis: *Hoc facite* hoc sacrificium et sacerdotium" (CTA 8:727).

⁶⁹ Paiva: "Et probavit, verbis *Hoc facite* praecepisse Christum, ut offerent, contra ea, quae dicerat alius Lusitanus [i.e., Foreiro], cum ita ecclesia intellexit, cum ait in missa: *Haec, quotiescumque facietis, in mei memoriam facietis*; facietis quidem, id est sacrificabitis; et ita omnes patres semper intellexerunt"—"[Paiva] proved that, by the words 'Do this,' Christ commanded the apostles to offer sacrifice, against what was said by the other Portuguese peritus, since the Church understood it in this way, as it says in the Mass: 'For as often as you do these things, you do them in my memory'; here 'do' means 'sacrifice,' as the Fathers have always understood" (CTA 8:732–33).

⁷⁰ Contreras: "Christus enim, transferendo legem—sacerdotium et sacrificium transulisse necesse est; illud autem instituit in coena, cum et consecravit et obtulerit. . . . Christus enim in coena consecravit, obtulit, sumpsit; quod apostolis faciendum praecepit. Et ita *Hoc facite* notavit"—"Because Christ transferred the law, it was necessary to transfer the priesthood and sacrifice. This he established at supper, when he both consecrated and offered sacrifice. . . . Christ therefore consecrated, offered, and consumed the sacrifice, which he commanded the apostles to do. And [Contreras] noted this meaning of 'do'" (CTA 8:730).

⁷¹ Ramirez: "Christum illis verbis *Hoc facite*, dedit potestatem offerendi sacerdotibus, cum ipse in coena obtulerit, cum dicat: *Corpus, quod pro vobis datur*, id est, immolatur; et si Christus constituit apostolos sacerdotes: ergo dedit potestatem offerendi, quod corollarium est"—"Christ, by the words 'Do this,' gave the power of offering sacrifice to priests, as he himself offered at supper, when he said, 'this body, which is given for you,' which means 'immolated'; and if Christ established the apostles as priests, he therefore gave them the power of sacrificing, which follows as a corollary" (CTA 8:730–31).

and Ottaviano Caro, O.F.M. conv.⁷² For our purposes, two other *periti* are notable for their citation of Aquinas in their respective interventions: the secular priest Melchior Cornelio⁷³ and the Jesuit Jean Couvillon.⁷⁴ Both acknowledge note that St. Thomas might seem to oppose the majority consensus in *ST* III, q. 80, a. 11, resp., where the Angelic Doctor interprets *Hoc facite* as a divine command for the faithful to frequently receive the Eucharist. However, both Cornelio and Couvillon bring to bear other texts of Aquinas to clarify that the Mass is indeed a sacerdotal sacrifice.

The insights of the theologians were compiled into the August 6 text presented to the Council Fathers; the pertinent text of the doctrinal decree and the canon on the institution of the Mass read as follows:

[From draft ch. 1, August 6]: It is to be held that Christ the Lord instituted this sacrifice, when at the Last Supper he changed bread and wine into his body and blood under those same symbols, and gave himself to the apostles as an offering to be consumed, and commanded them, by saying “Do this in commemoration of me,” with which words

⁷² Caro: “Et Christus id offerri mandavit in coena, cum ait: *Hoc facite*, scilicet quod ipse fecit, qui etiam consecravit et obtulit” (*CTA* 8:740–41).

⁷³ Cornelio: “Item Lucae 22:19: *Hoc facite*, Christus instituit sacrificandum, quia praecepit faciendum, quod ipse fecit, et verbum *Facite* sacrificare significant, et ita interpretatur concilium Constantiense, et Alexander Papa I et alli patres asserunt; idem habetur in constitutionum apostolicarum epitome post canones apostolorum, et B. Thomas 3 part., quaest. 82 art. 1 (et in 5); quaest. autem 80 [art. 11] contrarium videtur tenere, sed quaest. 80 art. 1 intelligit de consecratione, in 80 art. 11 quintae [*sic*] partis intelligit de memoria passionis ab omnibus Chistifidelibus facienda” — “At Luke 22:19, ‘Do this’ means that Christ instituted by sacrificing, for he commanded what he did to be done, and the word ‘do’ means ‘sacrifice,’ as interpreted by the Council of Constance, Pope Alexander I, and other Fathers. . . . Saint Thomas in *ST* III, q. 82, a. 1, and q. 80 seemed to hold the contrary, but in q. 80, a. 1, he is speaking of consecration, while in q. 80, a. 11, he is speaking of the memory of the passion which all the Christian faithful must hold” (*CTA* 8:734–46). This portion of the text is poorly edited in the Ehes edition; for example, the reference to a fifth part of *ST* is clearly an error.

⁷⁴ Couvillon: “illis verbis *Hoc facite* Christum praecepisse apostolis, ut offerrent. . . . B. Thomas q. 83 tertiae partis art. 4, licet videtur contrarium dicere 3 part., qu. 80, art. 11, qui non intelligit, ut omnes sacrificent vel consecrent, sed quia apostoli non poterant dispensare Eucharistiam, nisi omnes Christifideles ad eam accipiendam obligentur, uti omnes Christifideles tenentur obedire Petro, quia dictum est: *Pasce oves meas*, quae oves non possent pasci, nisi obedirent pastori. Nam et *facere* non est *manducare*, sed *sacrificare*, unde Paulus ait: *Quotiescumque facietis*, etc.” (*CTA* 8:736–37).

the Church has always understood as a command to priests, that they should offer this sacrifice in Christ's memory.⁷⁵

[Draft can. 4, August 6]: If any man should say that by the words "Do this in commemoration of me," Christ did not ordain that the apostles and other priests should offer his Body and Blood, let him be anathema.⁷⁶

In these drafts, a mention of priesthood makes its way into the treatment of the Last Supper, but the language does not yet explicitly point toward the joint institution of the sacraments of Holy Orders and the Eucharist. Since we cannot here embark on the cumbersome task of examining every episcopal *votum* leading up to the twenty-second session's final text, we will only note the differences between the first (August 6, cited above) and final (September 17) versions, with references to select *vota* which cite St. Thomas, to show the integration of Thomistic notions in the process of preparing Trent's Eucharistic teaching.

[From final ch. 1, September 17]: At the Last Supper, on the night he was betrayed, that he might leave to His own beloved Spouse the Church a visible sacrifice (as human nature demands), whereby that bloody sacrifice to be accomplished on the cross might be represented, and that its commemoration remain to the end of the world, and its saving power be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit, declaring himself a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, he offered his Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine to God the Father and, under those same symbols, to the apostles (whom he established as priests of the New Testament) that they should consume him, and handed himself to them and their successors in the priesthood, and ordered that they should offer [this sacrifice], with these words "Do this in commemoration of me," as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ CTA 8:751: "Illud [sacrificium] Christum Dominum instituisse tenendum est, cum in novissima coena panem et vinum in suum corpus et sanguinem convertens sub earundem symbolis se ipsum sumendum ac offerendum apostolis tradidit et praecepit dicens, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, quibus verbis semper ecclesia praeceptum esse sacerdotibus intellexit, ut sacrificium hoc in Christi memoriam offerent."

⁷⁶ CTA 8:754: "Si quis dixerit, illis verbis, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* non ordinasse Christum, ut apostoli et alii sacerdotes offerent corpus et sanguinem eius: anathema sit."

⁷⁷ CTA 8:910.

[Final can. 2, September 17]: If any man says that by the words, "Do this in commemoration of me," Christ did not establish the apostles as priests, or that he did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his Body and Blood, let him be anathema.⁷⁸

Chapter 1 of the doctrinal decree *De Sacrificio Missae* underwent significant elaboration from the first draft to the final version. These additions speak, among other things, of the necessity of a visible sacrifice, that Christ offered himself at the Last Supper, that Christ established the apostles as priests at the same time, and that the sacrifice is expiatory. This latter point was a hotly debated topic at the Council, and several bishops called on St. Thomas in defense of the expiatory nature of the Mass and Last Supper, such as Gaspar do Casal (Leiria),⁷⁹ Sebastiano Antonio Minturno (Ugento),⁸⁰ and Girolamo Michele Nichesola (Teano).⁸¹ Andrés de la Cuesta (León) also cited Thomas on the more general point regarding the mutual interrelation of Christ's sacrifice, the Mass, and the sacramental priesthood.⁸²

⁷⁸ CTA 8:962: "Si quis dixerit, illis verbis: *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* Christum non instituisse apostolos sacerdotes, aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi aliique sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem eius, anathema sit."

⁷⁹ Casal: "And if Christ offered in some way at supper, as some of the fathers have said, it must be said that he offered in a propitiatory way, since, as Thomas says, anything which is offered to God, or killed or eaten or drunk, is a true sacrifice. Thus, when Christ gave the blessing, changed bread into his body and wine into his blood, broke and ate bread, it must be said that he offered a true sacrifice. . . . All other things which were in propitiatory sacrifices were in the sacrifice of Christ at supper. *Ergo, etc.* [The supper] therefore represented the offering of the Cross, and for that reason Thomas says that the Eucharist is expiatory." [Note: Thomas holds in *ST* III, q. 79, a. 4, that the Mass expiates venial sins, as well as that it can expiate temporal punishment due to sin (a. 5).] "And just as all doctors hold that Christ merited our redemption from the first moment of his conception, but that his life and Passion were not superfluous, as Thomas declared [cf. *ST* III, q. 46 a. 5, ad 3], so is it the case in the offering of the supper and the Cross. Moreover, the Passion of Christ has the *ratio* of merit, satisfaction, and sacrifice, as Thomas says in *ST* III, q. 80, aa. 1–3" (CTA 8:768–69).

⁸⁰ Minturno: "[Minuturno] said that Christ offered himself in the sacrifice both Eucharistically and propitiatorily, with the reasons already provided by others, especially the notion that consecration presupposes immolation according to Thomas, and that Christ ordered what he did to be repeated" (CTA 8:779).

⁸¹ Nichesola: "The supper is one with the sacrifice of the Cross: and as the latter is expiatory, so is the former. For the Passion of Christ began on the evening of the 14th [of Nisan], as Thomas says in *ST* III, q. 46, a. 9" (CTA 8:776).

⁸² Cuesta: "It is said that the sacrifice of the Mass represents the death of Christ, and that it has the true *ratio* of a true sacrifice. Thus Thomas says that the consecration is a sacrifice, for this sacrament cannot be consecrated without a sacrifice. And Christ

Giovanni Beraldo (Sant'Agata dei Goti) directly invoked Thomas on the notion that Christ ordained the apostles priests with the words *Hoc facite*,⁸³ while Carlo Cicala (Albenga) notably cited Aquinas's liturgical texts for the notion that Christ offered himself at the Last Supper.⁸⁴ These Thomistic positions, it appears, were in fact integrated into the final text,⁸⁵ although many other bishops supported the eventual doctrine of the Council without explicit recourse to St. Thomas.

The unity of Eucharist and priesthood was further affirmed, not just in this session, but in the decree *Doctrina de Sacramento Ordinis* of the even more hotly contested twenty-third session. Without reviewing these protracted debates, we can here simply cite chapter 1:

Sacrifice and priesthood are so united by the mandate of God that both have existed in every law. Since therefore in the New Testament the Catholic Church has received the holy, visible sacrifice of the Eucharist from the institution of Christ, it must also be held that there is in that Church a new, visible and external priesthood, into which the old has been translated. That this was instituted by the same Lord our Savior, and that to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood was given the power of consecrating, offering and administering his Body and Blood, and also of remitting and retaining

mysteriously adds 'do this' after both consecrations. Therefore when Christ did this, he truly offered sacrifice, and all that the priest does was done by Christ" (CTA 8:777).

⁸³ Beraldo: "Explicetur, illis verbis *Hoc facite* Christum instituisse apostolos sacerdotes, ut doctores omnes affirmant, praesertim B. Thomas in sua *Catena aurea*"—"It should be explained that, by the words 'do this,' Christ established the apostles as priests, as all the doctors affirm, especially Thomas in the *Catena Aurea*" (CTA 8:764). This is not a citation of Thomas per se, since Thomas only refers to a citation from Remigius of Auxerre in the *Catena* on Matthew 26.

⁸⁴ Cicala: "Explicetur, Christum se obtulisse in coena, quod B. Thomas in officio Corporis Christi tradit"—"It should be explained that Christ offered himself at supper, as related by Thomas in the Office of Corpus Christi" (CTA 8:770).

⁸⁵ Here I wish to note the strange case of Antonio Corrionero de Babilafuente, bishop of Almería, who cited Aquinas's definition of sacrifice, but proceeded to argue against Thomas on the sacrificial and expiatory nature of the Last Supper and Mass ("Following Thomas in *ST* II-II, q. 85, a. 1, sacrifice is something offered to God, concerning which something is carried out. However, not everything that is consecrated is offered. For a priest may consecrate the Eucharist and not offer it, although may sin by doing so. Therefore, the consecration of the sacrifice is not of the nature of the sacrifice, since the words of the consecration of the Eucharist in no way pertain to the sacrifice" [CTA 8:777–78]). It seems that the authority of Thomas, at least in this session of the Council, was of such prestige that he was invoked by opposing parties to a dispute.

sins, is shown by the Holy Scriptures and has always been taught by the tradition of the Catholic Church.⁸⁶

Taken together with the doctrine of the previous session, the unequivocal teaching of Trent on the institution of priesthood and Eucharist can be summarized in the notion of a joint institution at the Last Supper. We can further say that celebration of the Eucharist is the principal specific difference in the definition of priesthood. These are essentially the positions of Thomas Aquinas, and as shown above, many Tridentine fathers believed this to be Aquinas's teaching, invoking him in support of what eventually became the position of the Council. By developing the doctrine on the nature of Eucharist and priesthood in this Thomistic direction, the Council implicitly left behind many alternate positions, such as that of St. Bonaventure,⁸⁷ who could conceive of the priesthood only in terms of its dual and equal powers of consecrating and absolving,⁸⁸ and thus conceived of its institution as progressive.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ CTA 9:620.

⁸⁷ Hellmann laments this Tridentine shift as a "narrow approach" which "impoverishes sacramental theology" because it is "not consistent with the earlier and much richer theological tradition so beautifully represented by the Seraphic Doctor" ("Bonaventure on the Institution of Sacraments," 357)—a rather strong conclusion given the fact that Hellmann only cites only Hugh of Saint-Victor as a precedent for Bonaventure's broader construal of sacramental institution, or what I have termed "progressive institution." As this essay has endeavored to show, it is an unfair characterization of the vibrant theological exchanges in the thirteenth century to imply, as Hellmann does, that the seventh session of Trent—albeit with good reason in light of a pressing doctrinal crisis—closed the door to a Bonaventuran sacramental ethos standing for a consistent anterior tradition when it decreed that all sacraments were instituted by Christ (cf. Sessio VII, *De sacramentis*, can. 1: "If any one should say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all established Christ, or that they number more or less than seven, . . . let him be anathema" [Denzinger-Schönmetzner (DS), no. 1601]). While I have argued that the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions of Trent further confirmed Thomistic theses, and thus by implication have made Bonaventuran positions more difficult to hold, my principal contention is to demonstrate how Aquinas's Corpus Christi texts—celebrated across the West for two centuries before Trent and invoked by at least one bishop in the aforementioned debates—already anticipated certain sacramental doctrines which would be confirmed by the Council Fathers. To hold Hellmann's position, I suggest, comes with the burden of demonstrating how Aquinas's own doctrine "impoverishes sacramental theology."

⁸⁸ Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, d. 24, p. 2, a. 2, q. 4, resp. (Quaracchi ed., 4:636).

⁸⁹ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* IV, ch. 4, no. 4 (Quaracchi ed., 5:269).

Conclusion: Aquinas on Priestly Renewal and The Eucharist

As I have tried to demonstrate in the foregoing, Aquinas's Orvieto period is of particular importance for the development of Catholic dogmatic theology on the priesthood and Eucharist. It is during this period that—while exploiting the proximity of the papal archives—Thomas found Greek patristic treasures long obscured in the West. These would help him, among other things, to unlock the puzzle of explaining creaturely causality in the sacraments.⁹⁰ Armed with these resources in 1264, St. Thomas refined his Christological and sacramental doctrines in *SCG* III–IV, while also perfecting the Mass and Office of Corpus Christi. The positions articulated in those works foreshadow the sacramental treatise in *ST* III, and, through the widespread influence of the latter work, also helped to shape the doctrine of the Council of Trent as expressed in the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions. The synthesis of priesthood and Eucharist achieved at Trent, therefore, have ensured not just for the *ST* but for St. Thomas's *Eucharistic poetry* a crucial, if underappreciated, place in the history of dogma. *Sacris solemniis* and *Lauda Sion* are in fact exceptional theo-poetic exponents of a sacramental theory which has survived its competition with the sacramentology of another contemporary popular work—the *Breviloquium* of Bonaventure.⁹¹ Yet, beside these more historical considerations, this unified doctrine of priesthood and Eucharist expressed in the Corpus Christi liturgy might give further cause

⁹⁰ See Blankenhorn, "Instrumental Causality," 275: "After completing his three-year term as master of theology at Paris, Thomas was assigned to the Dominican priory in Orvieto next to the papal palace and library. This gave him access to an incredible collection of ancient texts, including numerous patristic and conciliar documents of which most scholastics had little knowledge. Here Thomas came across a collection of citations and paraphrases of the works of St. Athanasius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and the proceedings of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Aquinas thus gained perhaps the best familiarity with the two great Christological councils and the Greek Fathers of any thirteenth-century Latin scholastic." The reception of these older resources helped Aquinas, as Blankenhorn demonstrates, to rework his understanding of Damascene's teaching that Christ's human flesh is an instrument of the divine power. Thus Blankenhorn locates the decisive shift in Aquinas's Christology (and consequently in his doctrine of instrumental sacramental causality) to have occurred not during the writing of *De veritate* during the first Parisian sojourn, but during the composition of *SCG* III and IV in Orvieto. See also Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 1:102–3, 115.

⁹¹ Here I follow Jay Hammond's proposal of a dating between 1262 and 1267 ("The Textual Context," in *Bonaventure Revisited: Companion to the Breviloquium*, ed. Dominic Monti and Katherine Wisley Shelby [St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2017], 51n70).

for reflection, especially in an era marked by decreasing belief in transubstantiation and the continuing scandal of sexual abuse by priests. Perhaps St. Thomas, by composing a Victorine sequence in *Lauda Sion*, intended to address not only the clerics of his time, but also the priests of today.

Whenever scandal afflicts the Church, a drift toward Donatist attitudes remains tempting, for when faced with the crimes of ministers, the faithful at large find may little comfort in the doctrine of sacramental efficacy *ex opere operato*. We might ask whether a sacramental theology predicated on a sharp divide between public liturgical life, on one hand, and private attachment to vice, on the other, is itself the condition for the possibility of the type of hypocrisy which both Popes Benedict XVI and Francis have vigorously condemned within the priesthood.⁹² In response to scandal, even if we restrain ourselves from affirming sacramental power *ex opere operantis*, we still recognize that the *onus presbyteratus* demands more from priests than just saying the magic words.

The Eucharistic theology taught by Thomas and Trent teaches that the plenitude of divine presence can be effected through the barest minimum of human cooperation. It acknowledges that God infallibly provides grace to his people even in spite of sin. Yet, affirming the necessity of sacraments should not involve a reductive focus on them to the exclusion of a life of moral integrity. Rather, the priestly vocation is a call to imitate Christ as much as possible, not only in administering sacraments, but also in his poverty, chastity, and obedience—and even his celibacy. A life fully conformed to Christ demands not a logic of the minimum but of the maximum, and nowhere is this clearer than in *Lauda Sion*'s perhaps most famous lines:

Quantum potes, tantum aude,
quia major omni laude
nec laudare sufficis.

Dare to do as much as you can,
for not even your highest praise
can praise [him] enough. (lines 4–6)

“Dare to do as much as you can” perfectly captures the spirit of the canons, the Victorines, and the Dominicans who found that returning as

⁹² Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, “Ninth Station,” Good Friday *Via Crucis* at the Colosseum, March 25, 2005; Pope Francis, General Audience of July 6, 2013: Meeting with Seminarians and Novices.

far as possible to apostolic simplicity with a renewed sacramental life, ever mindful of divine judgment, is the best antidote for the sins of their clerical brethren. For, by striving toward an ever greater imitation of Christ, priests not only effect the transubstantiation of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, but also help bring about, to quote Pope Benedict, “the transubstantiation of the world, . . . a world where love has vanquished death.”⁹³ Failing that, however, the alternative sketched out by St. Thomas for his fellow priests is no less clear: the unworthy sacrificers of the Lord’s flesh—the “filth” which Ratzinger decried on that Good Friday—ought to contemplate the *mors* and *interitus* awaiting them. Daring to praise the Savior as much as possible, in both public and private life, in both body and in soul, is obligatory for all the faithful, but especially for priests, for they are defined precisely by their power to offer the sacrifice of Christ’s Body and Blood. Renewal of the priesthood and Eucharistic revival are two sides of the same coin, and it is this coin which the Church must always render to the true King of the Ages. NEV

⁹³ Benedict XVI, “Commomoration of the 65th Anniversary of Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI’s Sacerdotal Ordination,” June 28, 2016.