

Two Paradigms on the Eucharist as Sacrifice: Scheeben and Journet in Dialogue

DAVID L. AUGUSTINE
Catholic University of America
Washington, DC

Introduction

THE AIM OF THIS ESSAY is to set into dialogue and, ultimately, synthesize two different approaches to the perennial question of the sacrificial character of the Mass, those of Matthias J. Scheeben (1835–1888) and Charles Journet (1891–1975). I have chosen Scheeben and Journet precisely because they approach this question from opposite directions, both of which deserve retrieval in certain ways today. Scheeben is heir to post-Tridentine speculation on the Mass that focuses on *the Church's new act of offering sacrifice*. For Scheeben, the Mass is a sacrifice *of the Church* precisely because her gifts are transubstantiated into the body and blood of the glorified Christ, whence her members partake of the fruits of his Passion. Journet, on the other hand, emphasizes the numerical unity of the Church's offering with Christ's Passion. The Mass is a sacrifice because, in it, Christ's Passion is sacramentally re-presented and is, therefore, made present in power. At bottom, these positions represent different ways of accessing the texts of St. Thomas, as we shall see.

By placing Scheeben and Journet in dialogue, I hope to show that their approaches can, if taken noncompetitively, mutually inform one another, producing a resultant position that is stronger than either taken individually. I will anticipate my conclusion here by saying that, although I consider Journet's position to be stronger taken in itself (it foregrounds what is of primary importance), nevertheless, I also think Scheeben's position provides a necessary counterpoint to

Journet's, since it illumines other aspects of the tradition that Journet, for the most part, leaves undeveloped. In so doing, I hope to contribute to the ongoing recovery of the Eucharist's properly sacrificial dimension in contemporary Catholic theology.

This essay will proceed in three parts. In the first, I will set forth Scheeben's theory of Eucharistic sacrifice. In the second, I will examine Journet's counter-proposal. In the last, I will set the positions in dialogue, showing how their different approaches are nevertheless able to mutually inform one another.

Scheeben on the Eucharistic Sacrifice

In order to understand Scheeben's (initially counterintuitive) position on Eucharistic sacrifice, it is necessary to first set forth some of the defining features of his sacrificial theology in general. To this end, I will first examine his take on the requisite alteration or *immutatio* needed to distinguish a sacrifice from a mere oblation: is it, he asks, an exclusively *destructive* action? In this connection, I will also discuss Scheeben's position on what this alteration—or series of alterations—is intended to express in terms of a human being's relationship to God. By first surveying these two topics, we will be better positioned to understand the particulars of his theory of Eucharistic sacrifice.

Scheeben begins his detailed treatment of sacrifice in volume 5/2 of his *Handbuch* with a discussion of the narrowing of its meaning and external form in the post-Tridentine period, next to which he presents his own position as the recovery of a broader (Augustinian-Thomistic) perspective. The meaning of sacrifice is narrowed, Scheeben tells us, when the "vantage point under which God should be specifically honored by sacrifice" is taken in too restricted a fashion or when the goal for which it is offered is likewise truncated.¹ Its *meaning* is narrowed when latreutic sacrifice, the highest form of sacrifice, is offered to God only for the recognition of God's majesty, next to which creaturely being is nothing.² The *goal* for which sacri-

¹ Mathias Joseph Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, vol. 5/2, ed. Carl Feckes, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 6/2, ed. Josef Höfer (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1954), no. 1424 (all citations of the *Handbuch* will be to the paragraph numbers rather than page numbers; all translations of the work are my own).

² Latreutic sacrifice—so designated according to its motive for offering—is the highest form of sacrifice because it is offered primarily to render to God λατρεία, the worship owed to him as God. "Latreutic" comes from the Greek λατρεία and Latin *latria*, and it refers to the service that is due to God alone

fice is offered is truncated when its latreutic aims are subordinated to “the expiation to be performed for sin,” which is now taken as the “primary aim of sacrifice.”³ Against these truncations of the scope of its meaning and aim, Scheeben sets forth his own position by referring back to the broader conceptions of Augustine and Thomas.

With Augustine, Scheeben affirms that sacrifice is the highest expression of religion: it orders the creature to God “for his honor and glorification” through the ordering of the creature to God “as the highest and holiest good” via *caritas religiosa* in order to represent “the striving [of the rational creature] for perfect assimilation and unification with God.”⁴ Viewed in this way, sacrifice—in terms of its highest aims—is directed to the manifestation of God’s glory in the world, precisely through the glorification and transfiguration of the spiritual creature.⁵ Scheeben draws on the thought of St. Thomas in this connection through a pair of citations from the *Summa theologiae* [ST]. In the first, ST I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 8,⁶ Thomas speaks of “the goal of the most perfect sacrifice, the burnt offering,”⁷ as offered out of “reverence to [God’s] majesty, and love of His goodness.” As for the effects of this kind of sacrifice on the worshipper, Scheeben cites ST III, q. 22, a. 2, where Thomas notes that one of the main reasons sacrifice is offered to God is so that “the spirit of man [may] be perfectly united to God.”⁸ Scheeben thus stakes out his position: the

as God (see, e.g., Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 10.3). In scholastic discussions, the Old Testament sacrifice most directly connected with worship *as such* was the holocaust, the burnt offering (see, e.g., Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* [ST] I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 10). See Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1445n9.

³ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1424.

⁴ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1424. Scheeben does not directly cite Augustine in this paragraph. With his reference to Augustine, he is directing the reader back to his citation of the *Doctor gratiae* in no. 1421, where he discussed Augustine’s famous locus classicus of sacrificial theology, *De civitate Dei* 10.6 (see, likewise, 10.3).

⁵ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1424.

⁶ Scheeben cites ST I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 7, but this is a mistake.

⁷ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1424. But cf. ST I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 9: “The holocaust was the most perfect kind of sacrifice.” See also ST I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 10. Citations of the *Summa theologiae* are from: Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, trans. Laurence Shapcote, ed. John Mortensen and Enrique Alarcón (Lander, WY: Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012).

⁸ St. Thomas continues by noting, “hence, under the Old Law, the holocaust was offered . . . the victim was wholly burnt,” thus linking the altar fire with the creature’s transformation in the state of glory.

highest aims of sacrifice are latreutic, ordered to God as the rational creature's first principle *and* last end.⁹

In connection with Scheeben's broadening of the aims of sacrifice also comes a reconsideration of its external form.¹⁰ So as to draw out a standard component in definitions of sacrifice, Thomists generally cite *ST* II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3, where Thomas notes that a sacrifice is distinguished from a mere oblation through the fact that *aliquid fit*, that something is done to it: "A sacrifice, properly speaking, requires that *something be done* to the thing which is offered to God [*circa res Deo oblata aliquid fit*]." ¹¹ A mere oblation, on the other hand, "is properly the offering of something to God even if nothing be done thereto" (*ST* II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3). At this point, the question naturally arises of precisely *what kind* of alteration or *immutatio* is necessary to constitute an oblation as a sacrifice.

This is where Scheeben steps in. He maintains that there is a diminishment of the total idea when the form of the sacrificial action (*Opferhandlung*) is taken in an exclusively destructive sense, as an *immutatio demutativa seu destructiva*.¹² This is a move he sees increasingly among theologians of the new Scholasticism in the late sixteenth century, especially Gabriel Vásquez.¹³ Scheeben counters that, "besides the destructive alteration, there is also the *immutatio perfectiva seu consummativa*, which is to say, *transformativa in melius*," meaning a transformation of the *res oblata* (the thing offered) for the better, where it is raised into a *higher* condition.¹⁴ For Scheeben, it is this *immutatio perfectiva* that corresponds to the broader, perfective dimension of latreutic sacrifice outlined above (union with

⁹ For this formulation, see *ST* II-II, q. 85, a. 2, cited by Scheeben in *Handbuch*, 5/2:1426, where Thomas observes that "the soul offers itself in sacrifice to God as its beginning by creation [*principio suae creationis*], and its end by beatification [*fini suae beatificationis*]." Cf. *ST* I-II, q. 102, a.3. See also *Handbuch*, 5/2:1416: sacrifices are "the practical, respectively, symbolic expression for the striving of man to recognize God as the highest good as well as the first principle and last end [*erste Prinzip und letzte Endziel*], respectively, as the principle of his being and of his perfection." See also *Handbuch*, 5/2:1367, 1373, 1445. See too Scheeben's citation of Adam Tanner in no. 1427.

¹⁰ See the footnote by Carl Feckes in *Handbuch*, 5/2:1422: Scheeben's "broadening of the meaning of sacrifice requires therefore a broadening of its form."

¹¹ Emphases altered. Scheeben cites this passage in *Handbuch*, 5/2:1426–27. See also *ST* II-II, q. 86, a. 1.

¹² Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1425.

¹³ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1425.

¹⁴ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1425.

God as the creature's ultimate end). Moreover—and here we come to perhaps *the* key element of Scheeben's sacrificial theology—this perfective *immutatio* as expressed in Israel's typological sacrificial cult was accomplished through the application of *ignis divinus*, the divine fire burning on Israel's altar.¹⁵

Scheeben's meditations on the significance of Israel's altar fire form the center of his sacrificial theology. Israel's altar fire, Scheeben reminds his readers, was no ordinary fire. Rather, it first came forth “from the glory of God itself” at the time of Aaron's priestly consecration (see Lev 9:23–24), and then later after Solomon's dedication of the Jerusalem temple (see 2 Chr 7:1–3).¹⁶ This is why the altar fire is, for Scheeben, the “image and organ of the sanctifying power of God,”¹⁷ and again, the “supernatural organ of his purifying, transfiguring, assimilating and unifying power.”¹⁸ In other words, the burning in the altar fire in Israel's typological cult represents the moment of divine acceptance in the sacrificial rite, which moment corresponds to the teleological/unitive moment in latreutic sacrifice. Here, the gift is accepted by God and transformed in such a way that, rising up in smoke, it becomes a sign and pledge of the creature's call “through participation in his glory” to be made “into a testament of his glory.”¹⁹

For Scheeben, the sending of divine fire and its transformation of Israel's sacrifices in the Old Testament was a type of that other supernatural, epicletic action so characteristic of the New Testament. It was inaugurated when the Spirit fell on the Blessed Virgin at the

¹⁵ I have taken the Latin *ignis divinus* from Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 65.18, cited from St. Augustine, *Opera Omnia: Tomus Quartus*, in PL 36, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris: Brepols, 1841), 798. Scheeben cites this passage in *The Mysteries of Christianity*, trans. Cyril Vollert (New York: Crossroads, 2006), 440n9.

¹⁶ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1439. Moreover, as Jacob Milgrom notes, it was “*this* fire” that was the subject of the injunction in Lev 6:9, 12–13 that the fire on Israel's altar be kept *perpetually* burning (*Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible 3 [New York: Doubleday, 1991], 388–89: “The sacrifices offered up at the inauguration of the public cult were consumed miraculously by a divine fire (9:24), and it is *this* fire which is not allowed to die out so that all subsequent sacrifices might claim divine acceptance.”) Note, however, that Milgrom provides commentary on Lev 6:13 as Lev 6:6, due to an alternative chapter–verse division he employs.

¹⁷ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1440.

¹⁸ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1439.

¹⁹ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1421.

Annunciation²⁰ to constitute Christ a perfect sacrifice.²¹ It fell on Easter Sunday to signify the acceptance of the sacrifice of the Cross in Christ's resurrection.²² It falls presently on Christians believers through their sacramental participation in Christ's Paschal Mystery, first via grace, then glory.²³ And it also falls on the Eucharistic gifts in the consecration.²⁴

Before turning directly to Scheeben's theology of Eucharistic sacrifice, let us ask one more question apropos his sacrificial theology in general: does Scheeben's stress on the perfective character of Israel's altar fire lead him to ascribe an exclusively positive significance to the sacrificial *immutatio*, and therefore to the rite of sacrifice as a whole? It does not, and this is in two respects. First, Scheeben is willing to ascribe a destructive significance to a number of the preliminary acts in the sacrificial rite, such as the slaughter of the animal, a sacrificial act that obviously has something less than a perfective significance.²⁵

²⁰ See Luke 1:35, with its allusion to Exod 40:34.

²¹ See Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1478, where Scheeben notes that Christ's "offering [*Opfergabe*; i.e. his sacred humanity] was from the beginning [*von Anfang an*] situated on the altar and in the altar fire." See also no. 1472, where Scheeben identifies the altar, in Christ's case, as the "*divine Logos*, who, as the hypostatic bearer of Christ's flesh, in and with his human spirit, is the altar" on which his sacrifice rests, as too "this same Logos, both in himself, as well as [under that aspect whereby he is regarded as] the principle of the Holy Spirit, is the *holy and living, spiritual fire* that, in and with the human spirit of Christ, spiritually transfigures and vivifies the flesh hypostasized in him."

²² See esp. Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 436: "But we must insist on the fact that His resurrection and ascension actually achieve in mystically real fashion what is symbolized in the sacrifice of animals by the burning of the victim's flesh. . . . The Resurrection and glorification were the very acts by which the Victim passed in to the real and permanent possession of God. The fire of the Godhead . . . caused it [Christ, the slain lamb] to ascend to God in a lovely fragrance as a holocaust."

²³ See Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *Nature and Grace*, trans. Cyril Vollert (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009 [orig. 1954]), 335: "The fire in which this holocaust [i.e., the self-gift of the rational creature] is to be offered to God is grace, along with the burning love of God that grace enkindles in the creature." For the transformation of grace into glory, see 337.

²⁴ For now, see Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 506: ". . . as the fire of the Holy Spirit consumes the substance of the bread and substantially changes it into the highest and most sacred holocaust."

²⁵ See, for example, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1441, where Scheeben notes that the sacrificial slaughter serves as "an expression of the [lay offerer's] willingness to give himself up to death." However, as Scheeben also notes, rather significantly, the slaughter does not constitute the *form* of the sacrificial act, but serves instead as

Second, he is even willing to ascribe a certain destructive significance to the consuming action of the altar fire, but his point is that this is simply not the primary one:

Admittedly, with the transformation *through the fire* there always slips in some kind of *destruction* of the natural existence of the offerings, and, with that, the activity of the renunciation of a natural good, respectively, the representation of the complete emptying of oneself [comes to the fore]; however, it is the moment of perfective transformation that is certainly the dominant one and is precisely the one that makes the transformation a priestly one.²⁶

Here, the basic shape of the sacrificial action, in Scheeben, comes to the fore: it is neither purely destructive nor transformative, but *Paschal*. In other words, Scheeben does make room for a destructive moment, but this moment is always *preliminary* and always ordered, as such, to the perfective one. “Each act of submissiveness and renunciation,” he writes, “has a sacrificial tendency precisely insofar as it aims, directly or indirectly, to introduce the one so offering into a condition wherein he lives in God and for God, and precisely thereby finds his own beatitude.”²⁷ As applied to Christ’s sacrifice, one can readily see where Scheeben is going with this. As Aidan Nichols put it, “Scheeben [here] anticipates the twentieth-century theology of the Easter events as a single ‘Paschal mystery.’”²⁸

The following notes sum up the characterization thus far of Scheeben’s sacrificial theology in general. First, whatever other aims there may be for sacrifice,²⁹ the latreutic aim is primary. Second, latreutic sacrifice, which is offered primarily to glorify God’s name, does not

the layman’s “*material* component part” of the sacrificial action, which is then *in-formed* by the priest’s act of offering that forms “the soul of the [sacrificial] action,” through which the gift thus offered is set in relation to the altar.

²⁶ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1425. For the hieratic dimension of the sacrificial burning, see the previous footnote and Scheeben’s reference to the “soul of the [sacrificial] action.”

²⁷ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1424.

²⁸ Aidan Nichols, O.P., *Romance and System: The Theological Synthesis of Matthias Joseph Scheeben* (Denver, CO: Augustine Institute, 2010), 372.

²⁹ Scheeben follows the traditional scholastic fourfold division of motives for sacrifice as found, for example, in *ST* I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 10: the propitiatory, the latreutic, the eucharistic and the impetratory (*Handbuch*, 5/2:1445n9).

aim simply at recognition of his sovereignty or majesty, but instead seeks to glorify him through the perfection of the rational creature made in his image, who thereby becomes a living “testament to His glory.”³⁰ Third, this perfective dimension of latreutic sacrifice was expressed ritually in Israel’s sacrificial cult through the requisite *immutatio* by divine fire, the ritual burning of the *res oblata*, here taken as representative of the moment of divine acceptance in the sacrificial rite. Fourth, what was expressed figuratively in types and shadows in the Old Testament cult (see Heb 8:5 and 10:1) is now brought to a mystical-real fulfillment in the person and work of Christ, as well as in their supernatural extension via the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, who is “the Spirit of Christ” (Rom 8:9). Fifth and finally, the sacrificial *action*, for Scheeben, is not an exclusively perfective action; it is, rather, a *paschal* action. As such, it has ample room for the destructive moment in the rite of sacrifice, but with the important caveat that this moment is always preliminary to the higher, perfective one. As we turn now to Scheeben’s theory of Eucharistic sacrifice, we will see all of these elements of his general theory recapitulated in significant detail.

There are two principal sources for Scheeben’s theology of the Eucharist as sacrifice. The first is his treatment in sections 69–76 of *The Mysteries of Christianity*, the magnum opus of his youth.³¹ The second is a pair of articles that appeared in 1866, “Studien über den Meßkanon” parts I and II, that deal with the Eucharist in its concrete liturgical setting in dialogue with the studies of Ludwig Augustin Hoppe on the nature and meaning of the Epiclesis.³² Both

³⁰ Scheeben, *Handbuch*, 5/2:1421.

³¹ See Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, 469–535. For the original German, see Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *Die Mysterien des Christentums*, 3rd ed., vol. 2 in *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Josef Höfer (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1958), 385–441. Scheeben’s treatment in *The Mysteries*, however, was preceded by a preliminary study: Matthias J. Scheeben, “Das Geheimniß der Eucharistie,” *Der Katholik* 42 (1862): 41–75, recently reproduced in Matthias J. Scheeben, *Über die Eucharistie und den Messkanon*, ed. Michael Stickelbroeck with commentary (Regensburg: Pustet, 2011), 17–49.

³² Matthias J. Scheeben, “Studien über den Meßkanon im Anschluß an das Werk von Dr. Hoppe über die Epiclesis, I,” *Der Katholik* 46 (1866): 526–58; Scheeben, “Studien über den Meßkanon im Anschluß an das Werk von Dr. Hoppe über die Epiclesis, II,” *Der Katholik* 46 (1866): 679–715. These articles have recently been reproduced in Scheeben, *Über die Eucharistie und den Messkanon*, 50–128, and will be cited as “Studien I” and “Studien II,” respectively, with page numbers cited according to the pagination of Stickelbroeck’s

of these works will be consulted in what follows.

In *The Mysteries*, Scheeben attempts to account for the sacrificial character of the Mass by locating the sacrificial *immutatio* proper to this absolutely unique *res oblata*. This procedure is one he shares with a number of post-Tridentine scholastics. Underlying all these attempts—Scheeben’s included—there seems to be an argument built upon the following premises.³³ The first of these is the Council of Trent’s dogmatic assertion, *pace* the Protestant denials thereof,³⁴ that the Eucharist is, in point of fact, a “true and proper sacrifice [*verum et proprium sacrificium*].”³⁵ The second premise joins this affirmation of the Mass’s requisite sacrificial character with St. Thomas’s definition of what distinguishes a *sacrificium* (sacrifice) from the broader category of *oblatio* (oblation) as found in *ST* II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3.³⁶ According

reprint, rather than the original publications in *Der Katholik*. Unless otherwise noted, all translations from both “Studien I” and “Studien II” will be my own. Scheeben also treats of the Eucharist briefly in *Handbuch*, 5/2:1507–9, but his *Dogmatics* was left incomplete at his death in 1888, and thus he never wrote the final portion, which would have included his treatment of the sacraments.

³³ See Trent Pomplun, “Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 346–61, at 352–53, and the argumentative patterns present in Pomplun’s presentation of Bellarmine’s, Suárez’s, and de Lugo’s positions in particular (to be discussed below). See also the argumentative pattern present in Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 506–8, which presupposes that (a) the Eucharist is a sacrifice that, accordingly, (b) has “something . . . done” to it (508). See too the tenor of Charles Journet’s overview in *The Mass: The Presence of the Sacrifice of the Cross*, trans. Victor Szcurek (South Bend, IN: St. Augustine’s Press, 2008), 252–67, where he notes that the unbloody offering of the Eucharist is, indeed, “a real and true sacrifice,” but he asks why this is so. He then proceeds to survey a spectrum of responses post-Trent, many of which look for a new destruction or transformation of some kind to account for the fact.

³⁴ See Peter Walter, “Sacraments in the Council of Trent and Sixteenth-century Catholic Theology,” trans. David L. Augustine, in Boersma and Levering, *Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, 313–28, at 320: “The issue of whether the Mass is a sacrifice was a central point of the Reformation critique of the traditional praxis of the Church.”

³⁵ Council of Trent, Session 22 (September 17, 1562), can. 1, in *Heinrich Denzinger: Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals* [DH], 43rd ed., ed. Peter Hünermann, Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), no. 1751. See also Trent’s statement that the Eucharist is a “true and unique sacrifice [*verum et singulare sacrificium*]” (DH, no. 1738).

³⁶ Scheeben discusses this passage from St. Thomas in his generic discussion of sacrifice in *Handbuch*, 5/2:1426, a formula that Scheeben further specifies in

to Thomas, a sacrifice is distinguished from an oblation—something that is merely *offered*—by the very fact that “something is done [*aliquid fit*]” to it.³⁷ This *aliquid fit*—that is, *immutatio* or change—is accordingly a defining feature of any sacrifice properly so-called. This being the case, however, one concludes that there must likewise be an *immutatio* of some kind in the Mass whereby it truly merits the designation sacrifice. Were we to condense this argument into syllogism form, it would read as follows:

Major premise: The Eucharist is a “true and proper sacrifice,” according to Trent.

Minor premise: Every sacrifice, however, has “something done” to it whereby it is distinguished from a mere oblation.

Conclusion: Therefore, the Eucharist undergoes the requisite *immutatio*—at *some point* in its celebration (as yet undetermined)—through which it becomes a sacrifice.

Scheeben shares this basic line of argumentation with many of his Baroque Scholastic (and later) confreres. Where Scheeben differs from some of these authors is in the *type* of *immutatio* needed, on his view, for a sacrifice to be constituted as such. Accordingly, those theologians who, unlike Scheeben, were predisposed to see sacrifice in predominantly destructive terms set out to find the requisite *immutatio destructiva* in the Mass. The difficulty quickly arose, however, as to where to locate this destructive action, and the answers have varied widely. Robert Bellarmine’s proposal, for example, placed the destructive moment in the priest’s consumption of the sacramental species, which were thus *broken down* through digestion.³⁸ John de Lugo—and, with him, Johann Baptist Franzelin (a professor of Scheeben’s at the *Gregorianum* in Rome)—found the destructive

no. 1427 as a “conficere per immutationem materiae alicujus,” whence the term *confectio* as applied to the Mass.

³⁷ See also *ST* II-II, q. 86, a. 1. See Pomplun, “Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology,” 352–53, for the role of these texts by Thomas (and others) in this developmental process. Pomplun also notes on 352 that Franciscans often employed *Summa fratris Alexandri* 3.55.4.1 for the same purpose. Scheeben cites this latter text in *Handbuch*, 5/2:1417, as part of his general treatment of the “notion of sacrifice in the hieratic sense” (beginning in no. 1415).

³⁸ See: Journet, *The Mass*, 253; Johann Auer, *A General Doctrine of the Sacraments and the Mystery of the Eucharist*, trans. Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis, ed. Hugh M. Riley (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003), 275.

immutatio in Christ's supposed abasement in adopting a sacramental mode of existence.³⁹ August Rohling, in his critique of Scheeben's theory of Eucharistic sacrifice (published in 1868), proposed something similar to de Lugo, countering that Christ was sacrificed in the Mass, inasmuch as he was, through the consecration, deprived of the use of his senses, and thus was present, though alive, "in the condition of death."⁴⁰

However, not all destructive theories of sacrifice in this period necessarily led to the positing of a new destructive action per se. For example, Gabriel Vásquez, whom (as we saw above) Scheeben opposed in connection with his interchanging of *immutatio* and *destructio* in his general definition of sacrifice, simply posited a "mystical immolation" of Christ via the double consecration.⁴¹ As Leo Scheffczyk put it, for Vásquez, "the double consecration at Mass involves only a symbolic death," the symbolic destruction here being sufficient to constitute the Mass a sacrifice properly so-called.⁴² Leon-

³⁹ See: Journet, *The Mass*, 253; Pomplun, "Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology," 353; Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 472n4; Leo Scheffczyk, "Eucharistic Sacrifice," in *Sacramentum Mundi: An Encyclopedia of Theology*, ed. Karl Rahner et al., vol. 2 (London: Burns and Oates, 1968), 273–76, at 275.

⁴⁰ August Rohling, "Miscellanea Eucharistica," *Der Katholik* 48 (1868): 257–83, at 279 (translations of Rohling are my own). Rohling views the moment of destruction as essential to any sacrificial act where God is not visibly present (as he was in Paradise when he strolled among his people [see Gen 3:8]) (see Rohling, 272–73). From this, Rohling concludes regarding the Mass: "[As] the moment of destruction is indispensable for all cases where man stands opposite the Eternal One who is no longer visible; therefore, it must also be found in the holy sacrifice of the Mass" (Rohling, 273). On 279, Rohling, arriving at his conclusion on where to locate the destructive moment in the Mass, avers that Christ is abased by being placed under the species without his proper spatiality or the use of his senses: "Thus, the body of Christ is indeed present alive; however, the consecration constitutes him present in such a way that he is present as dead: He has eyes and they do not see, ears and they do not hear, the sense of feeling and he does not feel. O a moving thought, our Lord in our hands—living and yet dead, full of life and in the midst of death!"; "Here alone," he triumphantly concludes, "can the true sacrificial character lie."

⁴¹ See Journet, *The Mass*, 258. The term "mystical immolation" is Journet's, employed also with reference here to the theory of Cardinal Billot, which is similar to—but goes beyond—Vásquez's.

⁴² Scheffczyk, "Eucharistic Sacrifice," 275. See also Pomplun, "Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology," 353: "No unanimity existed during the baroque age on the celebrated question about whether the transformation of the *res oblata* necessarily involves the so-called 'destruction' of the eucharistic victim. Vásquez, for example, rejected the 'destruction' theory altogether, maintaining

ard Lessius's theory treads along a path similar to Vásquez's. However, Lessius's mystical mactation, unlike Vásquez's, looks for a destructive moment in the separation of Christ's body and blood as effected by the double consecration. After the consecration, they are, in point of fact, still united on account of the glorious Christ's impassibility, but now only by way of concomitance (i.e., the body is there primarily, then the blood).⁴³

Contrary to these various destructive theories, Scheeben follows Francisco Suárez⁴⁴ in proposing a *productive* theory of Eucharistic sacrifice. Scheeben locates this productive *actio sacrificalis* in the transubstantiation. In Aidan Nichols's succinct summation: for Scheeben, "the *transsubstantiatio* is the *actio* of the Mass."⁴⁵ As for the contents of this action, Christ's body comes to be present in the bread not so

that the Mass, being a relative sacrifice, need not involve a slaying of Christ at all, but only that this death be represented visibly by the separation of the body and blood on the altar. In Vásquez's view, Christ, being impassible, undergoes no transformation in the double consecration beyond being made present visibly by the separation of the body and blood on the altar." See also: Roger J. Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice* (London and New York: T & T Clark International, 2009), 164; Auer, *General Doctrine*, 276.

⁴³ See: Journet, *The Mass*, 253; Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled*, 164–65; Auer, *General Doctrine*, 276: "Lessius further developed this theory by saying that the words of transformation are the mystical sword whereby this *mactatio mystica* occurs."

⁴⁴ Scheeben acknowledges his dependence on Suárez in *The Mysteries*, 507n4, citing Suárez's *In Illam Partem*, disp. 83, sect. 2. Scheeben also refers to Lessius here, but I presume this is principally because Lessius situates the *actio* in the *consecratio*, and not because of his mystical mactation theory per se. See also: Nichols, *Romance and System*, 391; Pomplun, "Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology," 353–54: "Matthias Scheeben . . . [offers] a variant of Suárez's position." Journet summarizes Suárez's position as follows: "[For Suarez] the sacrifice of the Mass consists in the consecration. The following elements belong to the essence of the Mass: 1) the double consecration of the bread and wine, which mystically signify the bloody separation of the Body and Blood on the Cross; 2) the destruction of the substances of the bread and wine, offered as the matter from which comes the sacrifice; 3) first and foremost the presence of Christ under the sacramental species, the end [i.e., *terminus ad quem*] of the [act of] sacrifice. The Mass, therefore, is a very new sacrifice, since the priest, far from immolating the Victim, actually brings it into existence. It has for its end not a destruction, but rather a production (*effectio*) and a presentation (*praesentatio*)" (*The Mass*, 254). Scheeben's dependence on Suárez will become evident in what follows.

⁴⁵ Nichols, *Romance and System*, 391. Or, in Scheeben's own words: "Transubstantiation formally constitutes the real sacrificial action proper to the Eucharistic sacrifice" (*The Mysteries*, 506).

much by “expel[ing] the substance of bread” with its ingress, but by the “conversion of the bread into it[self],” which takes place when his body comes “down from heaven upon the altar” (but without his body leaving heaven in the process; there is no local motion of Christ’s body).⁴⁶ This production of Christ’s body cannot be understood in the sense of a “natural conversion” like, for instance, digestion, where the bread would simply accrue to Christ’s body. Rather, in its passing over, the “bread simply ceases to exist as to both form and matter,” with the body of Christ, accordingly, taking the place of the substance of the bread under the accidents.⁴⁷

That said, Scheeben still finds very useful here St. Gregory of Nyssa’s and St. John Damascene’s depiction of the action of conversion as a consecration that proceeds on analogy with Christ’s human metabolic activity during the days of his flesh.⁴⁸ In *De fide orthodoxa* 4.14, St. John Damascene speaks of how Christ consumes the bread and wine on the altar not by digestion, but by consecration, by means of the digestive solvent of the Holy Spirit, who is poured out upon the gifts proffered for this purpose. He likens this process to the Incarnation of the Son of God (i.e., that original epicletic action where the Holy Spirit was poured out on the Blessed Virgin, following her *fiat*, for the production of Christ’s flesh).⁴⁹ It is as an

⁴⁶ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 497–98 (*Die Mysterien*, 410). For Thomas’s rejection of local motion (i.e., movement from point A to point B) in the Eucharistic conversion, see *ST* III, q. 75, a. 4.

⁴⁷ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 498 (*Die Mysterien*, 411).

⁴⁸ Scheeben respectively cites St. Gregory of Nyssa, *The Great Catechism* 37, in *The Mysteries*, 498n34 (for an English-language edition of Gregory’s work, see *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* [NPNF], vol. 5, *Gregory of Nyssa: Dogmatic Treatises, etc.*, trans. William Moore and Henry Austin Wilson, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004], 505–6), as well as (in the same note) St. John of Damascus, *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* 4.14 (for an English-language edition, see NPNF, 9 [*Hilary of Poitiers, John of Damascus*]: 83).

⁴⁹ See John of Damascus, *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* 4.14: “The body which is born of the holy Virgin is in truth body united with divinity, not that the body which was received up into the heavens descends, but that the bread itself and the wine are changed into God’s body and blood. But if you enquire how this happens, it is enough for you to learn that it was through the Holy Spirit, just as the Lord took on Himself flesh that subsisted in Him and was born of the holy Mother of God through the Spirit. . . . But one can put it well thus, that just as in nature the bread by the eating and the wine and the water by the drinking are changed into the body and blood of the eater and drinker, and do not become a different body from the former one, so the bread of the table [or: *prothesis*; *προθέσσεως*] and the wine and water are supernaturally

outgrowth of this metabolic model that Scheeben first sets forth his epicletic model of Eucharistic sacrifice/consecration. So as to effect the conversion of the substance of the bread into that of the body of Christ, the Holy Spirit falls on the Church's waiting sacrificial gifts like divine fire to perfect them and consecrate them, thereby bringing them into a higher state of existence. This is why, on Scheeben's view, the sacrificial action in the Eucharist is reminiscent not so much of Christ's crucifixion as of the productive action of Christ's body in the Incarnation (and, parallel with this, the transformative action of the Spirit in Christ's resurrection).⁵⁰

Does Scheeben's emphasis here on the productive character of the Eucharistic *actio sacrificialis* mean that he has no place for the Eucharist's anamnestic re-presentation (*Vergegenwärtigung*) of the Cross? On the contrary, when speaking of the consecration of the *discrete* species, Scheeben observes that Christ "appears in our midst under the symbols of His immolation, as the Lamb slain for the honor of God."⁵¹ Indeed, through this efficacious re-presentation, the Cross is made present to us in power,⁵² such that, "receiving its fruits during the sacrifice," we are privileged to drink "the merits welling up in it [as] from their very fountainhead," whence "we are also made one sacrifice with Him."⁵³ Nevertheless, granted that the Eucharist is for Scheeben an efficacious anamnesis of the Cross, it is still, for him, constituted a "true and proper sacrifice"⁵⁴ through the productive transformation of the gifts into Christ's body and blood (whereby he accounts for the *immutatio* proper to this sacrifice).

Scheeben's next move is to place this epicletic, productive dynamism of the Eucharist's *actio sacrificialis* more securely within the

changed by the invocation and presence of the Holy Spirit into the body and blood of Christ, and are not two but one and the same" (*NPNF*, 9:83).

⁵⁰ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 509 (*Die Mysterien*, 421): "Since the sacrificial action [*Opferhandlung*; i.e., of the Eucharist] consists in a mutation by which the lower gift is changed into the higher, it has, from the viewpoint of its essential character, greater similarity with the execution of the hypostatic union and the resurrection of Christ's body *than with the immolation of that body on the cross*" (emphasis added).

⁵¹ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 495.

⁵² For Scheeben's fullest treatment of the complicated question of the relationship of the Eucharist as efficacious anamnesis to the historical action of the crucifixion—a relationship mediated through the exercise of Christ's heavenly priesthood—see *Handbuch*, 5/2:1496–98, read together with no. 1507.

⁵³ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 495.

⁵⁴ Council of Trent, Session 22 (September 17, 1562), can. 1 (DH, no. 1751).

overarching paschal dynamism of his sacrificial theory. He begins by reminding his readers that “sacrifice, understood in its most comprehensive sense, involves a certain [read: preliminary] destruction of the victim.”⁵⁵ This does not mean that the content of this action as applied to the Eucharist can be found in the mere fact that “the substance of the bread and wine are destroyed.”⁵⁶ The reason for this, Scheeben writes, is that it is “not the bread, but the body of Christ” that is “the proper sacrificial victim [read: *res oblata*] of the Church.”⁵⁷ But his body is the sacrificial victim here as the result of a *process* of conversion, a process that is necessary if this sacrifice is to be truly *ecclesial*:

The body of Christ truly becomes the sacrifice *of the Church* only on the condition that the Church makes an offering of that body to God from its own midst by changing the bread into it, and by this same conversion pledges and effects the surrender of itself to God. And if this oblation is to be more than a simple offering⁵⁸ made to God in connection with a sacrificial act already accomplished, and is to be offered in *a new, genuine act of sacrifice* [*eine neue, wirkliche Opferhandlung*], the conversion of another gift into this gift must be brought about.⁵⁹

If the *res oblata* of this sacrificial action is none other than the body of Christ, then his body, though sacrificed once for all on the Cross, becomes *the Church's* sacrifice, but only on the grounds that his body is offered to God therein via the total *conversion* of her gifts.

To the objection that his theory of Eucharistic sacrifice makes the gifts of bread and wine (and not Christ's body) the *res oblata* in the Eucharistic sacrificial action, Scheeben responds that the *actio* in question consists in a dynamic process with two poles, a *terminus a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*. “We find the essence [of the Eucharistic *actio*],” he writes, “in the total conversion, with reference simultane-

⁵⁵ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 505 (*Die Mysterien*, 416).

⁵⁶ Translated from *Die Mysterien*, 416.

⁵⁷ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 508.

⁵⁸ The text here literally reads “and if this oblation [*Opfergabe*] should be [one such that is] not merely offered [*offeriert*] to God” (Scheeben, *Die Mysterien*, 420). This is as obvious reference to the requisite *aliquid fit* of ST II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3, by which a sacrifice is distinguished from a mere oblation.

⁵⁹ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 508, emphasis added (*Die Mysterien*, 420).

ously to the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem*.”⁶⁰ If, however, the bread and wine are thus “de-substantiated”—to borrow a term from Rohling⁶¹—then it must be said that it is the *terminus* of this dynamic movement that carries the day in Scheeben, via the productive action *at which* the gifts *arrive* via this process of transference.⁶² It is truly the body of Christ that is offered, but now *from out of* the gifts of the Church.⁶³ Hence, “the value of the sacrificial action,” Scheeben writes, “is not gauged by the value of the gift undergoing change, but by the value of the gift *into which* it is changed.”⁶⁴

Before concluding this treatment of Scheeben’s theory of Eucharistic sacrifice, it is necessary to take a moment to draw out certain key *liturgical* implications that follow from his theory of Eucharistic sacrifice as set forth in a pair of articles published in 1866. Scheeben composed these articles after his quite favorable encounter with Ludwig Augustin Hoppe’s 1864 book *Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgieen und der römische Consekrationsskanon* (*The Epiclesis of the Greek and Oriental Liturgies and the Roman Consecratory Canon*) on the nature and meaning of the liturgical prayer known as the Epiclesis.⁶⁵ Hoppe’s aim in this book is twofold. First, he proposes

⁶⁰ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 508 (*Die Mysterien*, 420).

⁶¹ Rohling, “Miscellanea Eucharistica,” 273.

⁶² See Scheeben, *Die Mysterien*, 420.

⁶³ For, Scheeben writes, the body of Christ “can be offered anew and consecrated to God by the Church only insofar as it emerges [*hervorgeht*] from the gifts dedicated to God by the Church or insofar as the Church consecrates and presents her gifts to God through their transubstantiation into it” (“Studien II,” 88).

⁶⁴ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 508–9 (emphasis added).

⁶⁵ Ludwig Augustin Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgieen und der römische Consekrationsskanon* (Schaffhausen: F. Hurter, 1864). For Scheeben’s definition of the Epiclesis—derived from Hoppe—see “Studien I,” 60: by the Epiclesis (*Epiklese*) is meant “the invocation [*Anrufung*] or, rather, the calling down [*Herabrufung*] of the Holy Spirit onto the sacrificial gifts so that they are sanctified, consecrated, or transformed by Him into the holy body and blood of Christ.” For a contemporary discussion of the bounds of what should be included in the definition of the Epiclesis, see John H. McKenna, C.M., *The Eucharistic Epiclesis: A Detailed History from the Patristic to the Modern Era*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2009), 94–105 (ch. 3: “Understanding the Terminology of Modern Writers”). McKenna defines “the more developed epiclesis” by situating three elements: “In any case, three basic facets *generally* turn up in the fully developed epiclesis, namely; an appeal for the Holy Spirit (1) to transform or sanctify the bread and wine (2) so that they may benefit those who partake of them worthily (3)” (*The Eucharistic Epiclesis*, 105). This last element, though absent from the definition given

that, while the Words of Institution are what actually effect the consecration, the Epiclesis is also a primordial liturgical datum that is found in all liturgies, both East and West. In this connection, Hoppe argues that the Western variant of this liturgical formation is none other than the *Supplices te rogamus*⁶⁶—a prayer that occurs shortly after the enunciation of the Words of Institution in the Roman Canon—in which the Church, through her minister (the priest), beseeches God for the interchange of the gifts on the earthly and heavenly altars “by the hands of your holy Angel [*per manus sancti Angeli tui*].”⁶⁷ By this point, it should be no surprise that both Hoppe and Scheeben identify the *sanctus angelus* in question with the Holy Spirit.⁶⁸ If this is the case, however, and there is indeed a post-consecratory Epiclesis in the Roman Canon, this means that the problem of the Epiclesis is no longer a problem of East versus West because it now presents itself as an *intra-Western* liturgical problem.

This brings Hoppe to his second point (and it is here that Scheeben really begins to intervene in Hoppe’s work at the theological level): given that the Epiclesis is a common element of the Eucharistic Anaphora, what does it mean?⁶⁹ In particular, how does this (seem-

above, is nevertheless discussed by Scheeben at length in “Studien II.” See also Anne McGowan, *Eucharistic Epicleses, Ancient and Modern: Speaking of the Spirit in Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014), 13–15.

⁶⁶ See Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, 121–50, in a section entitled, “*Ermittlung des Sinnes der Oration Supplices te rogamus*, Investigation of the Meaning of the Oration *Supplices te rogamus*.”

⁶⁷ For the English/Latin of the *Supplices*, see *Daily Roman Missal: Complete with Readings in One Volume* (Woodridge, IL: Midwest Theological Forum, 2012 [7th ed., 3rd printing]), 778–79: “In humble prayer we ask you, almighty God: command that these gifts be borne by the hands of your holy Angel [*per manus sancti Angeli tui*] to your altar on high in the sight of your divine majesty, so that all of us, who . . . receive the most holy Body and Blood of your Son, may be filled with every grace and heavenly blessing.”

⁶⁸ See Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, 167–91, esp. at 179: the *sanctus angelus* “is none other than the holy messenger [*Gesandte*] of the Father and Son . . . the Holy Spirit.” For Scheeben’s identification of the *sanctus angelus* with the Holy Spirit, see “Studien I,” 68, where Scheeben also, however, multivalently identifies the *Gesandte*, the messenger or one sent, with Christ/the Logos. Although, in “Studien I,” 69–71, he broadens this identification to include the “*ministerium* of the created angels”—in line with some early liturgies—but he notes that this interpretation can only be taken in “an auxiliary sense.”

⁶⁹ Hoppe treats of this question in the second part of *Die Epiklesis*, “Absicht und Berechtigung der Epiklese,” “Purpose and Justification of the Epiclesis,” 211–334.

ingly consecratory) *deprecatory* oration (“In humble prayer, we ask you, almighty God”)⁷⁰ relate to the consecratory Words of Institution spoken in the *declarative* voice (“This is my body,” etc.)? Hoppe’s solution takes as its point of departure the twofold role of the priest in each consecratory act.⁷¹ First, the priest “appears as the representative [*Stellvertreter*] of Christ, who speaks and acts in the person of Christ.”⁷² In the Eucharist, this role is expressed by the priest’s recitation of the Words of Institution, acting *in persona Christi capitis*. However, when the priest acts as Christ’s *Stellvertreter*, “the person of the priest and the Church . . . recedes wholly into the background.”⁷³

What, then, of the place of the Church in this action? Or, again, what of the place of the priest, now conceived of not primarily as Christ’s representative, but as the Church’s? For Hoppe, this second aspect—taken as the Church’s consciousness of her role as Christ’s *ministra* or *Dienerin* (female servant)—must be given expression through a prayer in which she “petition[s] for Christ’s gracious cooperation through His Holy Spirit.”⁷⁴ Thus, for Hoppe, the Epiclesis (whether the *supplices* or otherwise) functions as the “liturgical complement to the consecratory act” in which the Church expresses “her awareness that she is Christ’s subordinated representative [*untergeordneten Stellvertreterin*] in her representation of his divine act.”⁷⁵

Scheeben agrees with Hoppe’s presentation as far as it goes but thinks it can be given an even richer expression. For Scheeben, the Church’s “two-fold position as representative and servant of Christ” is best summed up in her status “as Christ’s *bride*.”⁷⁶ As such, what is primarily at stake vis-à-vis her liturgical petitions is not merely an

⁷⁰ The opening phrase of the *Supplices*, cited in *Daily Roman Missal*, 779. The equivalent prayer (i.e., the Epiclesis proper) in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, cited in *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, ed. R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, 3rd ed., revised and enlarged (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 133, reads: “We pray and beseech and entreat you, send down your Holy Spirit.”

⁷¹ I am following Scheeben’s general summary in “Studien I,” 73–75. For the corresponding texts in Hoppe, see *Die Epiklesis*, 301–26, where he treats of the Church’s twofold relationship to Christ in the consecratory act under the headings (a) *Stellvertreterin*, (female) representative (301–5), and (b) *ministra*, (female) servant, (305–26).

⁷² Scheeben, “Studien I,” 73.

⁷³ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 74.

⁷⁴ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 74.

⁷⁵ Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, 326.

⁷⁶ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 75 (emphasis added).

expression of “her *subordination* under her bridegroom,” but rather an expression of the royal “dignity” that she receives from him.⁷⁷ Moreover, this dignity is expressed in her petitions, since she functions here not as “a simple organ” of Christ, as if she were a passive vehicle through which the consecratory act simply flowed, like water through a garden hose, but instead, through her *powerful* intercessions, through which she “solicits the unfolding of the power of her bridegroom’s grace.”⁷⁸ Thus, these deprecatory orations, Scheeben concludes, “are a meaningful and effective factor in which the Church asserts her [own] dignity” as Christ’s bride.⁷⁹

To develop this idea further, Scheeben next has recourse to the scriptural imagery of the Annunciation, with the Church now taking Mary’s place as Christ’s bride. In her Eucharistic prayer, Scheeben writes, the Church groans with the *gemitus columbae*⁸⁰—the groans of the dove—where she seeks, “through the overshadowing and insemination of the Holy Spirit, to emulate in a wonderful manner, the birth of the Son of God Himself from the womb of the Virgin.”⁸¹ She recapitulates this great mystery when “the bread that she proffers is recast through the fire of the Holy Spirit into the Body of the Son of God, just as the flesh of the Virgin was enlivened with that same fire and was united with the person of the Son of God.”⁸² Here we see Scheeben return to his model of Eucharistic sacrifice from *The Mysteries*, but it recurs now in an explicitly *liturgical* context in which Scheeben is casting about after the meaning of the Church’s *deprecatory* orations, particularly the post-consecratory Epiclesis. The significance of this will be drawn out in due course.

Proceeding on analogy with the Annunciation, then, Scheeben sees in the consecration proper the union of two desires, that of the Church and that of the Holy Spirit. When these two desires meet—

⁷⁷ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 75 (emphasis added).

⁷⁸ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 75. Scheeben continues here: “Because Christ wished to maintain her dignity as bride intact, for this reason he has given her petitions . . . an especially independent influence on his work, an influence which the holy Fathers often virtually set in parallel with the power of instrumental efficacy [in the celebration of the sacraments].”

⁷⁹ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 75–76.

⁸⁰ See Scheeben, “Studien I,” 75–76. Scheeben borrowed this term from St. Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas* 3.17. See also Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, 310n656.

⁸¹ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 77.

⁸² Scheeben, “Studien I,” 77.

that is, when they “unite in a spirit of vital interpenetration”—conception occurs, the Church’s “desire turn[ing] into spiritual conception” via the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit.⁸³ For her part, the Church expresses her desire—with its corresponding *gemitus* or groan—via her various epicleses (scattered throughout the liturgy), which are the liturgical counterpart to the *fiat* of the Blessed Virgin.⁸⁴ Given that the actual enunciation of Mary’s *fiat* preceded her conception of the Word, Scheeben thinks that it is “very fitting that there is an [pre-consecratory] Epiclesis in the oration *Quam oblationem*” of the Roman Canon, enunciated just before the Words of Institution.⁸⁵ (The Church’s voice, of course, steps into the background when Christ is speaking.)

What then of the post-consecratory Epiclesis? How is this Epiclesis, as *post*-consecratory, still an expression of the Church’s desire to synergize with the action of her divine Bridegroom (already accomplished in Christ’s words, spoken in the declarative voice)? Scheeben accounts for the post-consecratory oration on analogy, once again, with Mary’s conception of Christ. In the latter case, “the fructification of the Virgin’s womb by the Holy Spirit was [indeed] the work of a moment, but both the influence of the Holy Spirit, as well as the Virgin’s desire to give of her flesh and blood for the humanity of God’s Son . . . was something *continuous*.”⁸⁶ In other words, Scheeben does not think that the Virgin’s desire to give of her flesh and blood simply ceased with the moment of her conception of Christ. Just the opposite: her desire had to “stream forth from her heart all the more urgently . . . so long as she bore the Son of God beneath her heart.”⁸⁷ Yet the Church is in just this position when she too bears the Son of

⁸³ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 78.

⁸⁴ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 78: “The Epiclesis is the *fiat* of the Most Blessed Virgin, upon which the conception of the Logos immediately followed.”

⁸⁵ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 78. For the *Quam oblationem*, see *Daily Roman Missal*, 772–73: “Be pleased, O God, we pray, to bless, acknowledge, and approve this offering in every respect; make it spiritual and acceptable, so that it may become for us the Body and Blood of your most beloved Son.”

⁸⁶ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 85 (emphasis added). Scheeben explains how the work of the Spirit in the consecration is something continuous on 83–85, where he notes that the Spirit’s activity in the consecration, though instantaneous, is nevertheless something that involves “a static, perennial efficacy” through which he sustains the gifts from moment to moment “in the preservation of the product.”

⁸⁷ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 85–86.

God in her bosom, on her altar after the consecration. This is why Scheeben does not think that her petitions need to end with the consecration. Rather, her invocation or petition for the Holy Spirit, as the activity proper to the Church, from that moment on actually “becomes a more trusting and intimate one,” since she sees “before her the fulfillment of her longing,” whence it becomes “a real apprehension” of His efficacy.⁸⁸ (Nevertheless, this sated desire, of course, always has recourse to “that point in time when one did not yet possess” the good in question.)⁸⁹

The main fruit of Scheeben’s engagement with Hoppe, then, is Scheeben’s view that the Church’s deprecatory orations or epicleses—in particular, her post-consecratory Epiclesis—express the activity *proper to the Church* as Christ’s bride, since she there beseeches the Holy Spirit to *transform* her gifts, uniting them with Christ’s body. Note that this corresponds precisely to Scheeben’s depiction of the Eucharist sacrifice as “the sacrifice *of the Church*,” and again, as “a new, genuine act of sacrifice” with its own productive *actio sacrificialis*.⁹⁰ As such, for Scheeben, the Eucharistic sacrifice is given liturgical expression in the Epiclesis⁹¹ even if it actually takes place via the enunciation of the Words of Institution in the declarative voice.

The following points summarily characterize Scheeben’s theology of Eucharistic sacrifice. First, in line with many post-Tridentine neo-Scholastics, Scheeben thinks that there must be a new *immutatio* or *actio sacrificialis* proper to the Eucharist if it is to be, in the words of Trent, a “true and proper sacrifice.”⁹² Second, Scheeben thinks, in line with his sacrificial theory in general, that the *actio* proper to this sacrifice is the productive conversion of the Church’s gifts, transformed by the fire of the Holy Spirit as they are changed into the body and blood of Christ (the *terminus ad quem* of this dynamic, paschal movement). This is why Scheeben thinks that the *actio* in question more closely resembles the mysteries of Christ’s Incarna-

⁸⁸ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 82.

⁸⁹ Scheeben, “Studien I,” 82.

⁹⁰ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 508 (emphasis added).

⁹¹ Indeed, Scheeben devotes the whole of “Studien II,” no. 1 (“The Meaning of the Oration *Supplices* Explained from the Organism of the Eucharistic Sacrificial Action”) to demonstrating how the complex of prayers following upon the Words of Institution in the Roman Canon—beginning with the *Unde et memores* and culminating in the *Supplices*—expresses his theory of Eucharistic sacrifice (“Studien II,” 86–101).

⁹² Council of Trent, Session 22 (September 17, 1562), can. 1 (DH, no. 1751).

tion and resurrection rather than it does his Cross. Third, however, Scheeben also holds together his emphasis on the *productive* character of this *actio* with that other dimension whereby the Eucharist is the efficacious anamnesis of Christ's Passion, the latter being symbolized through the consecration of the *discrete* species of bread and wine. Finally, the *actio sacrificialis* proper to the Eucharist as a *new* sacrifice of the Church is given liturgical expression in the Church's deprecatory orations (above all, in her post-consecratory Epiclesis), when the ecclesial act of offering/petition for transformation comes to the fore, the latter being veiled during the actual act of consecration when the priest is speaking in the voice of the divine Bridegroom, and is thus acting *in persona Christi capitis*.

Turning now to Journet's Thomistic proposal, we will see how this twentieth-century theologian approaches the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice from precisely the opposite direction as Scheeben.

Journet on the Eucharistic Sacrifice

In the mid-twentieth century,⁹³ Charles Journet's treatment of the Eucharist as sacrifice is situated on the far side of a broader rejection of the *immutatio* theories of Eucharistic sacrifice—whether destructive or productive—that prevailed in theological schools from the late-sixteenth through the early-twentieth centuries.⁹⁴ The key move informing this paradigm shift was the transfer of discussion of the Eucharist's sacrificial dimension wholly into the genus of *sign* or *sacrament*. Appealing to St. Thomas, a number of theologians—besides Journet, Anscar Vonier, and Eugène Masure are especially notable—reframed the argument in terms of sacramental efficacy: the Eucharist is not a “true and proper sacrifice”⁹⁵ because (in Thomas's words) “*aliquid fit*, something [read: new] is done” to it,⁹⁶ but rather because—and here theologians appealed to another text of St. Thomas, *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1—it is *an efficacious sign of Christ's sacrifice*.⁹⁷ Before turning directly to Journet, it will

⁹³ Journet's *The Mass* was originally published in 1957 in French as *La Messe: Presence du Sacrifice de la Croix* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1957).

⁹⁴ For an overview of this theological paradigm shift, see Scheffczyk, “Eucharistic Sacrifice,” 274–76. Scheffczyk also helpfully discusses the ambiguities of Odo Casel's position, which we have not had space to treat.

⁹⁵ Council of Trent, Session 22 (September 17, 1562), can. 1 (DH, no. 1751).

⁹⁶ See *ST* II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3.

⁹⁷ For appeals to *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1, see Dom Anscar Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, preface by Peter Kreeft and introduction by Aidan Nichols (Bethesda, MD: Zaccheus Press, 2003), esp. ch. 15 (95–103: “Saint Thomas and

be helpful to take a moment first to examine this text of St. Thomas, as Journet's position is an extended explication of it.

Thomas's *ex professo* treatment of the Eucharist as sacrifice in the *Summa* is limited to this one article, *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1. Despite its brevity, Thomas's terseness masks an unusual depth of insight. In this article, he gives two reasons that, when taken together, conspire to constitute the Eucharist a sacrifice. The first reason is that (citing Augustine) "the images of things are called by the names of the things whereof they are the images."⁹⁸ However, the celebration of the Eucharist "is an image representing Christ's Passion, which is His true sacrifice."⁹⁹ Therefore, the Eucharist "is called Christ's sacrifice."¹⁰⁰ In this article, Thomas does not specify how the Eucharist images Christ's Passion, but he surely has in mind, as in *ST* III, q. 74, a. 1, the consecration of the discrete species, since in "Christ's Passion . . . the blood was separated from the body."¹⁰¹ Is this relationship of signification between the celebration of the Eucharist and Christ's Passion sufficient grounds to say that Christ is sacrificed in this sacrament? On Thomas's account, it is not. For, he notes, on these grounds, we can say that Christ was likewise sacrificed in

the Council of Trent on the Oneness of the Christian Sacrifice"). For Vonier's application of Thomas's position, see esp. 64. (Vonier's work was written in response to Maurice de la Taille; see Nichols's introduction, on xii–xiii). For Canon Eugène Masure's explication of this text, see his *The Christian Sacrifice: The Sacrifice of Christ our Head*, trans. Iltyd Trethowan with preface (London: Burnes, Oates, and Washbourne, 1944), 217–19, in a section entitled "Eucharistic Tradition up to the 16th Century." Incidentally, this section is followed by Masure's discussion of the Baroque-era position, in a section ominously entitled "The Break with Tradition" (on 221–25). See particularly 255, where Masure praises the position of Cardinal Louis Billot (1846–1931) in concert with Vonier: Billot "has probably made possible all our present theological advances: the Mass is the very sacrifice of the Cross under sensible signs, which are convenient because representative. Then we return to the great stream of our tradition: *a reality beneath a sign*." See Journet, *The Mass*, 80–81, for his explication of Thomas's text.

⁹⁸ *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1, citing St. Augustine, *Ad Simplicianum* 2.

⁹⁹ *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1.

¹⁰⁰ *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1. For a good treatment of Thomas's take on the Eucharist's sacrificial character, see Štěpán Martin Filip, O.P., "*Imago Repæsentativa Passionis Christi*: St. Thomas Aquinas on the Essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass," *Nova et Vetera* (English) 7, no. 2 (2009): 405–38.

¹⁰¹ Thomas continues in *ST* III, q. 74, a. 1: "And therefore in this sacrament, which is the memorial of our Lord's Passion, the bread is received apart as the sacrament of the body, and the wine as the sacrament of the blood."

the sacrifices of the Old Testament, since these too figured Christ's Passion.¹⁰² Therefore, something else is required if the Eucharist is to have a relation to the Passion that differs from that had by the Old Testament sacrifices.

Thomas's second reason, therefore, completes the first, and it has to do with sacramental efficacy: the celebration of this sacrament "is called a sacrifice, in respect of *the effect* of His Passion: because, to wit, by this sacrament, we are made partakers *of the fruit of our Lord's Passion*."¹⁰³ Here we arrive at the crux of what causes the sacraments of the New Testament to differ from those of the Old Testament. "We have it on the authority of many saints," Thomas writes, "that the sacraments of the New Law *not only signify*, but also *cause* grace."¹⁰⁴ Thus, the sacraments of the New Testament differ from other signs in this way: they are *efficacious* signs. They are signs that, "to use the common expression, effect what they signify [*efficiunt quod figurant*]."¹⁰⁵

As applied to the Eucharist, what this means is that the Eucharist, as a sacrament of the New Law, is an *efficacious sign*, a sign that is an instrumental cause of a "hidden effect,"¹⁰⁶ an effect that it effects precisely by way of *signification*. If, therefore, we wish to know what the celebration of the Eucharist effects, we must first look to its sign value. As noted above, however, the Eucharist, through the consecration of the discrete species (bread and wine), is an image of Christ's Passion. Therefore, in Thomas's words, "it is proper to this sacrament for Christ to be sacrificed in its celebration."¹⁰⁷ In a nutshell, this is Thomas's argument for the Eucharist's sacrificial character. For clarity's sake, allow me to condense it into syllogism form:

¹⁰² This is why, Thomas notes, Rev 13:8 speaks of the lamb "slain from the beginning of the world" (cited in *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1). Other readings of this verse, however, coordinate the phrase "from the beginning [or: foundation] of the world" with the names of the saints written in the book of life. Cf. the rendering of the Revised Standard Version, for example.

¹⁰³ *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1 (emphases added).

¹⁰⁴ *ST* III, q. 62, a. 1 (emphases added).

¹⁰⁵ *ST* III, q. 62, a. 1, ad 1. On Thomas's count, the sacraments are the *causa instrumentalis*, instrumental cause of grace. See *ST* III, q. 62, a. 1: "And it is thus [i.e., as instrumental causes] that the sacraments of the New Law cause grace: for they are instituted by God to be employed for the purpose of conferring grace."

¹⁰⁶ *ST* III, q. 62, a. 1, ad 1.

¹⁰⁷ *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1.

Major premise: Sacraments, according to “the common expression . . . effect what they signify.”¹⁰⁸

Minor premise: The celebration of the Eucharist, however, “is an image representing Christ’s Passion, which is His true sacrifice.”¹⁰⁹

Conclusion: Therefore, as a sacrament of a sacrifice, the Eucharist is (to anachronistically borrow the words of Trent) a “true and proper sacrifice.”¹¹⁰

This is Thomas’s argument,¹¹¹ and it is the starting point from which a number of twentieth-century theologians began to reevaluate the Eucharist’s sacrificial character, thereby bypassing the *immutatio* argument entirely.¹¹² Notice the key move here: the argument begins by first situating the Eucharist in the genus *sacrament* so as to argue to its sacrificial character, and not vice versa. Thus, the minor premise of the previous argument, positing (on Thomistic grounds) the need for a discrete *immutatio*, falls away. This is because the major premise begins not with the Eucharist’s sacrificial character, but with its sacramentality, only after which does it then argue, on the grounds that it is an efficacious re-presentation of Christ’s Passion (imaging his crucifixion),¹¹³ to the Eucharist’s properly sacrificial character.

¹⁰⁸ ST III, q. 62, a. 1.

¹⁰⁹ ST III, q. 83, a. 1.

¹¹⁰ Council of Trent, Session 22 (September 17, 1562), can. 1 (DH, no. 1751).

¹¹¹ As will be clear to the reader with ST III, q. 83, a. 1, open in front of them, I have restructured Thomas’s argument for clarity, drawing on, in particular, his foundational insights about the efficacious character of sacramental signs in general in ST III, q. 62, a. 1, which are presupposed in q. 83, a. 1. That said, I believe I have gotten to the bottom of what Thomas is saying here. See the following footnote for Abbot Vonier’s formulation of Thomas’s argument.

¹¹² See esp. Vonier, *Key to the Doctrine*, 64: “Let us take the signs, both things and words; examine these signs, and see whether they do really signify a sacrifice. If they do signify a sacrifice, then there is a sacrifice, according to the universal axiom that the Christian sacraments do what they signify: *Sacramenta efficiunt quod significant*.” Vonier restates this general argument in light of Thomas’s argument in ST III, q. 83, a. 1: “In the sacrament of the Eucharist, then, *representation and application* of the sacrifice of the Cross are the only kind of immolation to be admitted in the sacrifice of the Christian altar. The Cross is Christ’s true immolation [this is Thomas’s word *immolatio*]; the Mass is its perfect image, therefore it is an immolation” (*Key to the Doctrine*, 97; emphasis added).

¹¹³ I say the “efficacious re-presentation of Christ’s *Passion*,” however, contra Vonier, who takes the eccentric position that the signification of Christ’s body and blood as *separated* refers, in the Eucharist, not to the act of their separation

As will become clear, this is precisely the Thomistic foundation on which Cardinal Journet builds his own formulations, as he gathers and organizes Thomas's diffuse material relevant to this subject.

The central emphasis of Journet's theology of Eucharistic sacrifice is already evident in the subtitle of his work, *The Mass: The Presence of the Sacrifice of the Cross*. In this work, Journet is concerned to provide an account of the numerical oneness and identity of the sacrifice of the Mass with that of the Cross. "There is not *another* oblation for sin," he writes, "but a *presence*, an *application*, an *actualization* of that one oblation."¹¹⁴ The Eucharist is a "true sacrifice . . . not by the impossible reiteration of the unique sacrifice, but by the reiteration of the *presence* of the unique sacrifice under the unbloody rite."¹¹⁵ "Presence," "application," and "actualization" of the Cross: these are the hallmarks of Journet's approach to the Eucharistic sacrifice.

When we view it thus, we can see right off the bat how Journet's position differs from Scheeben's. Whereas Scheeben freely emphasizes that the Eucharist, as "a sacrifice of the Church," is offered in "a *new*, genuine act of sacrifice,"¹¹⁶ the transubstantiation, Journet stresses, on the contrary, the unity and numerical oneness of the sacrifice of the Mass and the Cross. Whereas Scheeben emphasizes that the productive *actio sacrificialis* of the Mass, precisely as productive and/or consecratory, more closely resembles the Incarnation and/or resurrection¹¹⁷ (even if it be without detriment to the anamnestic character of the dual consecration),¹¹⁸ Journet is keen to emphasize precisely

in Christ's crucifixion, but to *the dead Christ*. This is Vonier's interpretation of "*Christus passus*—the Christ *who has suffered*" (emphasis added), by which he brings out the past tense character of the perfect passive participle *passus*: "In virtue of the sacrament, the Eucharist contains, not the mortal Christ, not even the dying Christ, nor does it contain the glorious Christ; but it contains the Christ directly *after His death*" (*Key to the Doctrine*, 86). Vonier does, however, go on (*Key to the Doctrine*, 87) to stress that, by virtue of concomitance, the glorious Christ is also present, but this is almost in spite of the sacramental signification! For Journet's rejection of Vonier's interpretation of the sacramental signification (though Journet is, in general, favorable to Vonier's overall position), see *The Mass*, 261–62.

¹¹⁴ Journet, *The Mass*, 23 (emphases original). See also 50: the sacrifice of the Church/Last Supper are "inseparable from the Passion," since it "brings the Passion to us."

¹¹⁵ Journet, *The Mass*, 31 (emphasis added).

¹¹⁶ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 508.

¹¹⁷ See Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 509.

¹¹⁸ See Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 495.

the efficacious character of the Eucharistic anamnesis by which the identity of the Cross with the Mass is secured. Indeed, without ever mentioning Scheeben, Journet *de facto* rejects Scheeben's position via his surrogate Suárez: "Suarez [*sic*] would declare quite clearly that the sacrifice is essentially different at the Cross and at the Mass."¹¹⁹ "At the Cross, [in Suárez's view] the sacrifice is a destruction, a death; at the Mass, the sacrifice is a sanctification, a glorious sacramental presence,"¹²⁰ hence, the dissimilar sacrificial actions. For his part, Journet will have none of this. In his view, it is better to emphasize that the celebration of the Mass *makes present* the one sacrifice of the Cross. Of course, this raises the question of what precisely Journet means when he says that the Mass renders the sacrifice of the Cross present.

The key to understanding Journet's oft-repeated claim here is a distinction he develops between Christ's *substantial* presence and his *operative* presence. Substantially, Christ is present wherever he is,¹²¹ whether this be under his proper species (his natural appearance qua Jesus of Nazareth) or under his borrowed species (the sacramental species of bread and wine).¹²² For example, Journet observes, Christ was "present *substantially* in the house of Simon the Pharisee" (as recorded in Luke 7:36–50), as he was also "present *substantially* on the Cross," on both occasions under his own proper species.¹²³ At the Last Supper, however, Christ was "present *substantially* twice: first, naturally and under His proper appearances, and . . . second, sacramentally and under the borrowed appearances of bread and wine."¹²⁴ Lastly, at Mass, he is again present substantially, albeit only once this time, and this through his "*substantial* presence . . . now glorious" under the species of bread and wine.¹²⁵ Is the glorious Christ's substantial presence at Mass—via the dual consecration, and thus under the species of bread and wine—sufficient in itself, on Journet's account, to render Christ's redemptive sacrifice *on the Cross* present? The answer is that it is not. For this, something else is required: an

¹¹⁹ Journet, *The Mass*, 256. See also 79n45: "Suarez [*sic*] . . . would be led to see in the Mass a sacrifice specifically and essentially distinct from that of the Cross."

¹²⁰ Journet, *The Mass*, 256.

¹²¹ See Journet, *The Mass*, 59: "Substantial presence is for being in the ontological order."

¹²² For the distinction between proper and borrowed/sacramental species, see Journet, *The Mass*, 60.

¹²³ Journet, *The Mass*, 60.

¹²⁴ Journet, *The Mass*, 60–61.

¹²⁵ Journet, *The Mass*, 61.

operative or *efficient* presence of Christ with reference to his meriting action on the Cross.

By “*operative* presence,” Journet means that someone can be said to be present when that person there produces some kind of *effect*.¹²⁶ Thus, whereas Christ was present substantially in the house of Simon the Pharisee, “He was present *efficiently* only in the house of the centurion whose servant He cured” (in Luke 7:1–10).¹²⁷ Viewed in this way, we can say that Christ is present twice—that is, substantially *and* efficiently—at Calvary. We have already discussed how he is present there substantially, but now we must inquire how he is there efficiently. Journet tells us:

He is present *efficiently*, spiritually, by His action and His power, in the hearts of the Virgin and St. John [present at the foot of the Cross; see John 19:26], in order to draw them along in the wake of His offering and to pour out on them redemptive grace. He is at a distance from the Virgin and St. John by His substantial presence; He is *in* the Virgin and St. John by His virtual presence.¹²⁸

This image of the Virgin and St. John at the foot of the Cross is one to which Journet often has recourse to account for the presence of the Cross at Mass via efficiency.¹²⁹ His idea here is as follows: because the sacrifice of the Cross was offered with the intention of producing a certain effect in us, there is then, via the divine power, a “ray [that comes forth] from His bloody Cross,” a ray that touches and redeems us through our contact with this operative presence.¹³⁰ As such, what was merited on the Cross is now at work in us spiritually so as to produce its intended effects in our souls.¹³¹ If, however, this “ray of the

¹²⁶ See Journet, *The Mass*, 59: “Operative presence is for acting in the dynamic order.”

¹²⁷ Journet, *The Mass*, 60.

¹²⁸ Journet, *The Mass*, 60 (emphasis added).

¹²⁹ See Journet, *The Mass*, 70, 94, 103.

¹³⁰ Journet, *The Mass*, 81.

¹³¹ See Journet’s discussion of Thomas in *The Mass*, 81. Without explicitly citing the text, Journet is here referring to Thomas’s words in *ST* III, q. 48, a. 6, ad 2: “Christ’s Passion, although corporeal, has yet a spiritual effect from the Godhead united: and therefore it *secures its efficacy by spiritual contact*—namely, by faith and the sacraments of faith.” For Christ’s Passion as meritorious in Thomas, see *ST* III, q. 48, a. 1.

bloody Cross” was indeed at work in the Virgin and St. John, what ultimately matters is not whether we are contemporaneous with the event itself (such contemporaneousness is, for obvious reasons, “excluded from us”).¹³² Rather, what matters is “the [same] presence of spiritual contact” at work in us now that “touched the Blessed Virgin and St. John,” even as they stood *at a distance from*—though contemporaneous with—the event itself.¹³³ On Journet’s account, it is this “ray,” the operative, efficient, or virtual presence of Christ’s Cross, that accounts for the presence of Christ’s sacrifice at Mass, since this ray “moves with each succeeding generation in order to touch us” there.¹³⁴ Thus, the Mass, he writes, is “a true and real sacrifice,” since “it multiplies the real operative presences of the unique redemptive sacrifice”—that is, Christ’s Cross¹³⁵—so as to render it efficiently present to the faithful of all generations.

For Journet, how are these two presences of Christ, substantial and operative, made present at Mass? His answer is that they become present through the conjunction of re-presentation and efficacy that occurs there through the consecration of the discrete species,¹³⁶ which signify, and therefore make present, not only the presence of Christ’s body and blood (now glorious) but *also* the separation of his body and blood “in the only manner in which [this latter] can be rendered present to us, namely operatively.”¹³⁷ Journet brings all of this together in the following passage:

At the Mass there is, under the appearances of bread and wine, the *substantial* presence of Christ now glorious. And there is under the same appearances the *efficient, operative* presence of His one redemptive sacrifice. Not without reason does Christ, now glorious, come to us under the appearances of His Body given for us, of His Blood poured out for the remission of sins;

¹³² Journet, *The Mass*, 70.

¹³³ Journet, *The Mass*, 70.

¹³⁴ Journet, *The Mass*, 70.

¹³⁵ Journet, *The Mass*, 61–62 (see also 80, explaining St. Thomas’s position: “Christ is sacrificed at the Mass because the Mass brings us the effect of His Passion; it actualizes for us His Passion; it makes us partakers of the fruits of His Passion”).

¹³⁶ See Journet, *The Mass*, 80 (see also 70: “the spiritual ray of His bloody Cross come[s] to us in a sensible envelopment, capable at once of *signifying and transmitting* it” [emphasis added], which is to say, it comes to us via the confection of the sacrament).

¹³⁷ Journet, *The Mass*, 71.

it is in order to signify that He comes to us with the application, the contact, the power and the presence of His one redemptive sacrifice.¹³⁸

Here, Journet's exposition reconnects with the text of St. Thomas outlined above, emerging as an explication of it. Ultimately, what Journet intends to elucidate with his distinction between Christ's substantial and operative presence at Mass is what, precisely, St. Thomas meant when he spoke in *ST* III, q. 83, a. 1, of the sacrament as realizing "the effect of [Christ's] Passion," by which "we are made partakers of the fruit of our Lord's Passion."¹³⁹ If Thomas deals elsewhere with the presence of Christ's body and blood in this sacrament,¹⁴⁰ there is still the question of his body and blood being made present with "the effect of His Passion," whence it "contain[s] Christ crucified."¹⁴¹ This is the distinction Journet is highlighting. This is why, when he wishes to sum up Thomas's take on the Eucharistic sacrifice, he does so by redeploying his own finely articulated distinctions: "In other words [i.e., he is restating Thomas's position in his own words], the Mass brings us not only the *substantial presence* of Christ in His glorious *state*, but also the *operative presence* of His redemptive sacrificial *act*."¹⁴²

Before leaving Journet's texts, I would like to turn briefly to his discussion of the interrelationship of the respective roles of Christ and the Church in the liturgical offering of the Mass.¹⁴³ Here there are surprising convergences—but also some differences—between Scheeben's and Journet's positions. As we saw, Scheeben, in his account of the Eucharistic sacrifice, assigns an important place to the distinction at Mass between the priest's role where he speaks in the voice of Christ the divine Bridegroom (expressed in the Words of Institution) and his role where he speaks in the name of the Church as his bride (expressed, above all, in the various epicleses scattered throughout the Anaphora). As it turns out, however, we find a similar distinction in Journet. In a subsection treating of "the role of the Church and that

¹³⁸ Journet, *The Mass*, 61.

¹³⁹ Journet cites this passage in *The Mass*, 80.

¹⁴⁰ Throughout *ST*, especially *ST* III, qq. 75–76, particularly q. 76, a. 1, where Thomas deals with the presence of whole Christ—body, blood, soul, and divinity—in this sacrament by way of real concomitance.

¹⁴¹ Cited from *ST* III, q. 73, a. 5, ad 2.

¹⁴² Journet, *The Mass*, 81 (emphases original).

¹⁴³ Journet, *The Mass*, 93–94 (in ch. 5: "The Offering of the Mass").

of the priests in the cultic unbloody offering,”¹⁴⁴ Journet observes that “the Church intervenes through her priests in the cultic unbloody offering on two essentially distinct levels: as she is the bearer of *the voice of the Bridegroom*, or as she makes heard her own voice *as Bride*.”¹⁴⁵ As to the first level, where Christ is speaking (this level is primary):¹⁴⁶ “[The Church, in the transubstantiation] acts through her priests, *in persona Christi*. . . . It is the voice of the Bridegroom which she makes heard, and not that of her own.”¹⁴⁷ At what point, then, does the Church speak *in propria persona*, in her own name as bride? She speaks in her own name, Journet writes, both “*before and after the transubstantiation*.”¹⁴⁸ It is here that the priests “are no longer ministers as before, that is to say, in the sense of purely the instruments of Christ the Bridegroom”; rather, “they are ministers in the sense [that they are] the servants of the Church the Bride.”¹⁴⁹ Regrettably, Journet does not go into more detail as to precisely how the Church expresses her own voice in these anaphoral prayers (or, for that matter, into what consecratory symbolism might be implied through an analysis of their contents). He is content to simply mention the bare fact in one brief paragraph and then move on to the question of the laity’s act of self-offering at Mass in the order of charity.¹⁵⁰ Similarly, he does not discuss whether there is an act of the Church implicitly contained (in veiled fashion) in the priest’s enunciation of the Words of Institution (whereby the priest is, then, simultaneously Christ’s representative *and* the Church’s). We will return to this question below.

¹⁴⁴ Journet, *The Mass*, 98–99 (I have removed the capitalization from the subsection head for in-text citation).

¹⁴⁵ Journet, *The Mass*, 98 (emphases added).

¹⁴⁶ See Journet, *The Mass*, 93: “If Christ is both Priest and Victim at the Mass, according to the Council of Trent, then He holds the first place, and the Church the second.”

¹⁴⁷ Journet, *The Mass*, 98.

¹⁴⁸ Journet, *The Mass*, 99: “*Before and after transubstantiation* the Church acts through her priests in her own name, *in propria persona*. It is in her own voice, that of the Bride” (emphasis added).

¹⁴⁹ Journet, *The Mass*, 99.

¹⁵⁰ Later in *The Mass*, when Journet does deign to go into a more extended discussion of the other components parts of the Anaphora (227–33), his analysis is still cursory and consists mostly of remarks detailing the historical formation of the Canon. When he does discuss the *Supplices te rogamus*, on 231, he treats it exclusively as a prayer for *our* incorporation into Christ’s offering, and not as referring to the transformation of the gifts. His treatment of the *Quam oblationem* on 229 is wholly cursory.

As summary, the following points characterize Journet's theology of Eucharistic sacrifice. First, he emphasizes, above all, the numerical unity of the sacrifice of the Mass with that of the Cross. As such, the sacrifice of the Mass is not a "new" sacrifice (contra Suárez), but instead a re-presentation and actualization of Christ's one sacrifice, offered on the Cross "once for all" (Heb 7:27; 9:26; 10:10, 14). Second, Journet's position on the Mass as an efficacious re-presentation of Christ's sacrifice is basically an extended explication of Thomas's. Thomas's position is itself characterized by two points: (a) the consecration of the discrete species of bread and wine as an efficacious sign—or sacrament—of Christ's Passion, through which, then, (b) its fruits are applied. Third, key in explaining the latter point (b) is Journet's distinction between Christ's substantial presence and operative presence in the Eucharist. Substantially, Christ's glorified body and blood are present under the species of bread and wine following upon the consecration. Operatively, however, Christ is present in the Eucharist because he acts there to communicate the fruits of his Passion. This is why, then, on Journet's count, the Mass is "a true and real sacrifice": (a) through the medium of effective signification resulting in transubstantiation, Christ is rendered present, yes, substantially, but also because (b) he brings with him the *power* or *efficiency* of his Passion.¹⁵¹ Lastly, for Journet, the consecration is the work of Christ the Bridegroom as conveyed by the priest acting *in persona Christi* (via his declarative voice enunciation of the words of consecration). Journet, however, maintains this emphasis without detriment to the priest's role as representative of Christ's bride, the Church (even if he mostly leaves this other traditional datum undeveloped).

Having set forth Scheeben's and Journet's positions on the Eucharist as sacrifice, let us now turn to an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of their respective positions, setting them in dialogue. It is my contention that, far from being contradictory, each has the power to complete the other when viewed from the proper angle.

Scheeben and Journet in Dialogue

Allow me to begin by stating that, of the two arguments presented earlier—the one beginning from the Eucharist's sacrificial character and the other from its sacramental character—I regard the second

¹⁵¹ Journet, *The Mass*, 61–62.

argument, Thomas's, to be correct. The great difficulty with the various post-Tridentine *immutatio* theories is that, as Leo Scheffczyk put it, they have the habit of "each cancelling out the other."¹⁵² At least in some of their destructive formulations, there is also the further problem that they run the risk of renewing Christ's state of humiliation.¹⁵³ No consensus was ever reached on the identity of the desired sacrificial *immutatio*, nor could there be, since the search itself was premised on a category error. This is why, in the long haul, I regard this paradigm's eventual eclipse in the first half of the twentieth century as no great loss for Catholic theology, though I have learned much from the great theologians who advanced this paradigm.¹⁵⁴

Where, then, does this leave Scheeben's position? This is a more complex matter. On the one hand, I do not think his position is correct as it stands. His principal error derives from his search for the fresh *immutatio*—in his case, *immutatio perfectiva*—needed so as to constitute the Eucharist a "new, genuine act of sacrifice."¹⁵⁵ A side effect of this move is that it effectively severs his treatment of the Eucharist's sacrificial character from his account of its character as an efficacious memorial of Christ's crucifixion. The result is that these

¹⁵² Scheffczyk, "Eucharistic Sacrifice," 275.

¹⁵³ This, for example, is Scheeben's critique of de Lugo's (and Franzelin's) theory concerning Christ's sacramental debasement: "The sacrificial character of the Eucharist cannot, it seems, be found in such humiliation, if only for the reason that this humiliation, regarded as a moral annihilation, would renew the death and immolation of Christ, and hence also His meritorious activity, instead of merely representing them" (*The Mysteries*, 472–73n4).

¹⁵⁴ In saying this, I wish, however, to emphasize that I am not advocating a wholesale rejection of the views of any of the authors who have been discussed in these pages, nor do I mean to oversimplify the positions and contributions of any given era. Although the *immutatio* theories prevailed in the post-Tridentine period, I have not mentioned—due to considerations of space—the countervailing sacrificial winds of the seventeenth-century movement of priestly piety known as the French School, which, as Pomplun notes, "provide[s] the chief alternative [in this period] to these scholastic theologies of eucharistic sacrifice" ("Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology," 357). Authors of the French School argue for the character of the Eucharistic sacrifice from the identity, as Pomplun puts it here, of the "same 'inner oblation'" in Christ's will both at Calvary and at Mass, as bridged by the mediating influence of Christ's heavenly sacrifice. For Scheeben's tacit rejection of the French School's position on Eucharistic sacrifice—on the grounds that the same inner oblation cannot be present in Christ's will both on the Cross and in heaven (because they are discrete *temporal* acts of willing)—see *Handbuch*, 5/2:1496–97.

¹⁵⁵ Scheeben, *The Mysteries*, 508.

two facets of his theology of Eucharistic sacrifice are compartmentalized from one another.¹⁵⁶ On the other hand, while I do not agree with Scheeben's cleavage of the sacrificial *immutatio* (a false category) from the efficacious symbolism of the discretely consecrated species (even if their consecration be the engine that drives this sacrificial *immutatio*), I actually think that Scheeben, with his particular formulation of the *immutatio* theory, has picked up on something that Journet has overlooked. This has to do with the consecratory symbolism derived not from consideration of the Words of Institution, but from their broader liturgical context, which is caught up in an ongoing interplay between the Lord's institution (at the Last Supper),¹⁵⁷ on the

¹⁵⁶ In the pagination of *The Mysteries*, they are separated by twelve pages: in 494–95, Scheeben discusses Christ's representative "immolation" under the sacramental species, whence he is present "as the sacrificial Lamb"; only later, in 507–9, in a different subsection altogether (no. 72: "Nature and Meaning of Transubstantiation") does he finally get around to discussing the Eucharist's "real sacrificial action," which bears "greater similarity with the execution of the hypostatic union and the resurrection of Christ's body than with the immolation of that body on the cross" (508–9). Shortly thereafter, he notes: "The Eucharistic act of sacrifice bears the stamp of the immolation consummated on the cross . . . *only* so far as in the heavenly holocaust the immolation of the cross is exhibited and offered in God's eternal remembrance, and this remembrance is visibly depicted to us in the separation of the blood from the body . . . by the difference between the species" (509; emphasis added).

¹⁵⁷ I say "the Lord's institution (at the Last Supper)," as opposed to "the priest's declarative-voice recitation of the Words of Institution at Mass," to hedge my argument somewhat, as there are a few known liturgies that lack the explicit recitation of the Words of Institution, such as the Anaphora of Addai and Mari celebrated by the Assyrian Church of the East. However, I still hold that all liturgies maintain the basic idea of the priest acting *in persona Christi* in a more or less pronounced form, since every Eucharist is, at bottom, a repetition of what Christ did at the Last Supper. Even Addai and Mari, in the Ghanta immediately preceding the Epiclesis, speaks of the "commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer you upon your pure and holy altar, as you taught us." This motif is taken up again a few lines later when the priest says that we "have received by tradition the example which is from you," and so "perform this great, fearful, holy, life-giving, and divine Mystery" (citations of Addai and Mari are from *The Order of the Holy Qurbana According to the Liturgy of Mar Addai and Mar Mari, The Blessed Apostles (for the Use of the Faithful)*, compiled by Lawrence Namato and the Assyrian Church of the East, rev. ed. [San Jose, CA: Adiabene, 2009], 57.) Thus, the symbolism of Christ's Passion, derived from the consecration of the discrete species following Christ's example, is still preserved, albeit obliquely, in this liturgy. For a discussion of the disputed historical question of whether Addai and Mari ever contained the explicit recitation of the Words of Institution, see

one hand, and the ecclesial reception of this act, on the other.

I submit that the Church's celebration of the Eucharist is essentially *one* action, but with *two* irreducible halves, which halves correspond respectively to the priest's relation to the action when he is acting *in persona Christi* and when he is acting *in persona ecclesiae*. By way of illustration, picture a curved line: it is one, and yet it has both a convex and a concave aspect. So too with the celebration of the Eucharist: it is one, but it has two different aspects, *in persona Christi* and *in persona ecclesiae*. *In persona Christi* represents Christ's institution, which in turn symbolizes/effects the Eucharist's relationship to Christ's saving Passion. This aspect will be emphasized whenever one places the emphasis in the liturgical rite on the Lord's institution as grounding the celebration of the sacrament, on the priest's recitation of Christ's words in the declarative voice, and in general, on the Eucharist as the memorial of Christ's saving Pasch.

The flip side of this action is the receipt and performance of this institution by Christ's bride, the Church. Even when the priest is acting *in persona Christi capitis* in the liturgy (above all with his recitation of the Words of Institution), this aspect—as both Scheeben and Hoppe contend—is still present, even if veiled. At other times in the liturgy, however, the priest expresses the Church's role in the action by speaking *in persona ecclesiae*, something that is expressed in the various offertories, epicleses, and intercessions that feature prominently in every known liturgy. Moreover, when the Eucharist is viewed from the vantage point of the Church's various offertories and consecratory petitions, it is not the Eucharist's aspect as an anamnesis of Christ's Passion that comes to the fore, but rather the transformation

U. M. Lang, "Eucharist without Institution Narrative? The *Anaphora of Addai and Mari* Revisited," *Divinitas* 47 (2004): 227–60. For a defense of its validity, see Robert F. Taft, "Mass without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October 2001," *Worship* 77, no. 6 (2003): 482–509. The Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity's declaration of Addai and Mari's validity, *Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East*, is available at the Vatican's website. For another prominent liturgy that potentially lacks the recitation of the Words of Institution, see Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Catechesis* 5.6–8, in *Lectures on the Christian Sacraments*, ed. F. L. Cross (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977), 73–74. Granted, this is a catechetical work and not a liturgical text—whence it is *possible* Cyril skips over portions of the prayer; as it stands, Cyril passes immediately from the *Sanctus* in 5.6 to the recitation of the epiclesis in 5.7 with no hint of any intervening material.

of her gifts¹⁵⁸ through which Christ—together with the fruits of his Passion—is made present in her midst.

When the Eucharist is viewed in this way, as an irreducibly two-sided action, the apparent opposition between Scheeben's emphasis on the *newness* of the Eucharistic sacrifice as the Church's sacrifice and Journet's emphasis on its *numerical oneness* with Christ's Passion falls away. This is so, at least, provided we have first shed the rationale underlying the *immutatio* theory: the "newness" of the Eucharistic sacrifice is to be accounted for on the basis of the ecclesial repetition—and reception—of Christ's institution. Thus, the newness of the action is its aspect as a consecration of the Church's gifts in response to her petition that they may become the body and blood of Christ, something that happens afresh with each discrete celebration of the Eucharist. On the other hand, the action's numerical unity with Christ's Passion comes to the fore whenever it is viewed in terms of Christ's institution, the priest's recitation of the Words of Institution, and in general, the Eucharist's anamnestic relationship to Christ's sacrifice offered once for all at the Cross, which is rendered present at Mass via representation and efficiency.

By viewing the Eucharist as an irreducibly two-sided operation (*in persona Christi* and *in persona ecclesiae*), we can overcome what I view as the basic lopsidedness of Journet's position, while at the same time liberating Scheeben's richer perspective from the limitations of the *immutatio* argument. Journet's position is lopsided because he makes comparatively little of the ecclesial side of the Eucharistic action. The richness of Scheeben's perspective consists in the fact that he rightly emphasizes *both* that it is the anamnesis of Christ Passion *and* that the Church's sacrifice of bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ. By retrieving Scheeben's perspective without his understanding of the *immutatio*, furthermore, we can open up certain lines of approach to the perspective of the Christian East, which has historically placed the preponderance of its emphasis on the deprecatory—and epicletic—half of this action (*in persona ecclesiae*), while the West has more heavily emphasized its character as the anamnesis of Christ's Passion, grounded in the recitation of the Words of Institution (*in persona Christi*).

¹⁵⁸ This is where the prominence that Scheeben gives to the Annunciation–resurrection typologies comes to the fore.

Conclusion

I would like to close with a nod to Eugène Masure, whose position resembles my own. Near the end of his book *The Christian Sacrifice*, Masure gives an extended account of the twentieth-century recovery of the Thomistic position of the Eucharist as sacramental sacrifice.¹⁵⁹ When, in due course, he takes up Suárez's position, he offers this criticism: on Suárez's count, "the Church's sacrifice becomes a sacrifice of bread and wine miraculously transformed in the course of the ceremony into the sacrifice of [Christ's] Body and Blood."¹⁶⁰ As Masure goes on to note, however, it is not so much that Suárez's perspective is false as it is that it is just incomplete, since it "shows only [the mystery's] secondary or initial aspect," its dimension as "the mystery of the Church."¹⁶¹

Contra Suárez, Masure avers, we must first say that: "The sacrifice of the Church is the sacrifice of Christ, thanks to the symbolic species of bread and wine already offered. By thus reversing the formula we set in order the entire doctrine."¹⁶² Masure sums up his position as follows: "The Mass is a liturgical sacrifice offered by the Church, which is yet at the same time the sacrifice offered on the Cross and consummated in heaven by our Lord—and this because the Church's oblations, the bread and the wine, whose species act as sacrament or sign for the immolation of Calvary, are changed into the body and blood of Christ's sacrifice, that is Christ Himself, so that the Church has as victim on her altars every day the very victim of the one eternal sacrifice."¹⁶³ This is well put. Masure has successfully integrated the two halves of the action: the consecration of the bread and wine into Christ's body and blood and its character as an anamnesis of Christ's Cross. Both of these perspectives—that is, Suárez's and Thomas's—are needed so as to give a full account of the Eucharist's sacrificial character. The only question, then, is one of how to fit them together properly to form one whole. And it is this that I hope to have achieved in some measure in the present essay. N&V

¹⁵⁹ Masure discusses Thomas's position—and Trent's—in *The Christian Sacrifice*, 216–19. He speaks of its twentieth-century recovery beginning on 226.

¹⁶⁰ Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice*, 254–55.

¹⁶¹ Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice*, 255. As Masure puts it in a footnote here: "the Suarezian formulas express the mystery of the Mass well enough in so far as it is the mystery of the Church." (Masure's footnotes are unnumbered and refer back to the text with various signs; in the case of this note, it is an asterisk.)

¹⁶² Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice*, 255.

¹⁶³ Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice*, 253.