

B R I A N F. B Y R O N



*From Essence to Presence:
A Shift in Eucharistic Expression Illustrated
from the Apologetic of St. Thomas More*

ONE OF THE MANY BENEFITS OF MY PROVIDENTIAL CHOICE of St. Thomas More as a subject for a doctoral thesis was my coming into contact with the Moreanum of Angers and its founder Germain Marc'hadour. Since 1965 he has enriched my life with his scholarship, his organization and his friendship. I have had the honour of being his guest several times and his host once. My visits to Angers have always been joyous and inspiring. His visit to Australia in 1978 for the quincentenary of More's birth is still having its effects. As a fellow priest I appreciate his love of the Mass and his writings on More's eucharistic devotion. I know he has a special place in his thoughts for the priest-members of the Amicale. As I write I have on my desk a postcard from Angers signed by Father Gregory Meere, Germain, Beatrice Lemasson and Mary O'Neill on 19 September 1986. Greg died suddenly shortly afterwards on his way home on 27 September in Los Angeles. He would want to be closely associated with the honouring of Germain at this high point in his illustrious career.

The central part of the present article was delivered as a paper at the International Conference on More and St. John Fisher at Chelsea in 1985. We were allowed only twenty minutes on that occasion so I had to be succinct. I may now be allowed additional words of explanation though I fear they will still not be enough. I hope to have the opportunity of dealing comprehensively with the subject at book-length.

The title I have given this essay is meant to describe a change that gradually came into eucharistic theology—a change from expressions of identity (or essence) to those of presence. “Essence” is from the Latin *esse*, the copulative “to be.” This copulative *esse* is to be distinguished from the substantive *esse* meaning “to exist.” “Presence” is from *prae-esse*, “to be before,” in which *esse* has the substantive meaning. By using More’s catena of patristic texts as an example, I indicate that there was a gradual change from the copulative *esse* to the substantive *prae-esse* in regard to the Eucharist. The verb “to be” as used of the Eucharist in the New Testament is always the copula. Thomas More uses the words of the Fathers in his efforts to prove eucharistic realism. I believe he succeeds. But he, like most in his time, expresses it in terms of *presence*. Is there any difference? Maybe we should look at the evidence first. What follows in the next section is the text of the paper I delivered at Chelsea in July 1985.

I

One of the most bitter debates between Catholics and Christians of the reformed traditions from the time of Luther until the mid-twentieth century was that over the Eucharist. Any possibility of reconciliation seemed impossible until in recent decades the miracle of the Ecumenical Movement replaced diatribe with dialogue and invective with agreed statements. Amongst these, of particular note are the Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) and World Council of Churches’ Faith and Order Commission (Lima) reports, which aim to by-pass the stalemates of the Reformation era by reformulating doctrine in uncontroversial language. My general objective in this paper is to further this wonderful enterprise. I believe that several important misconceptions had imperceptibly altered the formulation of eucharistic doctrine by the late scholastic period. I believe that some of these were not detected by either side at the time of the Reformation and, unfortunately, they are still undetected by most people and hence continue to cloud our understanding of the Eucharist today.

Thomas More and John Fisher provide us with a fair sampling of the Catholic apologetic of the Eucharist at the time of the Reformation. Studies have already been done on the treatment of the eucharistic sacrifice by these two defenders of the Catholic faith. It has also been shown that both men had a good understanding of the best scholastic explanation of the Real Presence and utilized it skillfully.¹ I am go-

ing to suggest, however, that there was one flaw in the scholastic theory which More and Fisher did not consider.

In my opinion there were, over the centuries, several shifts in the meaning of key expressions in eucharistic theology. I will concentrate in this paper on only one of them, namely, the shift from expressions which designate *identity* to those which designate *presence*. More’s last extensive writing on the Eucharist provides us with patristic citations with which I can illustrate the *fact* that a change in *expression* had crept in. I maintain that the change in expression reveals a change in conception.

The shift from expressions of *identity* to those of *presence* is in my mind very significant. It gave rise unconsciously to an erroneous comprehension of the sacrament. More importantly I believe that this wrong comprehension still constitutes a problem in eucharistic theology and ecumenical dialogue today. We are still asking the wrong questions at the very beginning.

I limit myself to the late work of More, *A Treatise Upon the Passion*, because it provides sufficient material for me to illustrate my claim.² This particular work, unlike More’s earlier eucharistic writings, is a relatively calm, invective-free exposition of the Catholic position. In it More is at pains to show that the Church’s doctrine was at his time identical with that of the early Fathers. In conjunction with “the old holy doctors” he held to the realism of the eucharistic formulas. He utilized scholastic theory to show the intrinsic possibility of that position. This in turn led him into the intricacies and subtleties which the Reformers found so repugnant, but which they did not always manage to avoid themselves. I will first examine More’s catena of patristic texts by which he sought to prove the continuity of Catholic doctrine from the earliest times. I will indicate the gradual change in expression. Then I will suggest how the change caused the setup which triggered the Reformation dispute.

More’s series of citations begins with St. Ignatius of Antioch (d. 107) and concludes with St. Anselm (d. 1109). More’s technique, as in so many of his other works, is to quote the (Latin) text and then to give his own English translation. His objective is to uphold the Catholic, realist understanding of the Eucharist and to refute a purely symbolic sense. More does this by indicating the expressions in which the Fathers assert that the Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ and those which describe the *eating* and *drinking* of Christ’s body and blood. Expressions describing the *change* of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ are also highlighted.

Let us look more closely at the expressions used by Fathers whom More quotes as witnesses of the Catholic tradition. He begins, as I said, with St. Ignatius who writes of "The bread of life, which is the flesh of Christ" (to use More's own translation, emphasis mine) (CW 13, 161). Next he cites St. Justin the Martyr: "So this food . . . we be taught that it is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate" (CW 13, 161; emphasis mine.) Again he quotes Irenaeus, "How shall it appear to them to be true, that the eucharistical bread upon which thanks be given, is the body of their Lord . . .?" (CW 13, 161; emphasis mine.)

Note then that these first three Fathers give their witness to faith in eucharistic realism by affirming *what the eucharist is* as distinct from what the scholastics were to assert later, viz, that the Body of Christ is *present* or is "contained" in the Eucharist.

More proceeds over a well-worn track to other familiar early Christian writers: Tertullian's famous words regarding the nourishment of our *bodies* by the Eucharist are rendered: "The flesh [i.e., our flesh] eats the body and blood of Christ that the soul also may be made fat of God." Origen is invoked to prove that in Communion we "eat and drink the body and blood of our Lord" (CW 13, 162). Cyprian too is cited: he repeats the words of institution in two forms, one in the Synoptic tradition, the other affected by the Johannine: "This is (saith he) my body"; "this is my flesh and this is my blood . . ." (CW 13, 163).

Passing on to Hilary, More translates that writer's proof of the hypostatic union from the analogy of the Eucharist. Hilary concludes, in More's translation: "Of the truth and verity therefore of his flesh and his blood, is there now no place left for any man to doubt: for now both by the word of our Lord himself, and by our faith also, verily is it his flesh and verily is it his blood, and these two received and drunken bring this to pass, that both we be in Christ and Christ in us" (CW 13, 165).

Eusebius Emesenus (i.e., of Emesa in Syria), who died in 359, is quoted by More in a Latin text which, if authentic, must be one of the earliest to introduce the term "substance." More translates: "For the invisible priest by his word and secret power, doth change and convert the visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood . . ."; "When the creatures which are to be consecrated by the heavenly words, are set upon the holy altars, there is the substance of bread and wine. But after the words of Christ there is the body and blood of Christ" (CW 13, 165-6).

We may pass quickly over More's references to Basil and Hesychius, though we may note the latter's conception of the eucharistic action in terms of sanctification of the elements (CW 13, 166-67).

Ambrose is brought forward next as another witness of eucharistic realism: "The sacrament before it be consecrate is bread. But when Christ's words be come to it, it is the body of Christ" (CW 13, 167; emphasis mine).

John Chrysostom's eucharistic realism is sometimes thought to be extreme and so he provides additional ammunition for More. Jerome is also cited but there is not much detail. Cyril is next: he compares Communion between Christ and us in the Eucharist to the joining of two pieces of melting wax (CW 13, 167-68).

Next comes Augustine: his famous misunderstanding of the title of Ps 33 (34), "Ferebatur in manibus suis," is applied to Christ at the Last Supper: "Christ bare himself in his own hands, when he commended his body and said on this wise, this is my body. For Christ bare that body in his hands" (CW 13, 168-69).³ Augustine's witness to the eucharistic fact also confirms the tradition of realism: "The body of our Lord should be received and taken into the mouth of a Christian man before any bodily meat" (CW 13, 169-70).

Gregory compares the blood of Christ to that of the paschal lamb: ". . . which blood is put upon both the posts, when it is drunken and received, not only by the mouth of the body, but also by the mouth of the heart . . ." (CW 13, 169).

Saint Bede (c673-735) gets closest to a scholastic expression: "There appeareth the form of bread where the substance of bread is not" (CW 13, 170).

Theophilactus, a Byzantine exegete of the eleventh century, appears to have a theology typical of other Eastern Fathers: More translates a passage of his: "Furthermore, saying, this is my body, he sheweth that the bread which is sanctified upon the altar, is the very body of our Lord, and not a figure answering to it. For it is changed by an unspeakable working, although it seems bread to us that be weak, and abhor to eat raw flesh, specially the flesh of man, and, therefore, it appeareth bread, but it is flesh." (More's translation omits a sentence which would have strengthened his case even further: "Non enim dixit, Hoc est figura, sed hoc est corpus meum" [CW 13, 170].)

And the Englishman by adoption, Anselm, also in the eleventh century uses the terms, "species" and "substance," which were to be universally adopted by the scholastic tradition. More renders an extract from "the second book of the body and blood of our Lord": "In those kinds

of bread and wine, either there is no substance, or else it is the substance of our Lord's body and blood" (CW 13, 170).

This virtually ends the evidence from the Fathers. More summarizes his argument by asserting that all these writers professed the same faith as the Church of his day. But in doing so he uses an expression which none of the early Fathers used, viz. ". . . in this blessed sacrament is the very body and the very blood of Christ . . ."; and later ". . . no man gainsaying the very blessed body and blood to be *therein* . . ." (CW 13, 171). As he goes on, More quietly changes to the more common scholastic expression when he speaks of "the *presence* of Christ's very body and blood in the blessed sacrament" (CW 13, 174).

Hence in the citations I have given, More exemplifies the shift which I claim occurred over the centuries from the original expressions denoting *identity* to those signifying *presence within*. In other words, the scholastics evidently considered to be synonymous the two statements: "This is my body" and "My body is in this." Their theological theory was geared entirely to prove the intrinsic possibility of the second statement, while they thought it justified a realistic interpretation of the first. The scholastics had, however, inverted subject and predicate apparently without realizing it. St. Thomas Aquinas came close to noting this when, in refuting consubstantiation, he reminded us that the words of consecration were "hoc est corpus meum"; "This is my body," not "Here is my body" (S. Th 3 q.75 a.2).

If one were to ask why this shift took place I would point to the need to make sense of the strong traditional belief in eucharistic realism coupled with another shift from the Semitic concept "flesh" to the holistic term "body." This latter claim is more difficult to document and substantiate and obviously time does not allow me to attempt it now, but I guess it is the real reason why the scholastics conceived the problem the way they did, i.e., in terms of presence. In doing this they took something consequential as essential.

I am of the opinion that a new theology of eucharistic realism is necessary and possible. There have been a number of fresh approaches by Catholic theologians in recent decades but to my mind they fail. Some of them do so because they also centre around the problem of presence. Certain transcendental theories seem to me to be obscurantist—a thing which More would never have countenanced! A good theology of the Eucharist must start from an accurate statement of the problem, a precise analysis of the terms and the sentences used as its basis; there should moreover be the provision of illuminating analogies related to an intelligible philosophy and to a culture.

Thomas More and his scholastic mentors had every right to theologize about the Eucharist using the current philosophical world-view. To my mind, however, they got themselves into difficulties by starting with the wrong questions—questions about presence rather than identity. Here I will attempt to explain what I think are the implications of the fact demonstrated above.

II

To my mind St. Thomas More proved the realism (as opposed to a simple symbolism) of the eucharistic faith of the Fathers from their writings. But his citations illustrate that there was a change in the statements about the Eucharist. Instead of the primary statements in his own theology being about the identity of the eucharistic signs, they became statements about the Body of Christ and its presence within the signs. Is there a difference? Yes. One can argue thus:

This is the Body of Christ
This is present
Therefore the Body of Christ is present

But one cannot argue:

The Body of Christ is present
This is present
Therefore this is the Body of Christ.⁴

The right question to ask about the Eucharist is not therefore: how can the Body and Blood of Christ be present in the host and cup? This was the sort of question the scholastics asked. The Reformers did not perceive this inaccuracy and many theologians today still have not realized it is a wrong start. The right question to begin with is surely, in what sense is the bread of the Eucharist the Body of Christ? In what sense is the content of the cup the Blood of Christ? The scholastics got sidetracked somewhere with the problem of how the whole Body of Christ could fit into the dimensions of the host and how it can be in many places at once. These questions had not preoccupied patristic writers.

Is it possible to build up a theology of eucharistic realism, compatible with Catholic doctrine, that is based on essence rather than presence? Many who have tried to provide an alternative to the scholastic synthesis have had their efforts condemned. However, let us accept the challenge, albeit with caution.

We must realize that Christianity was born in a Semitic culture. The later cultures which came into vogue sometimes failed to appreciate that the conceptualizations and thought patterns of the original Scriptures were different from their own and ended up with some erroneous conclusions.

In regard to the Eucharist we must remember that the Semitic mind tended to conceive things in an elemental as opposed to a holistic way. So, for example, man is spoken of as "flesh and bone," "flesh and blood," etc. Possibly the evangelist John's version of the Eucharist (Chap. 6) in terms of *flesh* and blood, rather than *body* and blood, is the original. The question of the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus in regard to the Eucharist has been thoroughly examined by Joachim Jeremias.⁵

Without going into detail I can remind readers that both the elemental term "flesh" and the holistic term "body" are found in early eucharistic texts. Sometimes both terms are used anarthrously in Greek texts—an indication of an elemental understanding. Of course Latin did not have either a definite or indefinite article, a factor which I believe helped to confuse matters further. There are nuances of meaning which depend on articles or their absence which can be lost in Latin. English, like other modern languages, can express such nuances.

For example, take the sentences: "We ate the lamb," "We ate a lamb," "We ate lamb." The last anarthrous usage designates what I am calling an elemental concept as opposed to a holistic one. This elemental sense corresponds with the idea of substance as understood in ordinary speech.

It seems to me that in the movement from the original Semitic concept, through Greek to Latin, the conception of the Eucharist in elemental terms tended to be replaced with a holistic sense. The trend was somewhat modified by the introduction of the term "substance" in the phrase "the substance of the body of Christ" in the West, though this in turn became obscure with the attribution to it of subtle and esoteric meanings. This was particularly true when it was coupled with the scholastic concept of accidents. Without making a general judgment on the philosophical validity of the substance-accidents analysis, I want to claim that "substance-appearances" is a better pairing for a discussion of the Eucharist.

I would like to argue first that appearances are not the same as accidents. As understood in the scholastic system at least, accidents are an objective constituent of being. They give rise to impressions in an observer. Appearances, however, allow for a subject observing reality to be confused and err. Let me illustrate: a snake may have the ap-

pearance of a stick and an observer may assume that it is a stick. The snake certainly does not have the *accidents* of a stick; it has its own. But it may have a stick's appearances. There is no falsehood in reality ("*ens et verum convertuntur*") but there is the possibility of deception through ambiguity. Nature's camouflage is an obvious example. It works because the unwary does not take the whole context into account.

I believe that the Eucharist is better analysed along these lines. The bread and wine of the Eucharist are assumed by the Person of the Word-Jesus. They are possessed through the sending of the Holy Spirit and are identified thereby as substance of his Body and Blood. They do not undergo any physical or physiological change. They must retain their forms as bread and wine to be suitable as our food and drink. A person not knowing the faith and liturgical context would from appearances conclude that they are merely bread and wine. But this would be erroneous.

One implication of the use of the traditional word "substance" is that the bread and wine can be the "stuff" of the Body and Blood of Christ without being a *part*. They become simply substance. The consecrated bread and wine are the Body and Blood *substantially*. They retain the appearances of bread and wine but those who know the full context by faith, who know of the words of consecration and the history behind them, will know that they are something far greater. Sharing in the humanity of Christ they are the sign and instrumental cause of His grace.

I have argued above that a viable ontology (to use Paul VI's term) of the Eucharist must start from the New Testament's expressions. As the quotations from St. Thomas More exemplify, these expressions of identity were repeated by the Fathers, who displayed a belief in realism without using either the expression or concept of "presence." "Essence" is the primary foundation of this ontology. I accept that the concept "presence" may be introduced as a secondary one, as a consequence. But what the Eucharist is, is what is present. The presence of the Person Jesus in the Eucharist has to be mediated through the consecrated species if it is to be specifically eucharistic. (The Person of Jesus as God is of course present everywhere.) If we want to assert the presence of the *whole* Jesus—Body, Blood etc.—we have to move out of physics into metaphysics. The scholastics rightly stated that this presence follows "the manner of substance." The principle, *totum in toto et totum in qualibet parte*, applies to substance in natural objects. For example, the substance *marble* is completely verified in this statue both in the whole and in any part. The *whole* statue is marble, and any part, e.g.,

the head, is marble. This metaphysical principle applies to the host and the consecrated wine.

In an article published some years ago I suggested other analogies explaining the essence of the Eucharist and consequent presence of Christ.⁶ These were various kinds of what I called "real tokens." Examples of these: samples; first fruits; a token force; representative teams; Adam in whom all sinned; Christ in whom all are saved, etc. Vatican Council II added another: the Universal Church is present in the local Church (*Lumen Gentium*, n.26).

Given the above understanding of the term *substance* and its use with regard to the Eucharist there is no difficulty with the traditional term "transubstantiation." That term, accused by some of being a neologism, has antecedents dating to the Greek Fathers, as Paul VI pointed out in his encyclical *Mysterium fidei* where he gives parallels: change, transform, transelement (par 47). Thomas More's catena of texts also provides examples.⁷

Disputes about the meaning of the sentences in the New Testament describing the Eucharist intensified at the time of the Reformation. Henry VIII attacked Luther's explanation, Luther counterattacked and More took up the King's part in his *Responsio*.⁸ Luther and Zwingli had a heated conversation on the issue, making no impression on each other. Not only were there differences between realists and pure symbolists, but among the realists themselves. One reason for this was that their conception of realism was in terms of presence: Luther proposed the presence of the Body and Blood with the bread and wine; More in the scholastic tradition thought of presence in the accidents of bread and wine. I am suggesting that by making the concept "presence" central and formally dominant they were causing difficulties and thence disagreement. As I have said, they asked the wrong question, viz "How is Christ present in the Eucharist?" Centuries before, Augustine had asked, "How is bread His Body? How the chalice His Blood?"⁹ These I believe are better questions. (However, Augustine's answer may not have been so satisfactory!)

In what sense is the eucharistic bread the Body (or Flesh) of Christ? The wine His Blood? In answering, the first choice is between symbolic and real. Zwingli opted for the purely symbolic. If he is right there is no metaphysical problem. However, as More demonstrates, there is a strong tradition, not only of symbolism, but also of realism, both in East and West. Together with some other recent writers, I am going to opt for symbolic realism.

Unfortunately, or maybe fortunately, in the history of thought there

have been several concepts of what is "real." Pilate's question, "What is truth?" is not so inane. There is the Aristotelian concept of truth, which is the correspondence of the mind with reality; there is the Platonic which finds reality in a transcendent world of which the things of this world are only a shadow; there is the phenomenological or personalist idea that reality is judged by relationship to man. No doubt there are others. Studies have been made of the meaning of the word "real" or "true" in John's Gospel. These are relevant to the Eucharist because of the words, "My Flesh is true food, My Blood true drink" in Chapter 6:55. John's concept of the true or real is not Aristotelian but is nearer to the Platonic, though influenced by his Semitic and Christian background.¹⁰

The doctrine of the Eucharist had travelled a long way before the Reformation: from a Semitic mentality, through Greek and Latin thought into scholasticism. Even in the last two centuries there have been fresh attempts to explain the Eucharist influenced by modern physics and philosophies, some of them bizarre,¹¹ some reasonable but still deemed insufficient by Church authorities.¹²

Gleaning from what I think to be true and seeking to avoid errors and inaccuracies, I would submit briefly my own conclusions.

As liturgical and some patristic formulas indicate, the bread and wine are sanctified by the Holy Spirit. This has the effect of making them the Body and Blood of Christ. The sanctified bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ. They are possessed and owned by the Person of the Word: this is My Body. The Person of Christ communicates truth and grace by the medium of the sacrament, the words and the elements. The bread and wine do not change physically or physiologically but in their natural form are the Flesh/Body and Blood. How? Substantially. The bread and wine, without changing form, become the substance of the Body and Blood. By substance I mean the stuff, matter, the elements. In the Semitic idiom flesh and blood were the elements of humanity. They had their original crude meaning but more abstractly they signified humanity, the human element or medium, sometimes with moral or other overtones.

So far I have not used the term or concept of "presence." It is a term that has been given a very important role in the Catholic and ecumenical theology of the Eucharist as well as in the Magisterium as late as the encyclical *Mysterium fidei* of Paul VI. Having seen what the eucharistic Bread and Wine are ontologically, we can bring in secondary and chronologically and logically later ideas which must flow from the primary and original ones.

The Eucharistic Bread and Wine, the sacramental Body and Blood, "contain" the whole Christ, not physically, but following the nature of a sign. "Sacramenta sunt in genere signi," as Aquinas says.¹³ Not any sign, not a mere sign, but in the case of the Eucharist we are dealing with a "real sign." I have suggested above examples of real signs or real tokens as analogies. A mere token would be such things as flags, rings, red lights. A real token is one which shares the nature or quality of what is symbolized, e.g., a representative, a sample. The Eucharist transcends this category of course, but I think it gives us the genre. The substances of bread and wine, having been consecrated by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, are possessed by the Word, Who is the Person of Jesus, and ontologically are thereby made substance of His Body and Blood, without being incorporated in any way such as digestion, but by being made real symbols in which His whole being can be said to be present and operative, communicating truth (as sign) and grace (as cause). The elements are the eucharistic *verbum visibile* (Augustine) by which the Father speaks to us and offers His love.

The ontological problem of the Eucharist has in a sense been an unfortunate area for confusion and controversy, distracting from its more important spiritual message. Whilst some would spurn it as less worthy of our attention than many other problems affecting Christianity and mankind, it has been central, indeed for some, the epitome of the difference between Catholicism and the Reformation. This was true for Thomas More, Martin Luther, William Tyndale, Thomas Cranmer and others of their time. Many today, both Catholic and Protestant, still give it a high priority in confessional differences.

Thomas More and Germain Marc'hadour, whilst reverencing the concerns of metaphysics, would prefer to contemplate the devotional aspects of the Eucharist.¹⁴ Yet the memory of past bitterness suggests that it is better to heal the wounds of division than risk them festering under the surface. The present essay is offered in that belief.

Our Lady Queen of Peace Church
Gladesville, Australia



Notes

1. Edward Surtz, S.J., *The Works and Days of John Fisher*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1967, especially Chap. 8, "Answering Oecolam-

padius on the Real Presence"; John Jay Hughes, *Stewards of the Lord*, Sheed and Ward, London, 1970, especially Chap. 7, "The Catholic Apologetic for the Mass in England"; Walter Gordon, "Selected Problems in Thomas More's Controversy with John Frith," *Harvard Theological Review* 69 (April 1976) 131-49; Walter Gordon, "A Needle in a Meadow: A Missing Reference in the More-Frith Controversy," *Moreana* 52 (November 1976) 19-22.

2. *A Treatise Upon the Passion*, The Yale Edition of the Complete Works of St. Thomas More, Vol. 13, ed. Garry E. Haupt (New Haven and London: 1976). All further references to this work will be given in parentheses in the body of my text as CW 13. I have modernized the spelling.

3. See Germain Marc'hadour, *The Bible in the Works of St. Thomas More*, Part I (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1969) 131. David feigned madness in the presence of Achish, ruler of Gath, a Philistine city. This incident is narrated in 1 Sam 21, 11-16, and follows David's visit to Ahimelech. The phrase corresponding to *Ferebatur in manibus suis* ("He walked on his hands") is not found in the title of most versions.

4. The Holy Spirit is also present in the Eucharist but one cannot argue, "therefore, this is the Holy Spirit."

5. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1966). See especially pp. 198-201.

6. Brian Byron, "The Eucharist—A Real Token," *The Clergy Review* 56 (1971) 331-42.

7. E.g., Eusebius Emesenus, *A Treatise*, CW 13, p. 165.

8. The Yale Edition of the Complete Works of St. Thomas More, Vol. 5, ed. John M. Headley (New Haven and London: 1969) 449 ff.

9. Rouët de Journel, *Enchiridion Patristicum*, Herder 1953, 1154: "Quomodo est panis corpus eius? Et Calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis eius?"

10. See a good summary in J. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1965), 901-3.

11. Walter Gordon discusses a theory in "Time Space in the Eucharist," *Dowdside Review* (April 1977): 110-17.

12. Pope Paul VI, *Mysterium fidei*, 1965, pars. 10 and 11.

13. S. Th 3 q 60 a 1.

14. During his visit to Sydney in 1978 Germain gave me a copy of a Holy Hour he had composed using More's devotional writings on the Eucharist.