

The Irish Ecclesiastical Record

A Monthly Journal under Episcopal Sanction

VOLUME XXXII

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1928

FIFTH SERIES

DUBLIN

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED, NASSAU STREET

1928

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Orangemen were furious. Brunswick clubs to maintain Protestant ascendancy in Ireland were established throughout the country. At an Orange meeting held in Dublin on the 12th August, Mr. Ellis, Master in Chancery, declared there were 400,000 armed Orangemen ready to take the field. The Catholics responded by pouring money into the coffers of the Association—one week the sum received was £2,704; the next week, £1,427 was acknowledged—and by attending the provincial meetings in military array with bands and banners, tens of thousands strong. O'Connell was not a revolutionist. He had too ingrained respect for constituted authority ever to resort to arms. His hatred of bloodshed was also intense. He had a conscientious horror of war. 'One murder, one robbery is horrid,' he once said, 'and I cannot conceive how robbery and murder are one whit better for being multitudinous—yet that is war.' The whole country was now at his back. A word from him, and the fires of insurrection would flash out. But he held this tremendous physical force under supreme control, and was determined to prevent it from hurling itself in mad desperation, as it desired, against the might of England. He bellowed defiance with sectarian lungs. The Ministers were to be deceived or intimidated by declarations, that seemed to have behind them a nation in martial array. But in O'Connell's mind was the fixed determination that, whatever happened, there was to be no rebellion.

MICHAEL MacDONAGH

[To be concluded.]

ARE THE FRUITS OF THE MASS INFINITE ?

BY REV. DAVID BARRY

AS this question was at one time treated in the I. E. RECORD by the late Archbishop Walsh, with his characteristic thoroughness and lucidity, it may seem superfluous for me, if not, indeed, impertinent, to return to the subject in these pages. But as it is more than forty-five years¹ since the Archbishop's articles appeared, they are, possibly, more or less inaccessible to the present generation of priests; and, on the other hand, the subject, both for practical and theoretical reasons, is of vital and abiding interest.

The easiest and clearest way, I think, to handle it is to consider in order the four categories of fruits or effects into which the benefits accruing to the Church generally, and to individuals from the Mass, are commonly divided; and to state what the theologians hold about the infinite efficacy of each. However, as a preliminary, a few technical terms that occur in this department of theology need a little elucidation. The first of these is the word 'infinite.' This may have two significations: it may mean infinite in the strict sense (*categorématique*), i.e., without any limit at all, in the sense, for instance, that the Divine eternity is infinite; or it may mean merely indefinite (*syncategorématique* infinite), i.e., when limits exist, indeed, but may be extended without restriction, as in the use of numbers, or when we say that a straight line contains an infinite number of points.

The next two terms which call for a few words of notice

¹ In the numbers for [December 1882 (pp. 705-718) and for January 1883 (pp. 12-21)].

are 'intensive' and 'extensive,' employed to qualify the word infinite, as when we affirm or deny that the fruits of the Mass are 'intensive' or 'extensive' infinite. Well, according to the meaning usually¹ ascribed to these terms, they have regard respectively to the efficacy of the Mass as applied on behalf of one recipient merely, and of more than one. In other words, to say that its effects are *intensive* infinite implies that one Mass is as helpful to an individual as two or more would be, his dispositions, or capacity to benefit, being supposed to remain the same. While to hold that the effects are *extensive* infinite is equivalent to maintaining that the advantages accruing to one person from a Mass are in no way prejudiced or lessened by any number of others being associated with him. Or to put the matter in a different way, we use *intensive* when we measure the efficacy of the Mass by reference to the number applied for a particular purpose; and we use *extensive* when we estimate it by reference to the number of purposes that each Mass serves. However, certain theologians, such as Lugo,² Génicot³ and apparently, Franzelin⁴ apply the word *intensive* to designate infinite efficacy in the strict or categorematic sense. Although these employ the term *extensive* in the meaning commonly given to it, namely, to cover the case of a Mass being offered for two or more intentions.

It may be well, too, to note that the question of the unlimited or restricted efficacy is in no way dependent on the discredited theory of Scotus⁵ that the actions of Our Lord for the purpose of merit and satisfaction were not of themselves—inasmuch as His human nature was finite—but only through the Divine acceptance, of infinite worth:

¹ See St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralit*, lib. vi. n. 312: 'Secunda sententia vero,' etc.; Billuart, *de Eucharistia*, diss. viii. art. v. p. 498 (1770 ed.); Walsh, I. E. RECORD, January, 1883, p. 17, nn. 59, 61.

² *De Eucharistia*, disp. xix. sect. 12, n. 244.

³ *Theologia Moralit*, ii. 218 (ed. 1921).

⁴ *De Eucharistia*, p. 371 (ed. 1873).

⁵ See Billuart, *de Incarnatione*, diss. 19, art. 5, p. 204 (ed. 1770); McGuinness, *de Incarnatione*, pp. 244, sqq.

⁶ This opinion, according to Suarez, 'nec probabilis nec pia nec fidei sententia consentanea videtur.'

which is contrary to what theologians of all other schools attribute to them, inasmuch as they were the actions of a Divine Person. For in reality the Scotists accept the view that these acts were endowed with efficacy in an indefinite degree,¹ whatever was its source. Although it is true that as a fact, if not as a consequence of their theory, Scotus himself,² and, possibly, St. Bonaventure, hold the restricted view as to the effects of the Mass.

As for the classes into which these effects are divided, the theologians, while agreeing about the facts, are not, invariably, at one about questions of terminology. Thus, Billot, in opposition to the common opinion, recognizes only three categories altogether, and includes the fruits of petition under those of propitiation. He professes to base his position on the teaching of the Council of Trent.³ Here are his words⁴ :—

Some authors make a distinction between sacrifice according as it is propitiatory on the one hand or impetratory on the other. Certainly, as far as the actual existence of these effects is concerned, there can be no ground of dispute; but so far as exposition or explanation goes, I do not like to make any distinction between these two ideas. In the first place, because the Council of Trent, although it speaks very plainly about the power of sacrifice in placating the anger of God, and in getting benefits for us, always employs the same word—propitiatory. Secondly, because this term covers very adequately, and applies very aptly to both these effects of sacrifice. For to make a person *propitious* towards us, is not merely to disarm his anger, by doing away with the cause of it, but it actually inclines him to shower gifts on the one-time offender. Hence, in the third place, propitiation includes petition, and adds to it the notion of making up for some offence. Accordingly, if there were no sin in the world, there would be no occasion for propitiation, only simply for impetration; however, inasmuch as there is sin, every petition should have a placatory side.

But if Billot wants to widen the content of propitiation, by assuming that it embraces impetration, other theologians are anxious, probably for clearness' sake, to lessen its comprehensiveness, by giving the special title of *satisfaction*

¹ See Billuart, loc. cit., p. 209.

² According to St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.

³ Sess. 22, cap. 2, and can. 3.

⁴ *De Sacramentis*, i., p. 585, note (ed. 1900).

to what the Mass does in getting us forgiveness of the temporal punishment (*reatus poenae*) due to sin, while they confine propitiation to its appeal to God's clemency to give us copious graces to get rid of sin itself (*reatus culpae*). I need refer to exemplify this only to Billuart, Lehmkühl and Noldin as representative authors.

It may be well to remark also that, though the question at issue about the infinite efficacy is raised usually in connexion with the special¹ fruit of the Mass—that certainly at the celebrant's disposal for others—it is not by any means confined to this, but may be extended as well to the general, and what is technically called the *very special* fruit—that coming automatically, as it were, to the priest himself.² But practical considerations regarding stipends, etc., have contributed to bring the controversy to a head and into prominence in connexion with the special fruit. And, as a fact, it is in the law and procedure conversant with this that the contending authorities find their principal armoury.

It is almost superfluous, I suppose, to remark that no one denies the limited value of the Mass, in so far as the offering of it is the act or work of the *Church*, in its corporate capacity, through its delegate or representative, the celebrant, or in so far as this is a meritorious action on his own part. Because, although the Victim offered by the Church and priest is infinite, this, as Lugo says,³ is a poor argument

¹ What some call the *fructus medius* or *ministerialis*.

² Some call this *special* and others *personal*. Prümmer and Noldin appropriate the term *special* to the graces accruing to those who are rather closely associated in the celebration of a Mass, i.e., those serving and assisting at it, and those who may have given an offering to have it said, etc. Whereas others simply include these with the priest as sharers in the *very special* fruit. However this may be, it is clear that one who gives a honorarium for a Mass receives not only the special fruit of it, but participates with those actually present at it in the benefits they get. So the foundation for the question that is sometimes put as to whether it is more advantageous to be present at a Mass or to give an offering for it, seems to me *salvo meliore iudicio*, to be somewhat slight or insecure. The formal classifying of those who share in the fruits dates only from the time of Scotus; but, of course, the underlying facts were always vividly realised in the consciousness of Christians. (Franzelin, op. cit. p. 378.)

³ Loc. cit. n. 233: 'Prius respicit Deus ad offerentem et postea ad munera.'

from which to infer boundless efficacy in the oblation; for its worth is derived, not primarily from the Victim, but from the dignity and status of the offerer. According to Lugo,¹ Dr. Walsh,² and Cohalan,³ the Mass, as offered in the name of the Church, can have only the efficacy of impetration, not that 'either of *merit* or *satisfaction*, for these, as theology teaches, belong only to individual, personal acts.'⁴ However, this is not the belief of Franzelin, who explicitly attributes both a satisfactory and a propitiatory effect to the Mass, in so far as the Church participates in it; as does Noldin⁵ to the recitation of the Divine Office in as far as it is the act of the Church as a moral body.

Having premised so much, it is time now to say that there can be no doubt at all that the value or efficacy of each Mass in itself, and apart from the question how far this is made available for its beneficiaries, or as some put it, considering it *in actu primo*, is infinite; and that, too, in the strict sense or categorematic sense. Because the Mass, being in reality the same sacrifice as that of the Cross, has the same High Priest of infinite dignity and worth to offer it and to be its Victim. Consequently, were it not for some disability on the part of those for whom it is applied, or for some Divine ordinance or economy, limiting what may be called its natural superabundance, it would be productive of an infinity of good effects for us, and be in an infinite degree capable of reaching and alleviating our wants.

And it is the unanimous teaching that as our limited receptive powers are not involved in the case, there is no obstacle in the way of its unrestricted efficacy as regards *worship* or *adoration* of God and *thanksgiving* to Him. Nor is there any reason why these effects should not invariably, and from each Mass, ascend before the throne of Almighty

¹ N. 240.

² I. E. RECORD, December, 1882, p. 713, n. 21.

³ *De Eucharistia*, p. 495.

⁴ Whereas the Church 'non exercet libertatem actualem in actu oblationis sed solum se habet sicut rex qui misit legatum.'

⁵ *De Præceptis*, n. 755, 2 (1922 ed.). Franzelin, p. 369.

God in a manner and to a degree that is worthy of His Infinite Majesty. Thus, Franzelin says¹ :—

As regards God: adoration, praise and thanksgiving worthy of Him, was at one time given on the Cross; and by the sacrifice [in the Mass] of the only Son of God, Who is both the principal Offerer of it and the Victim in it, the bloody sacrifice is again and again represented and, as it were, repeated in the sight of God.

And according to Dr. Walsh² :—

That the Mass is of infinite efficacy as a sacrifice of adoration and of thanksgiving,³ admits of no doubt.⁴

Now, as for the effects of it that are technically called *fruits*, namely, impetration, propitiation and satisfaction (if one wishes, unlike Billot, to consider these as distinct), it is clear that they are not *intensive* infinite in the sense that we saw was given that term by Lugo, Franzelin and Génicot. For in a world restricted in extent there can be no room for an effect that is infinite in the strict sense; and neither the needs nor the sins of even the whole human race can be of more than indefinite magnitude (*syncategorematic* infinite). Although, of course, in a sense, infinite malice is inherent in every mortal sin, inasmuch as it is an offence against God. However, the eternal punishment attaching to such a sin is not immediately forgiven by the holy sacrifice, but only through the grace of repentance.

Taking *intensive* in its common acceptation, the Mass could, as I have said already, be regarded as infinite or rather indefinite, if one were as efficacious for an individual as several would be, *supposing his dispositions were to remain unchanged*. Because if these or his capacity to benefit were different, when one of the group of Masses was offered, from what they were when the rest were applied, there would be no ground of comparison at all. Thus, it may be that, as the Masses are being said, the beneficiary has more and more need of grace and help, for instance, if he be dying, and a greater claim on the Divine mercy. So

¹ Page 370.

² I. E. RECORD, January, 1883, p. 12.

³ Italics in original.

⁴ See Cohalan, p. 504.

that, even if he gets a progressive increase of aid and favour, as the Masses are celebrated, this may not necessarily be attributable to their number; nor mean that the whole series is more efficacious than the first one, or, in other words, that the power of each is limited. This point, being carefully borne in mind, I think we can discuss the two questions together of (a) the 'intensive,' and (b) the 'extensive' infinity of the fruits; for the same principles seem relevant to the solution of each question, and the same schools of theologians hold the same view on both.

Well, limiting our consideration for the present to *propitiation* and *satisfaction*, Scotus, St. Bonaventure and Sotus, hold¹ that these effects are limited, both 'intensive' and 'extensive.' To these may be added Suarez and Lugo; as well as Billuart who favours both opinions in a hesitating way²; and in modern times Franzelin,³ Billot, Lehmkuhl, etc. Although they, naturally enough, do not all rely on identical arguments to sustain their position. One of the least plausible of these⁴ is that the efficacy of the Mass is derived from the action of the individual priest who may be saying it, inasmuch as Christ does not offer it immediately, but only remotely, in virtue of its first institution. But even if this contention were well founded, it would not follow that the value of the Mass would be measured by the merits of the celebrant. However, as a fact, Christ is at the same time the Victim and the principal Offerer in every Mass, as was laid down by the Fourth Council of Lateran (1215), according to which He is both the priest and the sacrifice in the Church. This point was even more strongly emphasized by the Council of Trent⁵ :—

For there is now the same Victim and the same Offerer, through the ministry of the priests, that at one time sacrificed Himself on the Cross; there is merely a difference in the way the offering takes place.

¹ As St. Alphonsus tells us, loc. cit. Though the Saint himself in his *Moral Theology*, considered this view less probable, he afterwards, in 1769, in some of his writings called it more probable and defended it.

² *De Eucharistia*, diss. viii. art. 5, p. 502 (ed. 1770).

³ *Loco. cit.*, p. 372.

⁴ See St. Alphonsus, loc. cit. Cf. however, Vermeersch. n. 285.

⁵ Sess. 22, *de sacrificio Missae*, cap. i.

Nor is any other view for a moment compatible with the perpetual priesthood of Christ in Heaven, always living to make intercession for us.¹

Accordingly, others, with a great deal more plausibility, adopt this line of reasoning. The Mass, regarded in itself, and with reference, as it were, to its native efficacy, would be beyond all question, infinitely beneficial to us; but the effects produced by it on each occasion that it is said have been definitely restricted by the Divine Will. So that although these effects may be all applied by the minister at his own discretion for the advantage of only one or for that of several, still, in proportion as they are made available for many, there will be so much the less for each to draw on. Just, these theologians say, as a fixed sum of money that a charitable person authorizes his almoner to distribute among certain poor persons will be more beneficial for one or two of them than if three or four were allowed to share it.

Billot, though, and perhaps others of what I may call, without disrespect, the minimizing school, do not believe in this supposed law or regulation of Christ, but look for the source of limitation in the manner in which the Mass is applied. And he reminds us that the application is better and more efficacious in proportion as it is more concentrated, if I may so put it, and the object of it more clearly and exclusively present in the priest's mind.² Now, this is the case when he has one intention rather than several, because it is the nature of a human act, such as the saying of Mass is, that in proportion as it embraces a number of objects as if they were a unit, so it is concerned less determinately and more obscurely with each.³ I leave it to the reader to judge whether this explanation, which seems a bit technical and artificial, would have suggested itself, apart from the regulations and practice of the Church which,

¹ Romans viii. 34; Hebrews vii. 28 and ix. 24.

² 'De applicatione dicimus illam esse tanto meliorem quanto minus confusa seu communis est.' (Billot, op. cit., p. 599.)

³ Ibidem, p. 602.

as evidencing the Will of her Divine Spouse, seem the real foundation on which the restrictive theory is based.

Before dealing with these regulations in detail, I may mention a consideration that I think gives a reason for them and an explanation of them, and shows how consistent they are and how uniform their tendency. I believe it may be fairly contended that the opinion as to its circumscribed efficacy is the better calculated to foster devotion to the Mass, by furnishing an incentive to assist at it, or celebrate it, or get it celebrated more frequently. If we were convinced that one Mass was the medium of boundless blessings to us, the selfish or self-regarding element in our nature, which is such a powerful motive in our imperfect state, would not induce us so often to celebrate the Mass for ourselves or our friends, or secure its celebration, as the case may be. It is true, indeed, that, whatever opinion one adopts, a priest neglecting the holy sacrifice (and in a measure the laity failing to do their part) 'deprives, in so far as he can, the Holy Trinity of praise and glory, the angels of joy, sinners of pardon, the just of help and grace, the souls in Purgatory of alleviation of their sufferings, the Church of Christ of spiritual benefits, and himself of a healing medicine for all his ills.' Nevertheless, it is manifest that if the propitiatory and satisfactory effects were indefinitely great, those who seem anxious to do as little as they can for their souls would not trouble much, if they were sure that one Mass was offered for them; at least if this were at a time when they were in a good position to profit by it.

Now, it is a fundamental principle of the Divine economy that we must work out our salvation in fear and trembling. And it is reasonable to assume that, just as all adults have by their own endeavours to avail themselves of the happy results of Christ's sufferings and death on the Cross, so the untold treasures of the Mass which are drawn from these should not be made accessible all at once and mechanically, as it were, but should be the reward of patience, perseverance, and continuous and life-long devotion to the Mass. This then, in a word, I should consider the basic reason for holding

the theory of restricted efficacy—that it supplies us with a great antidote to spiritual sloth, tepidity and carelessness.

The first evidence of the Church's mind on the subject may be given in the words of St. Thomas¹:—

If a suffrage offered for many would be as useful for each as if it were appropriated for this person alone, it would seem that the Church ought not to have arranged that Mass should be said for any individual in particular, but that it should be invariably said for all the faithful departed.

Motives of charity and compassion would make this inevitable if each Mass was indefinitely efficacious; because all Christians would, in this hypothesis, be benefited without prejudice to any one of them in particular. Everyone knows, though, how much a matter of course and how universal is the custom of offering the special fruits exclusively to meet the needs or aspirations of some individual. Indeed, there would seem to be little necessity at all, or little ground, for the distinction between the general and the special effects if the other view were true.

It is often alleged also that the condemnation by Alexander VII of the proposition that 'it is not against justice to take a stipend for several Masses and to offer only one of them,'² is incompatible with the theory that incapacity or unworthiness is the only bar to the efficacy of each. But, personally, I cannot see that this is conclusive, seeing that even though the fruits of each were unlimited, the Church might well put a curb on covetousness and the making of sordid lucre, by prohibiting the receipt of more than one honorarium for every Mass said. Nor need the fact that the obligation in question is one in *justice*, as appears from this proposition and the decrees of one of the Congregations, be taken as proving that it is any more than a wise ecclesiastical regulation; although such an authority as Franzelin thinks the contrary.³ Because permission to take any offering at all comes from the Church, and when she issues a prohibition against it in a particular

¹ Quoted by St. Alphonsus, n. 312.
² Cf. Code, cc. 825 and 828.

³ Page 372, note.

case, the title to it is *ipso facto* withdrawn, and taking it or keeping it then becomes unjust. In the same way as a priest who exacts too high a stipend, in defiance of law or custom, violates justice, though he probably does not commit simony.¹

The feeling of the Church, too, in the same sense, is evident from the encouragement given in the rubrics to celebrate a memorial Mass for a deceased person on the third, seventh, and thirtieth day after his death, and indeed annually. Since the beneficiary is dead, his dispositions suffer no change, and yet it is taken for granted that it may require not only one Mass, say, on the day of his death, but many others as well, to effect his release from Purgatory. This would seem to prove that the efficacy of each Mass is 'intensive' limited, or in other words that many are more effective than one, the conditions remaining the same. Equally expressive are the recognition of the importance of foundation Masses; and the giving of the indulgence of a *privileged altar*. The latter is to be applied for the benefit of the soul for whom the Mass, in connexion with which it is gained, is offered; and it would be quite nugatory and superfluous if such a soul at the same time got from the holy sacrifice all the alleviation in the way of satisfaction that its dispositions warrant.

It is also alleged, frequently, that an argument to the same effect can be drawn by analogy from the operation of the Sacraments. The fact, it is contended, that all the Sacraments have different functions, that one will not take the exact place of another, and that several may be received at practically the same time, goes to show that the efficacy of each is strictly limited. Thus, baptized infants may be beneficially confirmed² as they used to be in the early days of Christianity; indeed, the Blessed Eucharist used to be given to them as well, up to the twelfth century. And what is thus true of the Sacraments is very likely to be true of the Mass which, like them, applies the merits of the Cross to our souls.

¹ Prümmer, n. 270.

² Code, Canon 786.

But, on the other hand, it may, I think, be maintained with some probability that the analogy tells in favour of the opposite opinion. Because each of the Sacraments seems to be of indefinite power within its own sphere of operation, that is within the department of the spiritual life whose interests it is particularly intended to serve. For example, no one would advise a person to receive Penance twice at morally speaking the same time, when the presumption is that no change has occurred in the subject's dispositions or his capacity for grace. Now, this can only be for the reason that a single reception of the Sacrament fully satisfies *for the time being* one's needs, no matter how great these may be. Similarly, it is a very common view, held by Cajetan, Suarez and Bellarmine, that a person communicating under both species—a priest saying Mass—does not get *ex opere operato* more grace than if he received under one, provided his fervour and preparation were the same.¹ This corresponds to the teaching of Vermeersch,² where, referring to Noldin,³ he holds that the different anointings in Extreme Unction, like receiving under both kinds, give an increase of grace only if there be an improvement in the recipient's dispositions.

Seeing that the efficacy of the Mass has its source in the sacrifice of the Cross, which is no less advantageous to each of us than if Christ had died for him alone; and seeing, moreover, that the Mass, regarded in itself, is certainly of infinite worth, it must be admitted that the burden of proving their case rests on those who contend that its effects become limited when they are applied to us. So their adversaries, chief of whom are St. Alphonsus (in his *Moral Theology*) and Vasquez,⁴ largely content themselves with trying to discount the arguments I have already given as advanced by the other side: which they do with more or less success according to the particular proof selected for demolition.

¹ Cohalan, p. 400.

² *Theologia Moralis*, iii. n. 651 (1923 ed.).

³ *De Sacramentis*, n. 431.

⁴ According to Suarez, Cajetan, though sometimes (e.g., by Lugo, disp. 19, n. 245), quoted as in favour of this opinion, does not hold it at all.

Besides, they make a good deal of capital out of the following quotation from the Angelic Doctor¹:—

Although, therefore, this oblation is large enough to satisfy for every punishment, nevertheless it becomes satisfactory in a higher degree for those on whose behalf it is offered, or even who offer it, according to the degree of their devotion, and not always so as to do away with the entire debt of punishment.

This, indeed, seems to show that St. Thomas believes that the sole limit to the benefits of the Mass is the capacity of their recipient. These authorities also endeavour to explain away the passage of his that I quoted already, and that seems to favour their opponents, by maintaining that the Saint is referring in it to the Mass, not as a sacrifice, but as a prayer of the Church, under which aspect, of course, its power is limited. But no one, I think, would call this the Mass, without qualification, as St. Thomas does in the passage in question.

Perhaps, the strongest argument against assigning limits to its power of *propitiation* and *satisfaction* is the very large measure of support the theory gets that its *impetratory* effect is boundless.² And why it should be circumscribed in other respects, if inexhaustible in this one, is not easy to show; especially as, in the opinion of Billot, for instance, impetration and propitiation are inextricably united. The following effort to discriminate is made by Lehmkuhl³:—

As the effects of impetration are not obtained by offering the Mass itself, but by an appeal through it to the Divine clemency and liberality, it may easily be the case that those who are mentioned in the second or third place get as much as those who are accorded first preference and even more.

However, *having regard to the manner in which the Mass is usually applied*, even its impetratory effect, according to Suarez,⁴ would be limited. Because its efficacy in this

¹ *Summa Theologica*, iii. q. 79, art. 5, corp.

² Lugo, disp. 19, sect. 12, nn. 245 and 253. Cf. Lehmkuhl, Génicot, etc. However, according to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, x. p. 18b, many hold that the impetration also is limited.

³ *T.M.*, ii. n. 253 (11th ed.).

⁴ *De Eucharistia*, disp. 79, sect. 12, n. 8.

respect is based on the fact that it supports and recommends a prayer that is offered for a particular intention. Now, a prayer is proportionately less effective if the needs or aspirations of a number are embraced in it.¹ Accordingly, Mass offered in commendation of one prayer for several would be less useful to each of them than if the prayer were devoted to him alone. So, in order to avail to the full of the impetratory power of the Mass, the priest should say as many separate prayers—no matter how short—as the objects he proposes to forward or the persons he wishes to benefit; which, I think, is not usually done.

The practical rules for the priest's guidance as to a secondary intention, formulated by theologians in view of the dispute, are too well known to my readers to need enumeration in detail. They succeed in doing full justice to one who has given a stipend, and at the same time secure that none of the beneficent effects remain unused in the treasury of the Church.

In the case of the *very special fruit* it is the universal teaching that it is not in any way lessened for an individual offerer by reason of the fact that others are associated with him. Thus, at an ordination, it is, from this point of view, of no consequence how many young priests celebrate the Mass with the Bishop. And the same is true with respect to the secondary offerers, such as the ministers at High Mass, the servers, the members of the congregation, and those who may be in any way responsible for having a Mass said. These are all more or less closely connected with the ordained priest in sacrificing the Divine Victim. They are truly and literally 'a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation'²; and what one of them gets in no way interferes with the favours accruing to the others. Many authorities, however, consider that there is no conclusive reason to prove that these benefits, extended to them precisely *in their capacity of co-offerers*, include anything of a *purely* satisfactory nature.³

¹ Cf. Billot's somewhat similar view, which I mentioned above.

² 1 Peter ii. 5, 9.

³ Franzelin, p. 378.

But speculative differences apart, it is plain that if we wish to avail completely of the unbounded reservoir of mercy and grace to which the Mass gives us access, we ought to celebrate it in the spirit and, as far as possible, according to the letter of the prayer: 'Ego volo celebrare,' etc. In this way we shall give praise to the omnipotent God and the whole heavenly court. We shall benefit ourselves and the whole Church militant, and all those who have in a general way or in particular besought our prayers. And we shall be doing our own part to contribute to the spread of Christ's Kingdom and the triumph of the Holy Roman Church.

DAVID BARRY.