



PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE: [www.pamphletstoinspire.com](http://www.pamphletstoinspire.com)



**CHAPTER 26: 18-27**

For the Catholic Church, God's Revelation is found in Sacred Tradition, understood as God's Revealed Word handed down by the Living Teaching Authority established by Christ in the Church. That includes both Written Tradition (Scripture) and Unwritten Tradition received from Christ and handed down Orally by the Apostles and their Successors. The Church founded by Christ on Peter, and only that Church, has been Empowered by Christ to 'Interpret' His Teaching Authoritatively in His Name.

Scripture is *Inspired*; *Inspiration* really means that God Himself is the Chief Author of the Scriptures. He uses a Human Agent, in so marvelous a way that the Human writes what the Holy Spirit wants him to write, does so without Error, yet the Human Writer is Free, and keeps his own Style of Language. It is only because God is *Transcendent* that He can do this - insure Freedom from Error, while leaving the Human Free. To say He is Transcendent means that He is above and beyond all our Human Classifications and Categories.

Matthew writes his gospel account to give us the view of Jesus as the King. He records Jesus' authority in calling the disciples: "Follow me" (Matthew 4:19), and he also records more than any of the others about Jesus' teaching concerning God's kingdom and heavenly rule.

Considered one of the most important Catholic theologians and Bible commentators, Cornelius à Lapide's, S.J. writings on the Bible, created a Scripture Commentary so complete and scholarly that it was practically the universal commentary in use by Catholics for over 400 years. Fr. Lapide's most excellent commentaries have been widely known for successfully combining piety and practicality. Written during the time of the Counter Reformation, it includes plenty of apologetics. His vast knowledge is only equaled by his piety and holiness.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Continuation of Matthew 26: 18-27**

**Verse 18-** *Go into the city:* Jerusalem. From this it is plain that Christ said these things in Bethany. *To such a one, and say. Such a one;* this is the Hebrew idiom, when any one is intended whose name is not mentioned. However, He indicates him by certain marks, as S. Mark signifies: "And He sendeth forth two of His disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him. And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the good man of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the Passover with My disciples? And he will show you a large upper room furnished *and* prepared: there make ready for us. And His disciples went forth, And came into the city, and found as He had said unto them; and they made ready the Passover."

Where observe, that it is plain from S. Mark's words that this water-carrier, who guided them to the house, was not the master of the house. This latter appears to have been a wealthy man, who possessed a spacious mansion, and who was probably

a friend and disciple of Christ. The tradition is, that this house belonged to John, whose surname was Mark, the companion of Paul and Barnabas. This was the house in which the Apostles lay concealed after the death of Christ. In it Christ appeared to them in the evening of the day of His resurrection. And in the same house they received the Holy Ghost at Pentecost.

Wherefore also Peter, when he was delivered by the angel out of the prison into which he had been cast by Herod, betook himself to the believers who were gathered together in this same house (*see Acts xii. 12*). Wherefore, this house was converted into a church. For in it was Sion builded up, which is the greatest and the holiest of all churches. Alexander shows all these things in his *Life of the Apostle S. Barnabas*. He is followed by Baronius and many others. For *where My refreshment is*, as the Vulgate of S. Matt. (*ver. 14*) translates, the Greek has *κατάλυμα*, *inn* or *lodging*. The Greek for *chamber* is *ἀνώγειον*, an *upper floor*, or *chamber*, or *flat*, such as are inhabited at Rome by wealthy people. Wherefore it is a type of the Church, which is tending from earth to Heaven.

*My time, i.e.*, the time of My death, and of finishing the work which My Father sent Me to do.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Verse 19-** *And the disciples, viz., Peter and John, did as Jesus had appointed them:* they killed and roasted the paschal lamb. Now the lamb, prepared for roasting, set forth the image of Christ crucified. For as S. Justin (*contr. Tryph.*) teaches, the body of the lamb was pierced through with the spit. The hind- feet as well as the fore-feet, which stood in the place of hands, were distended, and held apart by little sticks inserted in the hollows of the feet. As if the spit signified the longitudinal portion of the cross, and the little stakes the transverse bars, together with the nails driven into the hands and feet of the Divine Lamb. For the fire of His affliction was no less than the fire by which the paschal lamb was roasted. "Why," asks Franc. Lucas, "do lambs always bear the marks of wounds in the hollow of their feet, in a manner not unlike to those which our Saviour retained from the piercing of the nails upon the cross?" Christ then, when He came to the house, and beheld the roasted lamb, beheld in it a lively image of His own crucifixion. Wherefore He offered this lamb, as it were a type of Himself, or rather He offered up Himself, a whole burnt-offering, and as it were a Victim for the sins of the whole world, with a great and burning ardour unto God the Father.

**Verse 20-** *When the evening was come, &c.* For in the evening, according to the Law, the lamb was to be eaten, and by the eaters standing, that the Hebrews might thereby show that they were prepared for the journey, that is to say, out of Egypt to the land of promise But Jesus is said to have lain down (*discubuisse*) with His disciples, because the ancients were accustomed at supper to recline upon couches; that is to say, with the lower portion of the body they were in a recumbent position, but with their

arms they leant upon supports, as though they were sitting at table. Mark (xiv. 17) has, *when it was evening he came with the twelve*. Speaking precisely, there were ten, since two had been previously sent to prepare the Passover, and were already on the spot.

You will ask, Was Judas the traitor present at the celebration of the Passover and the Eucharist? And did he partake of it? S. Hilary and Theophylact (*in loc.*) say, No. So do Clemens Romanus (*lib. 5, Constit. c. 16*), Innocent III. (*lib. de Myster. Euchar. c. 13*), and Rupertus (*lib. 10, in Matth.*). S. Dionysius (*de Eccles. Hierar.*) is thought by some to favour the same opinion; but other writers, as S. Thomas, take S. Dionysius to incline to the opposite view. Theophylact also may be taken both ways. The reason why the above writers think that Judas did not partake is, because a traitor was unworthy of so great Mysteries, and one who must be forbidden to assist at them.

But that Judas *was* present at the Passover and the Eucharist, and that he did communicate with the rest of the Apostles, is the common opinion of all other Fathers and Doctors, namely, Origen, Cyril, Chrysostom, Ambrose, SS. Leo, Cyprian, Austin, Bede, Rabanus, S. Thomas, and others, whom Suarez cites and follows (3 *part. quæst. 73, art. 5, disp. 41, sect. 3*), where he maintains that S. Dionysius also held the same opinion. For Dionysius says thus, “And the Author Himself (Christ) of the Creeds most justly separates him, who not as He Himself, nor in like manner, with sacred simplicity, had supped with Him.” Which means, Christ separates Judas from the company of Himself and His Apostles, saying to him, “What thou doest, do quickly,” because he had supped and taken the Eucharist unworthily with Him. For presently, after his unworthy communicating, Satan entered into him, and compelled him to accomplish his betrayal of Christ, as SS. Chrysostom, Cyril, and Austin teach.

This opinion is proved—1st Because Matthew here says that Christ sat down to the Supper of the lamb and the Eucharist with the twelve Apostles—therefore with Judas. Whence in the 21st verse it follows, *And when they were eating, He said unto them, Verily I say unto you that one of you shall betray Me*. 2d Because Mark (xiv. 23) says concerning the Eucharistic Chalice, *And they all drank of it*. 3d Because Luke says that, after the consecration of the Chalice, Christ immediately added, *Nevertheless the hand of him that betrayeth Me is with Me on the table*. 4th Because John (chap. xiii.), when he relates that Christ, before the Eucharistic Feast, washed the Apostles’ feet, signifies that He washed the feet of Judas, for He says, *Ye are clean, but not all, for He knew who would betray Him*. If, then, Christ washed the feet of Judas, He also gave him the Eucharist; for this washing was preparatory to the Eucharistic Feast. 5th Because Christ, after the Eucharistic Supper, said that one of them who were reclining with Him at the table, meaning Judas, was His betrayer. And when John asked, Who was this betrayer? Christ answered (xiii. 26), *It is he to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when We had dipped the piece of bread (Vulg), He gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon*.

The *a priori* reason is, that although Christ might properly have made known to the Apostles the hidden treachery of Judas, for the manifestation of His Divinity and His love, both because He was the lord of the character (*famæ*) of Judas, as well as

Observe, that Christ divided the bread into thirteen parts, one of which He took first Himself, and then gave the remaining parts to the Apostles, one by one. But with the contents of the chalice, being liquid, He could not do this. Wherefore, after it was consecrated, Christ first drank of it Himself, and then gave it to his next neighbour, whether John or Peter, bidding him pass it to his nearest neighbour, and thus the chalice passed round the company, and all the Apostles drank of it. Wherefore it does not follow, as the Hussites and Luther say, that the chalice ought to be given to the laity, and that they ought to communicate in both kinds, because Christ and the Apostles communicated in both kinds, and that the same is Christ’s command. For this precept of drinking, where He said, *Drink ye all of this* (as the Church has always understood), pertained only to the Apostles, who alone were then present. For Christ at that time was consecrating them Priests, and He bade them consecrate the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist under both kinds, and bade them receive both kinds, that they might complete a perfect Sacrifice. But He did not command this to the laity, to whom, inasmuch as they do not sacrifice, but only receive the Eucharist as a Sacrament, it is sufficient that they take it under one kind, because in one kind they receive the whole effect and fruit of the Sacrament. And it is especially to be considered that in so great a number of lay people communicating, the chalice might easily be overturned, and the Blood of Christ contained in it spilt upon the ground, which would be an act of great irreverence. Similarly the command of Christ, *This do ye for a commemoration of Me*, in what refers to consecration, pertains only to Priests; but to the laity pertains only the receiving of the consecrated Bread, as is plain. For when several precepts are mingled together, their variety may be limited and distributed, according to the condition of the persons intended, and the intention of the legislator, who in this place is Christ, and His interpreter the Church.

S. Cyprian, or whoever is the author of the treatise (*de Cæna Dom.*), observes that formerly it was forbidden to the Hebrews to drink the blood of animals, as, is plain from Heb. ix. 22, Lev. iv. 6, &c., but that now the Blood of Christ is drunk by His Priests. First, because the Blood of Christ is life-giving. 2nd Because by It we have been redeemed. 3rd Because by It, being made spiritual, we shudder at the sins of a carnal life, as at impure blood.

transubstantiate bread into His Body, and wine into His Blood. Wherefore by these words Christ constituted and ordained His Apostles Priests and Bishops, as the Council of Trent teaches (*Sess. 22, cap. 1*). For by these words He commanded His Apostles, as Bishops, to ordain Priests to celebrate as well the Sacrament as the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, continuously and perpetually throughout all ages. And this He did both for the perpetual praise and worship of God, and also for the spiritual nourishment of the faithful, that they might, by this means, ask and obtain of God every grace for the Church. And this is the doctrine and faith of the whole Church. *This do*, therefore, is as though He said, “Do what I do, *i.e.*, consecrate, sacrifice, transubstantiate bread and wine, and eat them, as I have consecrated, sacrificed, transubstantiated, eaten the same. Moreover, also, ordain Priests and Bishops, who, by a perpetual succession, may do the same, even unto the end of the world.”

*For a commemoration of Me.* “That, namely, by the consecration and receiving of the Eucharist, ye may commemorate, and, as S. Paul says (1 *Cor. xi. 26*), may announce (Vulg.), My death.” For consecrating Priests are here bidden not only to remember the Death of Christ, but to recall the same to memory with Christian people, that they may be always mindful of so great a benefit, and of Christ’s great condescension and redemption, and thankful for it, and so by it ask and obtain all grace from God.

**Verse 27-** *And taking the chalice*, &c. Bellarmine (*lib. iv. de Eucharist. c. 27*) is of opinion that Christ did not consecrate the chalice immediately after the consecration of the bread, but that many actions and words of His intervened. He endeavours to prove this from the fact that S. Matthew says, *whilst they were at supper*; but Luke and Paul say concerning the chalice, *likewise also the cup after supper*.

But it is far more probable that Christ, after the consecration of the bread, proceeded immediately with the consecration of the chalice. For Matthew, Mark, and Luke so relate. Moreover, the *rationale* of the Sacrament and the Eucharistic Sacrifice so required that there should not be any division or interruption, but that the whole matter should be accomplished at one and the same time. And we know that to the *rationale* of the Sacrifice pertains the consecration of the wine as well as the bread. For Christ instituted this Sacrifice after the manner of a feast, for which wine is required for drink, as well as bread for food. Thus likewise in the Old Testament, in the sacrifice of the *mincha*, that is, of fine flour, equally as in the sacrifice of animals, there was added a *drink-offering*, *i.e.*, a pouring forth of wine and oil. For sacrifice is offered to God that it should be a refection of God. But for a refection, drink is required as well as food, that is to say, both wine and bread.

*Drink ye all of this.* Christ said this before the consecration of the chalice. Wherefore, in Mark xiv. 23 there is an hysterologia when it is said, *and they all drank of it*. And presently he relates that Christ consecrated it, saying, *This is My Blood of the New Testament*. But it is certain from Matthew and Luke that Christ first consecrated the chalice, and then gave it to His Apostles to drink. For otherwise they would have drunk mere wine, and not the Blood of Christ.

because the treason of Judas was already known to others, that is, to the princes and elders, and was very shortly to become known to the Apostles themselves by the course of events, yet was He unwilling to do this, that He might give an example of perfect charity, and that He might by this means draw Judas to repentance. Lastly, He would show that secret sinners must not be publicly traduced nor prohibited from coming to the celebration of holy Communion. Wherefore, when Christ, in instituting the Eucharist, made the Apostles priests and bishops when he said, *Do this in commemoration of Me*, it follows that He created Judas also, who was present, a priest and a bishop. Wherefore it is said concerning him in the 109th [108th 8] Psalm, “And his bishopric let another take.” For S. Peter interprets this of Judas in the 1st chapter of the Acts. For although the Hebrew of the passage in the Psalm is *pecudato*, *i.e.*, *prefecture*, meaning his *Apostleship*, yet there is no reason why it should not be properly understood of *Bishopric*, as Suarez takes it. Lastly, it is plain that none others, except the twelve Apostles, were present at the Supper and the Eucharist. For these twelve only are mentioned. This against Euthymius, who thinks that others were present.

**Verse 21-** *And whilst they were eating*, &c. Matthew says that Christ spake this before the institution of the Eucharist, but Luke (xxii. 22) says *after it*. And this seems more probable. For Christ would be unwilling to trouble the minds of His disciples with such dreadful news before the Eucharist. Rather would He have them wholly intent upon, and devoted to the consideration of so great a Sacrament. Wherefore S. Matthew speaks by way of anticipation. Although S. Austin thinks (*lib. 3, de Consens. Evang. c. 1*) that Christ spake thus twice, both before and after the Eucharist.

*About to betray* (Vulg.), *i.e.*, in a few hours *to deliver up*. Christ spoke thus, as well to show that He was conscious of the treachery, as that, not against His will, but voluntarily, He suffered. Wherefore He did not flee away, but offered Himself to His betrayer. He did it also to prick the conscience of Judas and arouse him to repentance. So S. Jerome says, “He casts the accusation generally, that the conscience of the guilty one might lead him to repentance” Christ did not name Judas for three reasons. 1st For the sake of his good name, and to teach us to act in like manner. 2d Lest Peter and the Apostles should rise up against Judas, and tear him to pieces. 3d That by this gentleness and charity He might provoke Judas to repentance. Wherefore S. Leo says (*Serm. 7, de Passione*), “He made it plain to the traitor that his inmost heart was known to Him, not confounding the impious one by a rough or open rebuke, but convicting him by a gentle and quiet admonition, that He might the more easily correct, by bringing to repentance, him whom no charge had robbed of his good name.”

**Verse 22-** *And they were exceeding sorry*, &c. Syr. *They were vehemently troubled. Lord, is it I? Syr. Mori, i.e., My Lord, is it I?* For very greatly did they grieve that Christ their Lord, their Parent and their Master, upon

whom they wholly depended, was to be torn from them, and to die, and that through treachery, which was to be perpetrated by one of their own college, which would be the greatest injury, and occasion the utmost infamy to the entire college. Wherefore these words of Christ transfixed their hearts as with a sword, and, says S. Chrysostom, “they became half dead.”

*One by one:* therefore Judas lest if he alone kept silence should betray himself, or render himself suspected to the rest of the Apostles. For, as Origen says, “I think that at first he thought he might lie hid as a man. But when afterwards he saw that his heart was known to Christ, he embraced the opportunity of concealment offered by Christ’s words.” His first action was one of unbelief, his second of impudence. Now the other Apostles all said, *Is it I?* because, although their conscience did not accuse them of such a crime, yet, as S. Chrysostom says, they believed the words of Christ rather than their own conscience. Because, as S. Austin says in another place, “There is no sin which a man has done, which a man may not do, if the Ruler, by whom man was made, be absent from him.”

**Verse 23-** *He that dippeth his hand, &c. Dippeth;* Gr. *ὁ ἐμβαψάς, who dipped, or who is accustomed to dip.* It appears that Judas, in order the better to conceal his treachery, and show himself a friend to Christ, the more frequently dipped bread, or flesh, into the vessel of broth, or vinegar, or condiment. But inasmuch as the other Apostles were wont to do the same thing to some extent, they could not know that Judas was certainly designated as the traitor by these words of Christ. Whence they strove to get at the fact by means of other questions addressed to Him.

Here take notice, for the harmony of the Evangelists, who relate diversely the pointing out of Judas the traitor, that the following is the historical order which harmonises all the Gospels with one another. First, Christ before the Eucharist foretold that He should be betrayed by one of the Apostles. But this He did in a general manner, without naming or indicating any individual. This is plain from Matthew and Mark. Afterwards, when the Apostles asked one by one, *Lord, is it I?* Christ answered, that “he was the traitor, who dipped his hand with Him in the dish.” For the ancients were wont to recline at table on couches by threes and fours, as I have shown on Esther i. 6. Each three or four, therefore, had a common dish, in such a way, that those who reclined on opposite couches might have the same dish. Therefore, because several of the Apostles had the same dish, Christ did not by those words indicate precisely who was the traitor. After this Christ instituted the Eucharist. And when this was finished, He again said that the traitor was with Him at the table, as S. Luke relates at length; on which I have said more on S. John xiii. 21. Whereupon Peter made signs to John, who was reclining upon the bosom of Christ, to ask Him definitely, and by name, who was the traitor. John then asked, and to him Christ answered, “that it was he to whom He was about to give a morsel,” which presently He gives to Judas. Judas having received it, and feeling that he was designated both by his own consciousness of his guilt and by the sign which Christ gave, impudently asks, *Rabbi, is it I?* Christ answered, *Thou hast said, that is, thou art he.* Wherefore he seemed to himself altogether detected, goes forth, as it were, in madness and rage to

the theological reason. But in order to give full satisfaction to some weak minds, I will subjoin two evidential arguments for this mystery to show that it is possible—arguments which derive their force from analogy. Take, therefore, the following demonstration, drawn from a physical analogy—from the eye and a mirror. For both a looking-glass and a small eye receive into themselves the whole quantity of the very greatest things, not only men, but houses, temples, trees, mountains, &c., and clearly reproduce and represent them whole. Why then should not a small host, by God’s power, set forth (*exhibit*) whole Christ? You will say that in the eye and in the mirror what takes place is done in a spiritual manner, by means of optical or visual appearances. I reply, in like manner the Body of Christ in the Eucharist assumes a spiritual mode of existence, so that, as a spirit, it should be spiritually in the very small portion of the host. Let us add this, that the objective appearances themselves are not spiritual in such a sense as that they are not really natural and physical, yes, corporeal, entities. For they are inseparable from corporeal entities, such as the atmosphere. And of these things we see that very many, and as it were an infinite number, are received and comprehended in a mirror and in the eye. If all this constantly takes place in a natural manner, with respect to the appearances received by the eye, much more can the omnipotence of God do the same thing supernaturally in respect to the Body of Christ, miraculously in the Eucharist.

(Here follows in the original what the Author calls an analogical mathematical demonstration. This is omitted, both because it would involve the printing of two intricate mathematical diagrams, as also because such a species of argument seems less likely to convince now than it did when *à Lapide* wrote.)

You may add here a third proof drawn from condensation and rarefaction, which I have brought forward on 1 Cor. xi. 25. Water in a vessel, made dense by means of cold, occupies only half of the vessel, but when it is made hot and rarefied by means of fire, it bubbles up and fills the whole vessel. And yet the water continues the same as regards matter, volume (*molem*), and, as many celebrated philosophers are of opinion, as regards intrinsic bulk; for nothing is added to the water by rarefaction except extension in space. If, then, this takes place according to natural laws, why should God be unable to do the same thing supernaturally, as respects the body of Christ?

Luke adds (xxii. 19), *This is My Body which is given for you, i.e., which is about to be given.* S. Paul (1 Cor. xi.) has, *which shall be delivered* (Vulg.); Gr. *κλώμενον, broken.*

Luke also adds, *This do ye for a commemoration of Me.* By these words Christ gave to the Apostles, and to the Priests who were to be ordained by them, power, as well as commandments, to consecrate and

more marvellous things without being troubled; as, chiefly that that Man, whom they saw eat, drink, sleep, be weary, was true God. Yea, that He was in Heaven at the very same time that He was speaking with them on earth, when He said (*John* iii. 13), “And no man hath ascended up to Heaven, but He that came down from Heaven, *even* the Son of Man, which is in Heaven.”

*Blessed.* Observe, Christ before consecration, 1st gave thanks to God the Father, as Luke and Paul say; and that, after His manner, with His eyes lifted up to Heaven, as it is in the Canon of the Mass and the Liturgy of S. James. Whence this Sacrament is called the Eucharist, *i.e.*, Giving of Thanks, because it is itself the greatest and chief Thanksgiving.

2d Christ blessed, not the Father, as the heretics choose to say, but the bread and wine, as S. Paul says expressly, *the cup of blessing which we bless*, &c (1 Cor. x.). Now Christ blessed the bread and the chalice, that is to say, He invoked the blessing and almighty power of God upon the bread and wine, that it might be then at that time, and in all future consecrations, converted, the bread into the Body, and the wine of the chalice into the Blood of Christ, whensoever the words of consecration are rightly and duly (*legitime*) pronounced. Similar was the blessing of the loaves (*Luke* ix. 16). Not, therefore, was this benediction the same as consecration, though S. Thomas thinks otherwise (*see Council of Trent, Sess. 13, cap. 1*). Whence in the Liturgies of S. James and S. Basil, and in our Canon, we pray, after Christ’s example, that God would bless these gifts, that the Divine power may descend upon the bread and the chalice, to perfect the consecration. Hence it is called *the chalice of benediction, i.e.*, blessed by Christ. Whence also S. Paul says (1 Cor. x. 16), “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communication of the Blood of Christ?”

Lastly, it seems that Christ blessed the bread by making over it the sign of the cross, and in blessing, invoked the power of God, that it might become consecrated and transubstantiated. For, according to the practice of the Church, priests in consecration bless the bread and the wine with the sign of the cross. This they do after the example of Christ.

*This is My Body.* From hence it is plain that the Eucharist is not the figure of the Body of Christ, as the Innovators perversely say, but the true and proper Body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and crucified on Calvary, as the Church has believed in all ages, and defined in many Councils. This I have shown on 1 Cor. xi. 24. There Paul, in the same words, repeats and relates the institution of the Eucharist. We must add, that some have been torn away from this faith, because they are not able to comprehend how the Body of Christ, so lofty and so great, can be contained whole in (*sub*) a very little host. But these persons ought to remember that God is Almighty; and that as He constituted nature, so also He often works, as He wills, contrary to nature, in a supernatural manner, that He may show Himself to be the Lord and God of nature and of all things. Wherefore, whatsoever there is peculiar in nature may be inverted and altogether changed (*eversti*). Consequently, God is able to effect that a great quantity may be contained in a little space, yea, in a point. This is

accomplish the betrayal of Christ, and goes to the house of Caiaphas, to ask for servants and officers to take Christ.

**Verse 24-** *The Son of Man indeed goeth, &c. Good were it for that man if he had not been born.* For “far better is it not to exist at all, than to exist in evil. The punishment is foretold, that him whom shame had not conquered, the denunciation of punishment might correct,” says S. Jerome. He threatens him with the woe of damnation. For far better is it not to be, than to exist only to be endlessly miserable, as I have shown on Eccles. iv. 2, 3. Wisely does S. Jerome say (*Epist. ad Furiam*), “It is not their beginning which is inquired about in Christians, but their ending. Paul began badly but ended well. Judas’ beginning was commended, but his end was to be condemned as a traitor.”

*Goeth.* “By this word,” says Victor of Antioch, “Christ showeth that His death is like rather to a departure or passing away, than to real death. He signifies, likewise, by it that He went voluntarily to death.” Moreover, the betrayal of Judas was an act of infinite sacrilege, perpetrated directly against the very Person of Christ and God. Thus it was true *deicide*. Wherefore it is exceedingly probable that Judas abides in the deepest pit of Gehenna, near to Lucifer, and is there grievously tormented. And this seems to be indicated by the word *woe*, which Christ here pronounces upon him above the rest of the reprobates. Blessed Francis Borgia was wont, in meditation, in the depth of his humility, to place himself at the feet of Judas, that is to say, in the lowest pit of hell, exclaiming that there was no other place fit for him, neither in Heaven, nor in earth, nor under the earth, as the due reward of his sins.

**Verse 25-** *Judas answered . . . Is it I?* Franc. Lucas thinks, with probability, that Judas asked this question after Christ had given him the morsel of bread.

Now Judas asked this question out of impudence, to cover his wickedness; and, as Jerome says, “by boldness to lay a lying claim to a good conscience.” For he thought that Christ, out of gentleness, would not name His betrayer. As though he had said, “Surely it is not I, O Christ, who am Thy betrayer? I who have faithfully served Thee all these years? Who have fed Thy family, and executed all Thy business?”

*Thou hast said.* This is the modest Hebrew method of answering, by which they confirm what is asked. As though Christ said, “It is not that I say it, and call thee traitor. It is thou thyself who in reality dost call thyself so because thou art, in truth, a traitor.” Whence S. Chrysostom extols the meekness of Christ, who, in just anger, did not say, “Thou wicked and sacrilegious wretch! thou ungrateful traitor! but gently, *Thou hast said.* “Thus has He fixed for us the bounds and rules of forbearance and forgetfulness of injuries.”

**Verse 26-** *Whilst they were at supper, &c. This is My Body.* Thus the Syriac, Arabic, and Persian. But the Ethiopic more significantly renders, This is My very Flesh. The Egyptian adds *for: For this is My Body.* The rest, indeed, understand *for.* For that the word must here be supplied is sufficiently plain from the account of the consecration of the wine in ver. 28, *For this is My Blood.* The word *for* gives the reason *why* they must eat and drink, namely, because it is the Body and Blood of Christ which are offered to them by Him to be eaten and drunken. For who would not most eagerly receive such Divine and precious meat and drink?

*At supper, i.e., after the supper,* as Luke and Paul have, it, of the paschal lamb, but whilst they were still reclining at the table as it was spread for the feast. Therefore Matthew says, *whilst they were at supper.* Here take notice that this supper of Christ was threefold. First, that of the paschal lamb, which Christ and His Apostles celebrated standing, according to the law in Exod. xii. Secondly, a common supper of other food after the lamb, which they ate reclining upon couches. For all the members of a family, especially if it were a numerous one, would not have sufficient food in the lamb alone. Thirdly, Christ added a most sacred, yea, a Divine Supper, that is to say, the institution of the Eucharist. For Christ before the Eucharist partook of the lamb and the ordinary supper, since it was fitting that the type of the lamb should precede the Eucharistic Verity; and that the Eucharist should be the final memorial of Him who was about to die, as it were the highest pledge of love. So Jansen, Maldonatus, and others. Suarez, however, in speaking of this passage, thinks that the Eucharist was instituted between the paschal and the ordinary supper. At present, indeed, for the sake of reverence of so great a Sacrament, it is, says S. Augustine (*Epist.* 128), an Apostolic tradition that the Eucharist should only be taken by those who are fasting. Wherefore the heretics falsely and deceitfully call the Eucharist “the Supper,” although it be true the first Christians for some time celebrated the Eucharist at supper, after the example of Christ, as we gather from 1 Cor. xi. 25. Moreover, in the place of the second and ordinary supper, which Paul calls *the Lord’s Supper,* there succeeded in ancient times, among Christians, the *Agape,* that is, a feast common to all, as a sign and incentive of charity, but taken after the reception of the Eucharist. Lastly, Christ, after the supper upon the lamb and the ordinary supper, but before the institution of the Eucharist washed the disciples’ feet. He did this to signify with what purity we ought to approach so great Mysteries. This is plain from John xiii. 4. After the washing, He took and consecrated bread and wine, which were still upon the table, and converted them into the Eucharist, that is, into His own Body and Blood.

From all this it is gathered that Christ instituted the Eucharist about the first or second hour of the night. For after taking the Eucharist, Judas went out to summon the servants of the rulers, that they might seize Christ. Christ in the meanwhile delivered His prolonged discourse, of which John gives an account, chaps. xiv.-xvii. When this was ended, He went out to the Mount of Olives, and there continued a long time in prayer. Then He was taken by the Jews and dragged back from Gethsemane to Jerusalem. Then He was taken to Annas, and after that to Caiaphas. Still there was a great part of the night left, during which He was beaten by the hands of the servants of the priests, was spat upon and mocked by them, whilst they were

waiting for the day, that they might take Him to Pilate to be condemned. From all this it appears that Christ instituted the Eucharist about the beginning of Thursday night.

Lastly, listen to the Council of Trent (*Sess.* 22, c. 1): “After Christ had celebrated the ancient Passover, which the multitude of the sons of Israel sacrificed in memory of their going out of Egypt, He instituted a new Passover, that He Himself should be immolated by the Church (*ab ecclesia*), by means of (*per*) the priests, under (*sub*) visible signs, in memory of His passage from this world to the Father, when He redeemed us by the shedding of His Blood, and delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us to His Kingdom.”

**Verse 26 (Continued)-** *Jesus took bread.* Observe here five actions of Christ. 1st He took bread. 2d He gave thanks to the Father. 3d He blessed bread. 4th He brake bread. 5th He extended it, and as He was extending it to them He said, *Take and eat; this is My Body.* For these are the words by which He offered it to them as well as by which He consecrated it. This annihilates Calvin’s argument, who says, all these words, namely, *took, blessed, brake, gave,* have respect only unto *bread.* Therefore the Apostles received and ate *bread, not the Body of Christ.* I reply to the major premiss: These words refer to bread, not as it remained bread, but as it was in the act of being bestowed (*inter dandum*), changed by virtue of the words and consecration of Christ into the Body of Christ. For thus might Christ have said at Cana of Galilee, “Take and drink, for this is wine,” if He had wished by these words to turn water into wine. For so we say in ordinary speech, “Herod shut up S. John in prison, killed and buried him, or permitted him to be buried.” And yet it was not the same that he shut up in prison whom he buried. For he imprisoned a man, he buried a corpse. After a similar and common way of speaking is what the Evangelists and S. Paul say of the Eucharist.

Observe, secondly, from what Christ said, *Take ye, for this is, &c.,* it would seem that Christ took one loaf, and during the act of consecration broke it into twelve parts, and gave one of these parts to each of the Apostles, which they appear to have received in their hands. Wherefore also, for a long time in the Church, the Eucharist was given to the faithful in their hands, as is plain from Tertullian (*lib. de Spectac.*), and from S. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechesi Mystagog.* 5), and from S. Austin (*Serm.* 244). Afterwards, however, from fear of desecration, and through reverence, it was given in the mouth.

Lastly, the Apostles were not troubled at this unaccustomed action of Christ, and this new and wonderful Sacrament, for two reasons. First, because they had been already instructed and premonished (*John* vi.), as S. Chrysostom teaches (*Hom.* 83, *in Matth.*). The other, because the same Christ who delivered the Mysteries, illuminated their minds by faith, that they might simply believe. For they had heard and believed many other