

Shed for Many: An Accurate Rendering of the *Pro Multis* in the Formula of Consecration¹

Manfred Hauke

I. THE CALL FOR A FAITHFUL TRANSLATION OF THE “*PRO MULTIS*”

The “eucharistic sacrifice” is, according to the Second Vatican Council, “the source and the culmination of all christian life.”² At the center of the most intimate fulfillment of the life of the Church stands the Eucharistic Prayer or canon, with the words of Jesus which effect the consecration: “... by means of the words and actions of Christ, the sacrifice is carried out which Christ himself instituted at the Last Supper, when he offered his Body and Blood under the species of bread

1 The present study originally appeared in German as “Für viele vergossen.” *Studie zur sinngetreuen Wiedergabe des pro multis in den Wandlungsworten* (Augsburg, 2008); preceded by “Für viele vergossen.’ Studie zur sinngetreuen Wiedergabe des *pro multis* in den Wandlungsworten,” in *Forum Katholische Theologie* 23.1 (2007) 1-47. It integrates part of my foreword to the work of F. PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes—vergossen für viele? Zur Übersetzung und Interpretation des “hyper pollôn” in Mk 14,24*, *Quaestiones non disputatae* 12 (Siegburg, 2007) 7-32. For the English version some slight updates have been made.

Ed.: The translator of this work prefers to remain anonymous. A table of abbreviations of works cited is provided at the end of this essay. Where I have had access to English editions of the (mostly German) works referenced, I have supplied the relevant bibliographical information. Unless otherwise noted, all translations into English are the translator’s. Lastly, I have modified some of the author’s biblical quotations so as to conform them to the Revised Standard Version (RSV 1966), from which all Scripture citations are drawn.

2 SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen gentium* (21 November 1964), in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 2: *Trent to Vatican II*, ed. and trans. Norman P. Tanner (London and Washington DC: Sheed & Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990) §11, p. 857.

and wine, gave them to his Apostles to eat and drink, and left them the command to perpetuate this same mystery.”³

The central importance of Jesus’ words of institution in the canon is to be accentuated by a precise translation of the liturgical texts. This call was made already in 2001 with the Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam*; with it the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments (CDWDS) regulated the use of the vernacular in the publication of the liturgical books of the Roman Rite. In contrast to an earlier practice, which often confounded translation with interpretation, and thereby did not remain free of certain fashionable but dubious tendencies, the Instruction stressed fidelity to the original Latin text. The words of institution, which are indispensable for the consecration, were particularly emphasized:

The high point of all liturgical action is the celebration of the Mass, in which the Eucharistic Prayer or Anaphora in turn occupies the pre-eminent place. For this reason, the approved translations of the approved Eucharistic Prayers require the utmost care, especially as regards the sacramental formulae....⁴

Despite this clearly articulated theological standard, it made a sensation when, on 17 October 2006, Cardinal Francis Arinze, then-Prefect of the CDWDS, sent a letter to all presidents of episcopal conferences concerning the precise translation of the expression *pro multis* in the consecration of the Precious Blood.⁵ Just how little

3 *Institutio generalis Missalis Romani*, editio typica tertia (2002) 79d: “Nar-ratio institutionis et consecratio: verbis et actionibus Christi sacrificium per-agitur, quod ipse Christus in Cena novissima instituit, cum suum Corpus et Sanguinem sub speciebus panis et vini obtulit, Apostolisque manducandum et bibendum dedit et iis mandatum reliquit idem mysterium perpetuandi,” trans. International Committee on English in the Liturgy, *General Instruction of the Roman Missal (Third Typical Edition)* (Washington DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2003) p. 31. See also CCC 1353, 1375.

4 CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam* (28 March 2001) 63, at <www.vatican.va>. On 1 November 1974 the Congregation (then called the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship) had already expressed itself similarly: “The formulae of consecration, which must be the same in all the Eucharistic Prayers, are to be *faithfully and literally* [*ac fideliter et litteraliter*] translated” (emphasis in original). “Preces Eucharisticae pro Missis cum pueris et de reconciliatione,” §3, *Notitiae* 11 (1975) 5-6 at 6. Had this directive been adhered to “faithfully and literally,” we would have been spared the current controversy.

5 CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Letter to the Presidents of Conferences of Bishops, 17 October 2006

was to be hoped for by such a clarification, I experienced in the fall of 2005 at a liturgical congress in the United States. In the papers presented there, one heard frequent references to the importance of exact translations of Latin liturgical texts into English; but when I spoke with a high-ranking official responsible for the revision of the translations about the question of the *pro multis*, I received the answer that, on this point, given the attitude of the English-speaking bishops, there was no prospect of a precise translation being adopted. In this (humanly speaking) hopeless situation, the Petrine ministry has now brought an unexpected turn.

Already in July 2005 the CDWDS, by agreement with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, wrote to all presidents of episcopal conferences to ask their opinion on precisely this question. Pope Benedict XVI was subsequently made aware of the results of this consultation, and at his direction the Congregation's letter of 17 October 2006 was sent. The central points of the letter are reported here verbatim:

1. A text corresponding to the words *pro multis*, handed down by the Church, constitutes the formula that has been in use in the Roman Rite in Latin from the earliest centuries. In the past 30 years or so, some approved vernacular texts have carried the interpretive translation "for all," "per tutti," or equivalents.

2. There is no doubt whatsoever regarding the validity of Masses celebrated with the use of a duly approved formula containing a formula equivalent to "for all," as the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has already declared (cf. *Sacra Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, Declaratio de sensu tribuendo adprobationi versionum formularum sacramentalium*, 25 Ianuarii 1974, AAS 66 [1974], 661). Indeed, the formula "for all" would undoubtedly correspond to a correct interpretation of the Lord's intention expressed in the text. It is a dogma of faith that Christ died on the Cross for all men and women (cf. *John* 11:52; *2 Corinthians* 5, 14-15; *Titus* 2, 11; *1 John* 2, 2).

3. There are, however, many arguments in favour of a more precise rendering of the traditional formula *pro multis*:

a) The Synoptic Gospels (*Mt* 26, 28; *Mk* 14, 24) make specific reference to "many" (πολλῶν) for whom the Lord is offering the Sacrifice, and this wording has been emphasized by some

(Prot. No. 467/05/L). The official and controlling version of this letter is the Italian original, published in *Notitiae* 43 (2006) 441-43; translations into other languages follow thereafter. The English version (pp. 444-46) is more reliable than the German (pp. 453-55).

biblical scholars in connection with the words of the prophet *Isaiah* (53, 11-12).⁶ It would have been entirely possible in the Gospel texts to have said “for all” (for example, cf. *Luke* 12, 41);⁷ instead, the formula given in the institution narrative is “for many,” and the words have been faithfully translated thus in most modern biblical versions.

b) The Roman Rite in Latin has always said *pro multis* and never *pro omnibus* in the consecration of the chalice.

c) The anaphoras of the various Oriental Rites, whether in Greek, Syriac, Armenian, the Slavic languages, etc., contain the verbal equivalent of the Latin *pro multis* in their respective languages.

d) “For many” is a faithful translation of *pro multis*, whereas “for all” is rather an explanation of the sort that belongs properly to catechesis.

e) The expression “for many,” while remaining open to the inclusion of each human person, is reflective also of the fact that this salvation is not brought about in some mechanistic way, without one’s own willing or participation; rather, the believer is *invited* to accept in faith the gift that is being offered and to receive the supernatural life that is given to those who participate in this mystery, living it out in their lives as well so as to be numbered among the “many” to whom the text refers.

f) In line with the Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam*, effort should be made to be more faithful to the Latin texts in the typical editions.

4. The Bishops’ Conferences of those countries where the formula “for all” or its equivalent is currently in use are therefore requested to undertake the necessary catechesis of the faithful on this matter in the next one or two years to prepare them for the introduction of a precise vernacular translation of the formula *pro multis* (e.g., “for many,” “per molti,” etc.) in the next translation of the Roman Missal that the Bishops and the Holy See will approve for use in their country.

6 *M.H.*: *Isaiah* 53:11-12: “... the righteous one, my servant, [shall] make many to be accounted righteous; and he shall bear their iniquities ... yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.”

7 *M.H.*: *Luke* 12:41: “Peter said, ‘Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for all?’”

II. FIDELITY TO REVELATION AS THE POINT OF DEPARTURE FOR THEOLOGICAL EXEGESIS

The letter of the CDWDS offers an abbreviated compendium of some important subjects. Particularly important among these is the distinction between offer and efficacy as these relate to the salvation established by Christ in his sacrifice. The vernacular formula “for all” is an *interpretation* of the words of consecration, while the words “for many” correspond to the *biblical text*. Jesus died “for all” inasmuch as salvation is offered to all men. The actual acceptance of salvation depends, however, on the free will of the recipient, who can also refuse the divine offer. This possibility is left open by the vernacular formula “for many.”

The letter signed by Cardinal Arinze is sometimes interpreted (with regard to point 2) as if the meaning of the Lord’s words “for many” were simply equivalent to “for all.”⁸ The Pope’s directive would therefore provide “philological exactitude in place of what is actually meant.”⁹ Were this so, however, then it would contradict the observation (point 3e) that the translation “for many” offers an open formulation and thereby avoids a mechanistic misunderstanding of salvation. Granted, the letter’s remark that the formula “for all” reflects a correct interpretation of the Lord’s intention is ambiguous: undoubtedly salvation and sufficient grace is offered to all men, but the question remains whether this is really the sense of the Gospel words here at issue. According to the Roman Catechism, which (as will be seen below) transmits the most ancient interpretive tradition, the words of the Lord at the consecration of the Precious Blood do not refer directly to the universal offer, but rather to the limited efficacy of salvation for believers.¹⁰ In this interpretation the “blood of the covenant” refers directly to those who open themselves to this covenant in faith and in charity, therefore to the members of the Church or those effectively called to salvation.

A more precise explanation of this point, starting from the interpretation of the words of Jesus in the sacred Scriptures, is therefore much to be desired. The contemporary liturgical mistranslation of the Greek “for many” (*hyper pollôn*) with “for all” finds its origin

8 Thus, for example, A. GERHARDS, “Wie viel sind viele? Die Diskussion um das *pro multis*,” in *Herder Korrespondenz* 61 (2007) 79-83, at 83 (= idem, “Pro multis—für alle oder für viele?” in *Gestorben für wen? Zur Diskussion um das “pro multis*,” ed. M. Striet [Freiburg, 2007] 55-64 at 63: “The letter of the Congregation concedes that the divergent formulations coincide with what is meant; therefore they capture its sense”).

9 GERHARDS, “Wie viel,” 83 (= “Pro multis,” 63).

10 See Section IV.5 below.

primarily in a dictionary article of the Protestant exegete Joachim Jeremias (1900-1979). According to him, the formulation of Jesus would have been influenced by the Aramaic, which had no word for “all.”¹¹ “Many” is therefore to be understood inclusively, that is, as “all.” This interpretation is also presupposed in an official response of the then-Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, published in the January 1970 edition of *Notitiae*, to a question on the subject: According to this response, “the exegetes” held the opinion that the words at the base of the Latin *pro multis* mean “for all.”¹² A similar opinion was expanded upon a few months later in *Notitiae* by Father Max Zerwick, a Jesuit exegete teaching in Rome.¹³ This interpretation was contested already in 1972 in an important article by Wilfried Pigulla,¹⁴ but because textual modifications had by then already been introduced, the objections had no effect on liturgical practice.

The most thorough exegetical contribution on the theme to date is the thesis submitted at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome by Father Franz Prosinger, F.S.S.P.¹⁵ The study was written under the direction of the French Jesuit of Flemish mother-tongue, Albert

11 J. JEREMIAS, “πολλοί” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 6 (1959) [Eng.: *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. G. W. Bromiley, vol. 6 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968)] 536-45 at 536. Cf. idem, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, 4th rev. ed. (Göttingen, 1967), 171-74, 218-21 [Eng.: *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin from the 3rd ed. (1960) with the author’s revisions to July 1964 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966)]. Analyzed in PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes*.

12 *Notitiae* 6 (1970) 39-40 at 39: “[S]ecundum exegetas verbum aramaicum, quod lingua latina versum est ‘pro multis’, significationem habet ‘pro omnibus’...”

13 M. ZERWICK, “... ‘Pro vobis et pro multis effundetur’ ...” in *Notitiae* 6 (1970) 138-40. The relevant *Notitiae* texts from 1970 are easily available in English translation in an online article of E. MCNAMARA, “Why ‘For All’ in the Words of Consecration?” ZENIT, 7 September 2004, at <www.zenit.org/article-10962?l=english>. On Zerwick’s intervention, see also A. BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948-1975*, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1990) 109-10, n. 27.

14 W. PIGULLA, “Das für viele vergossene Blut,” in *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 23 (1972) 72-82. Critical observations on the inclusive interpretation of “many” in Jeremias are found also in G. NEBE, “πολύς, πολλέ, πολύ,” in *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, eds H. Balz, G. Schneider, 2nd ed., vol. 3 (Stuttgart, 1992). For early objections, see also D. MARIN, “‘Per molti’ e non ‘per tutti’ (Matth. 26,27-28),” in *Studia Florentina A. Ronconi ... oblata* (Rome, 1970) 221-31; M. J. COSTELLOE, “Pauca de ‘multis,’” in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 71 (1970/71) 417-25.

15 F. PROSINGER, “Hyper pollôn—Mk 14,24. Übersetzung und Interpretation” (Diss. Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991).

Vanhoye, the long-standing Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, who, because of his scholarly achievements, was created a cardinal by Pope Benedict XVI in 2006. Vanhoye is particularly well known among specialists for his writings on the Epistle to the Hebrews. These works contain a very precise theology of the covenant, itself of great interest for just our subject: for in discussing the words over the chalice one is dealing, after all, with the “blood of the covenant.” Proisinger’s study, completed in 1991 and published in installments in a little-known journal from 1993 to 1996,¹⁶ has recently been updated and enlarged.¹⁷ The Holy Father himself knows and appreciates this work, as evidenced by the following extract of a letter he wrote in 2004:

Perhaps you do not know that Fr Proisinger of the Fraternity of St Peter has written a thesis on this under the world-renowned exegete of the Biblical Institute, Fr Vanhoye, S.J., and has demonstrated very clearly that the translation [of the Latin *pro multis* in the institution narrative] should be “for many,” a conclusion that has also been accepted by the rigorous examiners of the Biblical Institute.¹⁸

Franz Proisinger shows that Joachim Jeremias fell into many errors. The Aramaic usage in its distinction between “many” and “all” does not contrast significantly with that of the Indo-European languages. “Many” indicates a great quantity which, if the context demands, can connote but does not formally signify “all.” The correct sense of the Greek *polloi* is given, then, from the relative context, in this case the circumstances of the Last Supper. Proisinger, although himself leaving open the exact meaning of “for many,” nevertheless raises notable points supporting an interpretation that refers to the believing community of the covenant: “We have an undetermined ‘many,’ not further specified as to amount, of those who, in conformity with the request directed to all to drink, accept the blood-covenant of the new People of God with the stipulated consequence.”¹⁹

The “for many” in Matthew and Mark must be seen in parallel with Luke and Paul, who use the phrase “for you.” The words “for you” refer to the believers in Christ who participate in the Eucharist.

16 PROSINGER, “Zur Übersetzung und Interpretation des *hyper pollon* in Mk 14,24,” in *Umkehr* no. 1 (1993) 18-24; no. 2 (1993) 21-32; no. 3 (1994) 28-40; no. 4 (1995) 22-32; no. 5 (1996) 22-32.

17 PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes*. (See n. 1 above.)

18 Letter of Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (now Benedict XVI) to Father Michael Wildfeuer, 23 July 2004. I am grateful to Father Wildfeuer for putting a copy of the letter at my disposal.

19 PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes*, 126.

The words of institution recall to mind the new covenant, to which no one is constrained by magical means; rather, Christ awaits the response of faith operating in charity.

The task of translation is to be distinguished from that of theological interpretation. The Latin *pro multis* of the Roman liturgy clearly should be translated accurately and literally with “for many” and not interpretively with “for all.”²⁰ The issue cannot be relativized with the argument that the liturgy treats the texts of the Gospels in a partially free way.²¹ For here Jesus Christ is being cited (“and said”): to modify the Lord’s words deliberately would therefore be outrageously presumptuous. Because the liturgy in the institution narrative draws on the words of Jesus himself, it is bound to translate the Greek *hyper pollôn* precisely as “for many.”

On the philological plane the situation is perfectly clear,²² a fact duly reflected in most Bible translations. This would be so even if the interpretation of Jeremias (put in doubt by Pigulla and Proisinger) were correct, and if Jesus with the word “many” would have expressed the Semitic equivalent of “all.” For as Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, the present Pope Benedict XVI, stresses:

The fact that in Hebrew the expression “many” [in Isaiah 53] would mean the same thing as “all” is not relevant to the question under consideration inasmuch as it is a question of translating, not a Hebrew text here, but a Latin text (from the Roman Liturgy), which is directly related to a Greek text (the New Testament). The institution narratives in the New Testament are by no means simply a translation (still less, a mistaken translation) of Isaiah; rather, they constitute an independent source.²³

20 See M. WILDFEUER, “Treue zum Testament des Herrn: ‘für viele’ oder ‘für alle?’” in *Una Voce Korrespondenz* 36 (2006) 17-40 at 22.

21 Thus the exegete T. SÖDING, “Für euch—für viele—für alle. Für wen feiert die Kirche Eucharistie?” in *Gestorben für wen?*, 17-27 at 20.

22 See the contribution of the classical philologist C. WICK, “Eine vaticanische Korrektur,” in *Kirchliche Umschau* 9 (December 2006) 1, 8-9 at 1. As far as I can see, this position is not contested by any serious scholar. Even a defender of the interpretive translation “for all” such as the Freiburg dogmatic theologian Peter Walter admits: “The translation ‘for many’ is, from the purely philological point of view, correct, and can look back on a long tradition.” P. WALTER, “Für alle’ entspricht dem biblischen Zeugnis,” in *Konradsblatt* 2 (14 January 2007).

23 J. RATZINGER, *God Is Near Us: The Eucharist, the Heart of Life*, eds Stephan Otto Horn and Vinzenz Pfnür, trans. Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2003) 37-38, n. 10 [German original: *Gott ist uns nah. Eucharistie: Mitte des Lebens* (Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich, 2001)]. A correct translation is also called for by J. BEUMER, “Mein Blut, das für euch und für viele (alle?) vergos-

Already in the sermon just cited, Ratzinger “leave[s] open the question of whether it was sensible to choose the translation ‘for all’ here and, thus, to confuse translation with interpretation....”²⁴ The Jesuit exegete Father Tibor Gallus insists that this surely was not right: the “for many” “must... be seen as inspired word of God, while its deformation into the human word “for all,” considered according to the standards of textual criticism, must be rejected as a falsification of the biblical Word.”²⁵ The Holy Father has now “placed the Word of God in the place from which it should never have been removed. With that he responds to the question ‘What is more important?’ in the only proper way: namely, in humility before the revealed Word.”²⁶

III. THE OFFERING OF JESUS FOR ALL MEN AND FOR HIS CHURCH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT²⁷

In the discussion concerning the accurate rendering of the phrase *pro multis*, it is often emphasized that, according to the testimony of Sacred Scripture, Jesus Christ died for all men. It would therefore be unimaginable that the eucharistic representation of the death on the cross could have a different sense. It is unfortunate that the literal translation of the words of Jesus in the liturgy could lead to the supposition that the offering of Christ on the cross is directed to only a part of humanity.²⁸

sen wird,” in *Anzeiger für die kath. Geistlichkeit* 83 (1973) 136, 138; idem, “Die eucharistischen Konsekrationsworte nach den Zeugnissen der Schrift und der Liturgie,” in *Theologie und Glaube* 64 (1974) 222-29, esp. 229.

24 RATZINGER, *God Is Near Us*, 37.

25 T. GALLUS, “Zur Streitfrage um die Konsekrationsworte ‘für viele’,” in *Verstöße. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag des P. Tibor Gallus SJ*, ed. M. Neumann (Klagenfurt, 1976) 94-96; reprinted in *Theologisches* 30 (2000) 294-96 at 295. The Hungarian Jesuit expressed himself still more sharply in his last article: “One is putting ... an untruth into the mouth of Jesus, and that is blasphemy!” T. GALLUS, “Die Verfälschung der Konsekrationsworte,” in *Timor Domini*, February 1983.

26 C. WICK, “Es ist an der Zeit, Fehler einzusehen,” in *Die Tagespost*, 28 December 2006, p. 12.

27 In this section there can be no question of a comprehensive treatment of the exegetical findings concerning the interpretation of Mk 14:24 and Mt 26:28, for which the reader is referred to the study of Prossinger. Presented here are some “prolegomena” for the understanding of the biblical evidence, which, although essential for a systematic treatment, are not always seen.

28 See SÖDING, “Für euch,” 25-26; M. STRIET, “Nur für viele oder doch für alle? Das Problem der Allerlösung und die Hoffnung der betenden Kirche,” in *Gestorben für wen?*, 81-92 at 90-91; GERHARDS, “Wie viel,” 81-83 (= “Pro multis,” 59-63).

This interpretive scheme is common, but it must be questioned. For the vicarious offering of Jesus “for” salvation can be directed, according to the context, both to 1) all humanity, and 2) his Church, with the elect who actually will be saved.

III.1. The electoral blood of the paschal lamb

The New Testament accounts of the eucharistic institution integrate the Old Testament preparation, which one must also keep in mind. In the first place we have here a reference to the *pasch* or liberation of Israel from slavery in Egypt.²⁹ For the Jews contemporary with Jesus, the paschal meal was “the remembrance of the creation, of the night in which God created the world; the remembrance of the beginning of the people of God, according to the promise to Abraham; the remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt; and finally the annunciation of the Last Day, that is, of the perfect liberation for all time.”³⁰ The blood of the paschal lamb was painted in Egypt on the doorposts and the lintels (Ex 12:7): “The blood shall be a sign for you, upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and no plague shall fall upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt” (Ex 12:13).

The blood of the lamb has here a selective or electoral significance that refers to those saved in the end. This particular sense stands in the foreground in the New Testament reception of the typology of the paschal lamb: “You know that you were ransomed ... with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot” (1 Pt 1:18-19). And again: “For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed” (1 Cor 5:7). The saved, who are an immense multitude in the figurative language of the Apocalypse, stand in white vestments before the throne of God, carry palms in their hands as a sign of victory, and “have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb” (Rv 7:14).

A reference to the paschal lamb is however also to be assumed in the allusion of St John the Baptist to the expiatory death of Jesus: “Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!” (Jn

29 Regarding this clear connection see, for example, J. BETZ, *Eucharistie. In der Schrift und Patristik*. HDG IV/4a (Freiburg i. Br., 1979) 8-9; A. GARCÍA IBÁÑEZ, *L'Eucaristia, dono e mistero. Trattato storico-dogmatico sul mistero eucaristico* (Rome, 2006) 52-62.

30 GARCÍA IBÁÑEZ, *L'Eucaristia, dono e mistero*, 58-59, with reference to the Targum of the Pentateuch on Ex 12:42 (“Poem of the Four Nights”).

1:29).³¹ Here it concerns “all the weight of the sin of humanity,”³² as the First Epistle of John also stresses: “... he is the expiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 Jn 2:2). Christ is “the Savior of the world” (Jn 4:42).

III.2. The vicarious expiation of the Servant of God for “the many”

The typology of the paschal lamb is connected in the account of John the Baptist with the figure of the Servant of God, who takes onto himself the punishment “we” have merited for our sins (Is 53:4-8). Here also the talk is of “the many” (*ha rabbim*) or (in the Septuagint) of “many” (without an article in the Greek):

... the righteous one, my servant, [shall] make many to be accounted righteous; and he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore I will divide him a portion with the great ... yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors. (Is 53:11-12)

This prophecy may have influenced the formulation found in Mark and Matthew, according to which the blood of the covenant is shed “for many.”³³ The “many” are the chosen people who, as addressees of salvation, stand in the foreground of Deutero-Isaiah, but probably also the “peoples from afar” (Is 49:1). The Servant of God is the “light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth” (Is 49:6; cf. 42:1, 4, 6-7).³⁴ The “many” who will be made just (Is 53:11) are evidently not all men without distinction, but rather the people of God who stay faithful, to whom also belong many members of all nations.³⁵ The “light” of the salvific offer is universal; the ultimate effect of salvation, however, is particular.

III.3. The analogy with the bilateral covenantal event on Sinai

Besides the typology of the paschal lamb and the Servant of God, a further important element from the Old Testament is the theme of the

31 See J. DE FRAINE, “Lamm Gottes,” in *Biblexikon*, ed. H. Haag, 2nd ed. (Einsiedeln, 1968) 1012-13; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 4th ed., vol. 1, HThK IV/1 (Freiburg i. Br., 1979) 285-89; J. BEUTLER, “Lamm Gottes,” in LThK, 3rd ed., vol. 6 (1997) 623-24.

32 SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1:285.

33 Whether there is a direct influence remains an open question. U. Luz, for example, is skeptical. LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28)*, EEK I/4 (Düsseldorf, 2002) 115-16.

34 See R. M. CAJOT, *Salvation in Deutero-Isaiah* (Rome, 1996) 168-76 (“The Recipient of Salvation”).

35 See PIGULLA, “Das für viele vergossene Blut,” 74-77; PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes*, 98-104.

covenant. In the accounts of the eucharistic institution, one should see also the influence of the making of the covenant on Sinai (Ex 24:1-11) and Jeremiah's promise of a new covenant (Jer 31:31-34). The formula "blood of the covenant" (Mk 14:24; Mt 26:28) refers to the event on Mt Sinai (Ex 24:8).³⁶ The making of this covenant presupposes the consent of the Israelites. After Moses had related to the people "all the words of the Lord and all his ordinances," all Israel answered: "All the words which the LORD has spoken we will do" (Ex 24:3). After the offering of sacrifices, Moses sprinkled the altar and the people with the blood of the victims, with the words: "Behold the blood of the covenant which the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words" (Ex 24:8). In connection with this, the elders of Israel were allowed to see God and participate at a sacred banquet (Ex 24:11).

In contrast to the covenant of God with Abraham, which included an unconditional promise of God to bless in Abraham all the peoples of the earth (Gen 12:1-3), in the covenant of Sinai we have a reciprocal event: the sprinkling with blood presupposes the consent of the Israelites. The Sinaitic covenant is not concluded with all humanity, but rather with the people of God, Israel, even if Israel, beginning with the promise made to Abraham, has the mission to convey the divine blessing to all peoples.

The Old Testament itself already expresses hope for a new covenant. According to the promise of Jeremiah, "Behold, the days are coming" in which God "will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah" (Jer 31:31). In contrast to the covenant of Sinai, which the Israelites have violated, in the new covenant God puts his law within them and writes it "upon their hearts" (Jer 31:32-33). Here also the covenant is made not with all of humanity as such, but rather with those who bear the law of God in their hearts. According to the formulation of Luke and Paul, the eucharistic cup itself is "the new covenant" in the blood of Jesus (Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25).

The reciprocity of this covenantal event, as in the Sinaitic covenant, is presupposed also in the covenantal theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The blood of Christ will "purify your conscience from dead works to serve the living God. Therefore he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called [!] may receive the promised eternal inheritance..." (Heb 9:14-15). Christ has "been offered once to bear the sins of many" (Heb 9:28). By "many" is

³⁶ See, for example, BETZ, *Eucharistie*, 13; more fully PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes*, 91-95. On the topic of the covenant, see Section V.3 below.

evidently meant the called, who are actually to be saved.³⁷ Christ has suffered death “for all” (Heb 2:9), but a little later it is said that God is “bringing many sons to glory” (Heb 2:10).

III.4. The universal salvific will of God and election in the Pauline epistles

The relation between the universal salvific will and election can be studied in the New Testament in a particularly clear way on the basis of Paul’s letters and the writings of John. The clearest affirmations of the universal salvific will of God in the Pauline corpus are found in the First Epistle to Timothy, where mention is made of intercession “for all men” (1 Tm 2:1), because God “desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth” (1 Tm 2:4). “For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all...” (1 Tm 2:5-6). Because here we have mention of “ransom,” the Lord’s own words in Mark 10:45 and Matthew 20:28 (“ransom for many”) are often interpreted as if “for many” means “for all.”³⁸ Even if this is questionable, it is nevertheless true that for Paul the prayer for all men is “founded on a faith in the universal salvific will of God and in the acknowledgment of its historical realization in the self-offering of Jesus *for all humanity*.”³⁹ The universal aspect is somewhat less certain in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: here too it is stressed that Christ has “died for all” (2 Cor 5:14-15) and that in him God “was reconciling the world to himself” (2 Cor 5:19), but the connected phrase, “all have died” (2 Cor 5:14), should be referred to the acceptance of baptism and, therefore, to those who have let themselves be reconciled with God (cf. 2 Cor 5:20). More clear is the hymn to Christ in Ephesians: God wants to unite “all things,” both in heaven and on earth, in Christ (Eph 1:10).

On the one hand, Paul emphasizes the universal salvific will of God; on the other, he offers the clearest biblical testimony for divine election.⁴⁰ God, according to his eternal plan, predestined “those

37 See E. GRÄSSER, *An die Hebräer (Hebr 1-6)*, EEK XVII/1 (Zürich, 1990) 129 (see n. 205 below). On Hebrews see also PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes*, 111-18.

38 So, for example (cautiously), J. GNILKA, *Das Evangelium nach Markus (Mk 8,27-16,20)*, EKK II/2 (Zürich, 1979) 103-104; M. THEOBALD, “‘Pro multis’—Ist Jesus nicht ‘für alle’ gestorben?” in *Gestorben für wen?*, 29-54 at 38.

39 L. OBERLINNER, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, vol. 1, *Kommentar zum Ersten Timotheusbrief*, HThK XI/2,1 (Freiburg i. Br., 1994) 68.

40 See L. SCHEFFCZYK, *Die Heilsverwirklichung in der Gnade. Gnadenlehre*, *Katholische Dogmatik 6* (Aachen, 1998) 214-17.

whom he foreknew... to be conformed to the image of his Son... And those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified" (Rom 8:29-30). The righteousness of God is manifested "for all who believe" (Rom 3:22). God gave up his Son "for us all," that is, for "God's elect" (cf. Rom 8:32-33). The mystery of election, which is not based on our merits, is illustrated with the figures of Jacob and Esau (Rom 9:6-24). Through the blood of Christ, we who have been chosen in Christ have the remission of sins (Eph 1:4, 7). In this view of election, the Church as a whole comes into play: Christ "loved the Church and gave himself up for her" (Eph 5:25). Here too the object of Christ's sacrifice on the cross is formulated in a particular (rather than universal) way: Christ "loved us and gave himself up for us" (Eph. 5:2).

III.5. The sacrifice of Jesus for "the world" and the believers in the Gospel of John

A similar connection between universal offer of salvation and particular election is found in the writings of John.⁴¹ On the one hand, Christ, the Lamb of God, takes away the sins of the world (Jn 1:29). The realization of salvation is however tied to the faith, so that the believers alone can appear as the object of the sacrificial offering of Jesus: "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish, but have eternal life" (Jn 3:16). In this sense, the sacrifice of Jesus is directed to those who are disposed to follow him: "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.... I lay down my life for the sheep" (Jn 10:11, 15).

The particular aspect of the sacrifice of Jesus becomes especially clear in the farewell discourse, which can also be read as theological commentary on the institution narrative (Jn 13-17). Already at the washing of the feet, the distinction is made between the "world" (in the negative sense) and the disciples: "having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end" (Jn 13:1). In the "high priestly prayer" to the Father, Jesus says of himself: "Since thou hast given him power over all flesh, to give eternal life to all whom thou hast given him" (Jn 17:2). "I am praying for them; I am not praying for the world but for those whom thou hast given me, for they are thine" (Jn 17:9). The Lord prays not only for his disciples in the Upper Room, but "also for those who believe in me through their

41 See R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 3rd ed., vol. 2, HThK IV/2 (Freiburg i. Br., 1980) 328-46.

word” (Jn 17:20). Read in this perspective, the synoptic references to the Eucharistic sacrifice of Jesus (“for you” or “for many”) appear likewise as the expression of the love of Jesus for his own, indeed as its highest demonstration.

John does not speak explicitly of the Eucharist in the description of the last meal of Jesus with his disciples, but rather in the speech on the Bread of Life in the Synagogue at Capharnaum. Jesus appeals here to faith as a condition for eternal life (Jn 6:47), but at the same time stresses the universal perspective of the eucharistic offering: “The bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh” (Jn 6:51).⁴² This remark is, in my opinion, the most important biblical evidence that could speak in favor of the universal interpretation of the phrase “for many” in the words of institution of the eucharistic consecration.⁴³

III.6. Universal or particular interpretation of the words “for many”?

It is clear, however, that in the context of the Last Supper both a universal and a particular interpretation of the words “for many” are possible. There are arguments for both interpretations. John’s discourse on the bread of life and the reference in Second Timothy to the sacrifice of Jesus as a ransom “for all” especially speak in favor of the universal interpretation. In favor of the particular interpretation, referring to the believing people of God, are the context of the paschal meal, the parallel with the making of the Sinaitic covenant, and the fulfillment of the prophecy of Jeremiah, according to which the new covenant presupposes a conversion of heart. In any case, for the theological interpretation both perspectives should be harmonized: the eucharistic offering of Jesus is directed—as an offer of salvation—to all men, but is realized—as a covenantal event—only in those who, according to the eternal plan of God, have been chosen and in living faith accept such a gift. When Jesus speaks of the “blood of the covenant,” then presumably the second perspective should stand in the foreground.

⁴² On the eucharistic character of the passage, see SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 2:83-84.

⁴³ In this sense, e.g., JEREMIAS, *Abendmahls Worte*, 101-102, 221; idem, “πολλοί”, 544 (see n. 11 above). Proisinger observes in contrast: “We find ourselves in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, and the expressions about the gift of bread or flesh refer to the future, that is, [unlike the accounts in the Synoptics and Paul, we are] not yet at the actual eucharistic participation in the closed circle after the opening to the world has been completed.” *Das Blut des Bundes*, 88.

IV. THE TESTIMONY OF TRADITION

A proper understanding of the biblical witness should not be wholly dependent on present-day exegesis, but should also consider how the words of the eucharistic institution have been understood and received in the Church's Tradition. Rather than beginning only with the contributions of a twentieth-century Protestant scholar, a balanced interpretation should take into account all the most important positions taken during the Church's history, positions that begin to appear already in the period of the Fathers. An exact and thorough examination of the Tradition on this theme is a task that demands further study.⁴⁴ Here we can only sketch some general features.

IV.1. *The Patristic era*

There are some recent works that significantly facilitate research on the patristic period. Notable for our purposes are collections of the most important patristic texts on the Eucharist,⁴⁵ and the *Biblia patristica*, which collects the citations and allusions to Sacred Scripture in the sources of the ancient Church.⁴⁶ Meriting special attention of course

44 The most thorough study known to me comes from a teacher of philosophy and appeared in an obscure journal maintaining sedevacantist views (according to which there has not been a legitimate pope since Pius XII). His philological studies on the theologians of the patristic era and Middle Ages are worthy of note, even if his judgment on ecclesiastical politics errs: F. BADER, "Die Verfälschung der Wandlungsworte im *Novus Ordo Missae*," in *Einsicht* 1.2 (May 1971) 36-42; 1.3 (June 1971) 49-53; 1.5 (August 1971) 40-44; 1.6 (September 1971) 32-42; 1.7 (October 1971) 39-43; 1.11 (February 1972) 34-51; 2.1 (April 1972) 27-35; 2.2 (May 1972) 12-16; 2.3 (June 1972) 5-12; 2.6 (September 1972) 15-18. The unfinished series of articles reaches to St Thomas Aquinas; the notice "continuation follows" finds no subsequent realization. Some of Bader's testimonies are reported again in WILDFEUER, "Treue zum Testament des Herrn," 32-39. See also the independent references in PIGULLA, "Das für viele vergossene Blut," *passim*. Greatly to be desired is a thorough study of commentaries on Matthew (and Mark) and of the liturgical and systematic works on the Eucharist. A noteworthy listing of the older commentaries on Matthew (up to 1800) is found in U. LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)*, 5th ed., EKK I/1 (Düsseldorf, 2002) 2-6.

45 Especially *Biblioteca Patristica eucharistica*, ed. G. di Nola, 4 vols (Vatican City, 1997-2000) [Vol. 1 (1997): John Chrysostom; Vol. 2 (1997): Augustine; Vol. 3 (2000): 1st-4th cent., from Clement of Rome to Athanasius; Vol. 4 [2000]: 1st-4th cent., from Afrhat to Didymus]. On the patristic doctrine of the Eucharist, see esp. J. BETZ, *Eucharistie. In der Schrift und Patristik* (Freiburg i. Br., 1979).

46 J. ALLENBACH, *Biblia patristica. Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, 7 vols (Paris, 1975-2000) [Vol. 1 (1975): Begin-

are citations of the eucharistic texts with the words “for many” (i.e., Mk 14:24 and, in particular, Mt 26:28), but also similar passages according to which the Son of Man gives his life as ransom “for many” (Mk 10:45 and, especially, Mt 20:28).⁴⁷ Occasionally instructive as well are the commentaries on Isaiah 53:11-12 (the expiatory sacrifice of the Servant of God “for many”), and on Hebrews 9:28 (the sacrifice of Christ for the sins of “many”).

IV.1.1. *The Greek Church*

A first look is owed to the Eastern Fathers and ecclesiastical writers who, in contrast to present-day exegetes, grew up with Greek, the ancient tongue in which the New Testament was written. Whereas the “lexographical feats” of Jeremias have been described by a classical philologist as exhibiting almost every methodological error possible,⁴⁸ the interpretations found in the patristic era may enable us to draw closer to the source.

The first explicit interpretation that analyzes the “for many” in the words of the Lord at the Last Supper comes from the Alexandrian ecclesiastical writer Origen in the third century.⁴⁹ Origen is the classical representative of a “hope for the salvation of all,” and therefore not subject to any suspicion of wanting to limit in any way

nings to Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian; Vol. 2 (1977): Third century except Origen; Vol. 3 (1981): Origen; Vol. 4 (1987): Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius; Vol. 5 (1991): The Cappadocian Fathers: Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Amphilochius; Vol. 6 (1995): Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster; Vol. 7 (2000): Didymus]. To date, Augustine and Jerome are still lacking, but exegetical indices to both authors are found, for example, in the relevant volumes of the CSEL and CChr.SL series, as well as (for Augustine) in the now-complete bilingual edition Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana.

47 For the ancient and medieval commentaries on Matthew and Mark, see: J. KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Evangelium sec. Matthaeum*, 3rd ed., vol. 1 (Paris, 1922) 62-65; idem, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1907) 20-21; E. ROMERO POSE, “Matteo (vangelo),” in *Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane*, ed. A. di Berardino, vol. 2 (Genoa, 1984) 2190-92 [Eng.: *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford, vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 543]; E. ROMERO POSE, G. PILARA, “Matteo (vangelo),” in *Nuovo Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane*, ed. A. di Berardino, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (Genoa, 2007) 3158-60; C. CURTI, M. A. BARBARA, “Catene esegetiche greche,” in *Patrologia*, ed. A. di Berardino, vol. 5 (Genoa, 2000) 611-55 (esp. 646-50); H. RIEDLINGER ET AL., “Bibel,” in LM, vol. 2 (1999) 41-75 (esp. 47-68); U. LUZ, *Mt 1-7*, 2-6.

48 WICK, “Es ist an der Zeit,” 12; See idem, “Eine vatikanische Korrektur,” 8-9.

49 See BADER, “Wandlungsworte,” *Einsicht* 1.6 (1971) 41-42.

the universal offer of salvation effected by Christ's sacrifice. Christ, "inasmuch as it depends on him, has left no one without a share in his mysteries."⁵⁰ However, he knew from the beginning who among the pagans and the Jews would believe in him.⁵¹ Origen interprets the passage according to which the Son of Man gave his life as a ransom for many (Mt 28:20; cf. Mk 10:45) in view of the salvific efficacy of his sacrifice for believers: Jesus came "to the human race to serve, and in service of our salvation went so far as to *give his own soul as a ransom for many* who believe in him. And, if one could assume that all would believe in him, then one could say that he *gave his soul as a ransom for all*."⁵² The Alexandrian theologian also reads Matthew's account of the Last Supper from this perspective: the "covenant of God has been founded in the blood of the suffering that Christ endured for us, so that we, believing in the Son of God who was born in the flesh and suffered, will be saved."⁵³ The efficacy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is at the same time connected with the participation of the believer at Communion: "If ... *the blood of the covenant for the forgiveness of our sins* has been poured into our hearts, because the drinkable blood is poured into our hearts, all the sins that we have committed earlier will be removed and cancelled."⁵⁴

While Origen thus refers the eucharistic *pro multis* to the believers, Apollinaris of Laodicea and Victor of Antioch interpret it in the sense of the universal offer of salvation. Apollinaris of Laodicea (ca. 315-392) reads the "for many" in the sense of "for all," with recourse to Rm 5:18-19: the justification of "all" is apparently read as universal offer of salvation. In the same context there is an allusion to the Johannine formula according to which in the eucharistic Bread Christ offers his flesh "for the life of the world" (Jn 6:51).⁵⁵ The Apollinar-

50 ORIGEN, *Contra Celsum* 7.41 (SC 150.110)

51 ORIGEN, *In Mt. series* 92 (PG 13.1743b; cf. GCS 38) (Commentary on the scene at the Mount of Olives).

52 ORIGEN, *Comm. in Mt.* 16.8 (PG 13.1397a; cf. GCS 40) (the text is transmitted in Greek).

53 ORIGEN, *In Mt. series* 85 (PG 13.1735a; cf. GCS 38): "testamentum Dei in sanguine passionis Christi positum est ad nos, ut credentes filium Dei natum et passum secundum carnem salvi efficiamur...."

54 ORIGEN, *In Mt. series* 86 (PG 13.1735c-d; cf. GCS 38). Notable here is the interpretation of the presence of the Word, of the sacramental blood of Christ "being shed" in the Holy Sacrifice. In this way the words of institution in the New Testament are interpreted recently by N. BAUMERT AND M.-I. SEEWANN, "Eucharistie ‚für alle‘ oder ‚für viele‘?" *Gregorianum* 89 (2008) 501-32.

55 See APOLLINARIS OF LAODICEA, Fragment 134, on Mt 26:26-28 (TU 61, 46): "saying that the blood is shed 'for many,' he says, 'for all,' because

ian interpretation is taken up literally in an ancient catena (4th-6th centuries) to the Gospel of Mark, transmitted under the name of Victor of Antioch: "While he [Jesus] says that he sheds his blood for many, he says all, for all are many, as also Paul, who shows that through one the many are justified."⁵⁶

More important for his theological value is John Chrysostom, who in the Greek Church provides the eucharistic doctrine richest in content and therefore bears the honorific title, "Doctor Eucharisticus."⁵⁷ The Antiochene Father insists forcefully that the Body of Christ "has been broken in an equal manner for all and offered up for all without distinction."⁵⁸ Chrysostom compares the shedding of the blood on the cross, which he illustrates with the words of institution according to Matthew (Mt 26:28: "for many"), with the blood on the doorposts for the salvation of the firstborn Israelites in Egypt: "There the blood was shed for the salvation of the first-born; my blood however is shed for the forgiveness of the sins of the whole world."⁵⁹ The opinion according to which Judas was still present at the Last Supper could also speak for a universal interpretation of the "for many."⁶⁰ Granted, the meaning of the "for many" in Matthew 20:28 and 26:28 is not taken up explicitly as a theme in Chrysostom, although Theophylact,

through one the many are justified [cf. Rm 5:18-19]" (= *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Kettenhandschriften gesammelt*, ed. J. Reuss, TU 61 [Berlin, 1957] 46). Regarding the exegetical interpretation of Romans 5 in this context, see PROSINGER, *Blut des Bundes*, 104-107.

56 *Catena in Evangelia S. Matthaei et S. Marci ad fidem. codd. mss.*, Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum 1, ed. J. A. Cramer (Oxford, 1840; repr. Hildesheim, 1967) 423. On the Catena and its compiler, see *ibid.*, xxvi-xxviii; *Patrologia*, ed. A. di Berardino, 5:224-25 (Victor of Antioch, 5th-6th cent.), 5:647-49 (catena on Mark); T. FUHRER, "Victor von Antiochien," in LACL, 716.

57 See A. NAEGLE, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus, des Doctor Eucharistiae* (Freiburg i. Br., 1900); J. BETZ, *Eucharistie*, 101-104; F. HOLBÖCK, *Das Allerheiligste und die Heiligen*, 2nd ed. (Stein am Rhein, 1986) 50-53; *Biblioteca*, ed. G. di Nola, vol. 1.

58 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom. in 1 Cor.* 27.4 (on 1 Cor 11:24) (PG 61.229).

59 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom. in Mt.* 82.1 (PG 58.739). More texts in NAEGLE, *Eucharistielehre*, 201.

60 See JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom. in Mt.* 82.1 (PG 58.737) and elsewhere; *Biblioteca*, ed. G. di Nola, 1:399 (index). The evidence of the Gospel of John, which is the most precise regarding historical events, speaks against Judas at Communion: he left the room before the main meal (cf. Jn 13:30). On the question of the "Communion of Judas," see J. BLINZLER, "Judas Iskarioth," LThK, 2nd ed., vol. 5 (1960) 1152-54; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 3rd ed., vol. 3, HThK IV/3 (Freiburg i. Br., 1979) 35.

a Byzantine author of the eleventh century, refers to the Antiochene Father in his own interpretation of Matthew 20:28, according to which “many” here means “all.”⁶¹ But perhaps he has mistakenly attributed Apollinaris’ comment to Chrysostom.

The interpretation of Chrysostom and/or Apollinaris is followed in the Byzantine Middle Ages by Theophylact⁶² and Euthymius Zigabenus (twelfth century). Euthymius, however, also adds the alternative interpretation, according to which “for many” refers to those “who from all are saved and for whom Christ died.”⁶³ According to Bader, John Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euthymius are “the only ones” who interpret, in the “examination of almost all the received commentaries on the Institution narratives from the patristic era and Middle Ages, ... the ‘for many’ in a universal sense.”⁶⁴ This result must be regarded as in need of revision, inasmuch as the universal interpretation of “for many” in Matthew 26:28 is found, as we have seen, in Apollinaris of Laodicea as well, whereas Chrysostom suggests such an interpretation, but not explicitly.

The interpretation of the “for many” in the sense of the universal offer of salvation is not, however, understood by Chrysostom as entailing an outcome of universal salvation. This is clear from his interpretation of Hebrews 9:28, according to which Christ has taken upon himself the sins of “many”:

Why of many and not of all? Because not all have believed. Certainly he died for all, so that he could save all, as regards him: his death [for all] corresponds to the ruin of all. However, he does not take away and cancel the sins of all, because they themselves have not wanted it.”⁶⁵

The testimony of the Greek tradition is therefore not clear-cut. The only authors in the ancient Greek Church who explicitly offer

61 THEOPHYLACT, *In Hebr.* 9:28 (PG 125.316d).

62 THEOPHYLACT, *In Mt.* 20:28, 26:28 (PG 123.365b; 444b), according to which “for many” means “for all.”

63 EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *In Mt.* 26:28 (PG 129.668b); cf. *In Mt.* 20:28 (PG 129.544d).

64 BADER, “Wandlungsworte,” *Einsicht* 1.11 (1972) 49.

65 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM *In Hebr.* 9:28 (PG 63.129). Wildfeuer (“Treue zum Testament,” 34) cites this passage as a testimony to the Tradition in the interpretation of the “for many” in the Institution, but he forgets the contrary expressions of the Church Father in his interpretation of the Last Supper. Chrysostom’s interpretation of Heb 9:28 is followed by PSEUDO-OECUMENIUS *In Hebr.* 9:24-28 (PG 119.384b); THEOPHYLACT *In Hebr.* 9:28 (PG 125.316d).

an interpretation of the “for many” in the Last Supper, even if very concisely, are Origen and Apollinaris. Alongside the Origenist interpretation, which refers the “for many” to the believers with whom the covenant is made, exists the Apollinaris-Chrysostom strand, according to which the *pro multis* refers to the universal offer of salvation, undoubtedly not accepted by all men.

IV.1.2. *The Latin Church*

While the testimonies of the Orient remain rather fragmentary, one finds in the Occident a systematic interpretation that continues in the tradition of Origen. The most influential testimony in its favor comes from St Jerome, the most learned biblical scholar among the Latin Church Fathers. Jerome interprets the statement in the fourth song of the Servant of God in the book of Isaiah, according to which the Servant of God will justify “the many” and take upon himself our iniquity (Is 53:11), in the sense of the efficacy of salvation: the Servant of God “will justify, from all the earth, many who believe.”⁶⁶ With that he thinks of the “many” who, according to the Gospel of Matthew, come from the East and the West and will participate at the final banquet in the Kingdom of God (cf. Mt 8:11). Objectively, Jerome would appear to be right: probably the talk in Isaiah 53:11 is of the “people of God effectively saved.... If therefore Jesus with his words over the cup has alluded to the prophecy of the Servant of God, one can suppose that he has used the word *many* in the same sense.”⁶⁷

The Commentary on Matthew is “the last New Testament interpretive writing that Jerome produced.”⁶⁸ The prologue attests a familiarity with earlier commentaries, some of which are no longer extant.⁶⁹ Among the older writers mentioned, Jerome also makes explicit reference to Apollinaris.⁷⁰ Concerning our theme, however, he does not adopt the opinion of Apollinaris, but that of Origen, whom he uses widely, although not without certain critical reservations.⁷¹ Jerome does not occupy himself with the *pro multis* in Matthew’s account of the Institution (Mt 26:28), but with the “ransom for many” (Mt 20:28): the Son of God “has assumed the form of a servant, in

66 JEROME, *In Is.* 53:10-11 (PL 24.511d; CChr.SL 73A.595).

67 FIGULLA, “Das für viele vergossene Blut,” 77 (cf. 75-76 on Jerome).

68 G. GRÜTZMACHER, *Hieronymus* (Leipzig, 1908) 2:244.

69 See JEROME, *Commentariorum in Matheum, praefatio* (PL 26.20b; CChr. SL 77.4-5).

70 Commenting on Mt 26:38: see GRÜTZMACHER, *Hieronymus*, 2:246. See D. HURST, M. ADRIAEN, “Praefatio,” CChr.SL 77 (1969) V-IX at V.

71 See GRÜTZMACHER, *Hieronymus*, 2:247-248.

order that he shed his blood for the world. He does not say that he offers his life as a ransom for all, but rather for many, that is to say for those who want to believe.⁷² To the “peoples who have believed” Jerome also refers to the promise of Jesus according to which “many” from the East and the West will come and take part in the joy of the kingdom of heaven (Mt 8:11).⁷³

An immense influence was to await St Augustine, even if he does not take a position on the interpretation of the *pro multis* in the words of institution. His doctrine on grace, which influences also the interpretation of the Eucharist, is undoubtedly authoritative. The most renowned Father of the Church does not deny, as is sometimes claimed, God’s general will of salvation:⁷⁴ Christ’s blood has been shed for the forgiveness of the sins of all.⁷⁵ The Bishop of Hippo certainly underlines most clearly the significance of predestination, in which the divine prescience and the divine operation of grace are bound up with each other.⁷⁶ In this sense especially does he treat the Johannine farewell discourse. Augustine stresses, for example (with John’s Gospel), that the Lord at the Last Supper prays for his Apostles and for all those who believe through their testimony.⁷⁷ “Through the faith in Christ, founded on his death and resurrection; through his blood, which is shed for the remission of sins, multitudes of believers are delivered from the domination of the Devil....”⁷⁸

72 JEROME, *In Mt.* 20.28 (PL 26.150b-c; CChr.SL 77.180).

73 JEROME, *In Mt.* 8.11 (PL 26.52a; CChr.SL 77.50). See BADER, “Wandlungsworte,” *Einsicht* 2.1 (1972) 29-30.

74 That the denial of God’s general will of salvation cannot be ascribed to Augustine himself is stressed by, for example, A. TRAPÈ, *Introduzione generale*, in Sant’Agostino, *Grazia e libertà*, Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana 20 (Rome, 1987) IX-CCIII at CXXVI-CXCII. The later predestinarianism surely found support in certain statements of the late Augustine himself, especially his restrictive interpretation of 1 Tim 2:6 (on the sacrifice of Jesus as ransom for all). But the (questionable) exegesis of the late Augustine certainly does not annul the other clear (and likewise late) statements concerning God’s general will of salvation, for example in *Contra Julianum* 6.4.8, with reference to 2 Cor 5:14. See Trapè, CLIII-CLIV.

75 AUGUSTINE, *In Joh. Tract.* 92.1 (CChr.SL 36.556): “Christi enim sanguis sic in remissionem peccatorum omnium fusus est, ut ipsum etiam peccatum posset delere quo fusus est.”

76 See AUGUSTINE, *De dono perseverantiae* 14.35: “Haec est praedestinatio sanctorum, nihil aliud: praesentia scilicet, et praeparatio beneficiorum Dei ...” (PL 45.1014).

77 See AUGUSTINE, *In Joh. Tract.* 109.5 (CChr.SL 36.621), with reference to Jn 17:20.

78 AUGUSTINE, *In Joh. Tract.* 52.6 (CChr.SL 36.448).

We do see a denial of the universal salvific will of God at the end of the fifth century in Gaul in the work of the presbyter Lucidus. His opinion that Christ came only for those who would believe in him is grounded on three biblical passages, among them the words of Institution according to Matthew (Mt 20:28; 26:28; Heb 9:28).⁷⁹ Threatened with excommunication by the bishop Faustus of Riez,⁸⁰ Lucidus retracts his error: as to what depends on Christ himself, he has sacrificed his life for all; he came also for the reprobate, who are lost of their own will.⁸¹ Lucidus retracts his opinions at the Second Synod of Lyons (474).⁸²

Prosper of Aquitaine (died after 455)⁸³ and Fulgentius of Ruspe (ca. 468-533) are important in the fifth century for the transmission of the Augustinian intellectual patrimony. Prosper writes a treatise on the very subject of the universal call to salvation⁸⁴ and formulates an important distinction: according to the greatness and power of the price (*pretium*) the blood of Christ is the redemption of the whole world, but he who dies without faith and baptism is foreign to the redemption. The drink of immortality has in itself the power to help all; it is effective, however, only if it is drunk.⁸⁵ In this sense he “has been crucified only for those to who put his death to use.”⁸⁶ Fulgentius of Ruspe connects the passage of the ransom “for many” (Mt 20:28) with the reference to the “holy family” of the people of God, the “sheep” of the believing “flock” that is redeemed by the Precious Blood of the Lord.⁸⁷

An important role for the mediation of the patristic inheritance to the Middle Ages is played by St Isidore of Seville (ca. 560-636). He compares the blood of the covenant with which Moses sprinkled the people of God (Ex 24:8) with the blood of Jesus, which purifies

79 See LUCIDUS, *Exemplar libelli pristinas errores revocantis* (PL 53.684c).

80 FAUSTUS OF RIEZ, *Epistula ad Lucidum Praedestinatum, ut errores suos revocet* (PG 53.687c): “Anathema illi qui dixerit quod Christus non pro omnibus mortuus sit, nec omnes homines salvos esse velit.”

81 See LUCIDUS *Exemplar libelli pristinas errores revocantis* (PL 53.684b-c).

82 See C. KASPER, “Lucidus,” in LACL, 463-64. See already the Synod of Arles (473): among the condemned opinions was the thesis “that Christ, our Lord and Savior, did not incur death for the salvation of all” (DH 332).

83 See W. GEERLINGS, “Prosper Tiro von Aquitanien,” in LACL, 596-97.

84 PROSPER OF AQUITAINE, *De vocatione gentium* (PL 51.647-722).

85 PROSPER OF AQUITANE, *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianorum* 1 (PL 51.177b-179a).

86 PROSPER OF AQUITANE, *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumniantium* 1.9 (PL 51.165b).

87 See FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE, *Sermo* 1.2 (CChr.SL 91b, 890).

the hearts of all believers in conformity with the word of the Lord, according to which the blood of the new covenant was shed “for many.”⁸⁸

IV.2. *The testimony of the oldest liturgies*

An important part of Tradition is found in the liturgical texts. The *hyper pollōn* of the words of institution of Jesus has never been translated as “for all,” but always as “for many.”⁸⁹ “Even liturgical texts should cite correctly and not put into the mouth of the Lord an ‘all’ which He did not say and, according to the opinion of eminent theologians *ibi et nunc*, did not think either.”⁹⁰

Undoubtedly worthy of note, however, is the fact that the Johannine formulation of the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross “for the life of the world” (cf. Jn 6:51) and the reference to the blood of the covenant “for many” can stand together in some Eucharistic Prayers. In the East Syrian or Chaldean anaphora of Theodorus (Theodore of Mopsuestia), for example, it reads: “This is my body, which is broken for the life of the world for the forgiveness of sins.”⁹¹ The Liturgy of St Basil carries the formulation “for you and for many.” It adds, however, after the epiclesis over the chalice: the Precious Blood has been “shed for the life of the world.”⁹² In the Roman Canon (both in the 1570 Missal “of St Pius V” and in the 1970 Missal “of Paul VI”) for every Holy Thursday, immediately before the consecration of the bread, it is emphasized that Christ, “before he suffered for the salvation of us and of all,” performed the Eucharistic Sacrifice (*Qui pridie, quam pro nostra omniumque salute pateretur, hoc est hodie, accepit panem...*). The sacrifice of the Cross therefore took place, even according to the 1570 Missal, “for us and for all.” The aforementioned addition to the *Qui*

88 ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *Questiones in V. T.: In Exodum* 58.3 (PL 83.318c).

89 See, for example, besides the letter of Cardinal Arinze, the remarks of the liturgical scholar K. GAMBER, “Die Übersetzung ‘für euch und für alle’ im neuen deutschen Missale,” in *Kult und Mysterium. Das Liturgieverständnis der frühen, ungeteilten Christenheit* (Regensburg, 1983) 63-67, 77-78 at 64; so too J. BEUMER, “Die eucharistischen Konsekrationsworte,” 228. An anthology of the most important ancient sources is found in *Præx Eucharistica*, eds A. Hänggi and I. Pahl, vol. 1: *Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti*, 3rd ed., Spicilegium Friburgense 12 (Fribourg, 1998). See also C. GIRAUDDO, “La formula ‘pro vobis et pro multis’ del racconto istituzionale. La recezione liturgica di un dato scritturistico alla luce delle anafore d’Oriente e d’Occidente,” *Rivista liturgica* 94 (2007) 257-84 at 266-79.

90 FIGULLA, “Das für viele vergossene Blut,” 81.

91 *Præx Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 383.

92 See *Præx Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 237. See also the indications in FIGULLA, “Das für viele vergossene Blut,” 81, n. 25.

pridie belongs in the Ambrosian Rite to the ordinary part of the text,⁹³ it probably goes back to the fifth century, to combat predestinarianism (according to which Christ suffered only for the elect); later it disappeared again, save for the Mass of Holy Thursday.⁹⁴ One could also point out, again in the Roman Missal of 1570, the prayer of the priest at the offering of the chalice: “We offer to you, Lord, the cup of salvation... for our salvation and that of the entire world... [*pro nostra et totius mundi salute...*].”⁹⁵

To illuminate more closely the connection between the universal will of salvation and the particular realization of salvation, let us examine by way of example some Eucharistic Prayers,⁹⁶ starting with one of the most ancient extant texts, the Eucharistic Prayer in the *Traditio Apostolica* of St Hippolytus (beginning of the third century).⁹⁷ In the authentic Preface of Hippolytus it reads: “He who wanted to fulfill your will and win for you a holy people, in his Passion spread out his hands, in order to liberate from suffering those who have believed in you.”⁹⁸ The final goal of the Passion of Christ, which is present in the Holy Sacrifice, is therefore the winning of a “holy people” whose membership is circumscribed by the faith. In the formula over the chalice the Pauline-Lucan version of the words of institution is used (“shed for you”; in parallel with “my body... broken for you”).⁹⁹ Their

93 So already in the “Missa canonica”: *Præ Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 450. Cf. J. A. JUNGSMANN, *Missarum Sollemnia*, 5th ed. (Vienna, 1962) 2:247 [Eng.: *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* (Missarum Sollemnia), trans. Francis A. Brunner, vol. 2 (New York: Benziger, 1955) 197-98].

94 J. BRINKTRINE, *Die heilige Messe*, 3rd ed. (Paderborn, 1950) 200-201.

95 This point, little noticed in the relevant literature, is recalled by H.-L. BARTH, “Die Liebe Christi drängt uns” (2 Kor 5,14) - Aufsätze zur Kirchenkrise und zu ihrer Überwindung, 2nd ed. (Rupperichterth, 2005) 57, n. 12.

96 On the Eucharistic Prayers in the ancient Church, see F. HAMM, *Die liturgischen Einsetzungsberichte im Sinne vergleichender Liturgieforschung untersucht*, LQF 23 (Münster, 1928); H. B. MEYER, *Eucharistie. Geschichte, Theologie, Pastoral*, Gottesdienst der Kirche 4 (Regensburg, 1989) 90-115, 130-182; V. RAFFA, *Liturgia eucaristica. Mistagogia della Messa: dalla storia e dalla teologia alla pastorale pratica* (Rome, 1998), 497-598; GARCÍA IBÁÑEZ, *L'Eucaristia, dono e mistero*, 113-19, 136-50.

97 For details see J. M. HANSENS, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte. Documents et études* (Rome, 1970); MEYER, *Eucharistie*, 104-107; RAFFA, *Liturgia eucaristica*, 512-523; GARCÍA IBÁÑEZ, *L'Eucaristia, dono e mistero*, 113-117. See also BARTH, *Die Mär vom antiken Kanon des Hippolytos. Untersuchungen zur Liturgiereform* (Cologne, 1999) (for a comparison with the present Second Eucharistic Prayer).

98 HIPPLYUS, *Traditio apostolica* 4 (FC 1.224-225).

99 Ibid. (FC 1.226-227).

significance is emphasized in the description of the liturgy of initiation: the bishop must give thanks “over the chalice with mixed wine as a figure of the blood that is shed for all those who believe in him”¹⁰⁰(!). Were the present-day Eucharistic Prayer II on these points to follow St Hippolytus (whom its architects invoked),¹⁰¹ the discussion about the meaning of the *pro multis* would presumably be less heated.

The most important Eucharistic Prayer in the West is without doubt the Roman Canon, which took shape between the fourth and seventh centuries. From the time of Pope St Gregory the Great (reigned 590-604) it has not undergone substantial modifications.¹⁰² The first verse of the Canon, *Te igitur*, prays “first of all ... for your holy catholic Church.” In the *Memento* of the living the importance of the faith for the reception of the fruits of salvation is highlighted. The prayer *Hanc igitur* requests that those reciting it be renewed “in the flock of your elect.” In the consecration of the chalice we see the joining of the tradition of Mark and Matthew (“for many”) with that of Paul and Luke (“for you”): “*pro vobis et pro multis effundetur.*” The Church as subject and (preeminent) object of the prayer is shown also in the prayer for the deceased who “have preceded us in the sign of the faith.” The universal aspect, going beyond the Church, is evident in the formulation “first of all” (*in primis*) but also (as already mentioned) in the offering of the chalice “for our salvation and that of the whole world.”

The liturgy of the Christian East that has been received most widely up to the present day bears the name of St John Chrysostom. It belongs to the West Syrian or Antiochene liturgical family; the anaphora goes back in its fundamental content to the fourth and fifth centuries.¹⁰³ The first clear declaration regarding our topic, between the *Sanctus* and the words of institution, has a Johannine flavor: “So much have you loved your world, that you gave your Only-begotten Son, so that every one who believes in him should not be lost, but have eternal life” (cf. Jn 3:16). Soon after, the night is recalled on

100 HIPPOLYTUS, *Traditio apostolica* 21 (FC 1.226-227).

101 See MEYER, *Eucharistie*, 350.

102 On the Roman Canon see BRINKTRINE, *Die heilige Messe*, 184-281; RAFFA, *Liturgia eucaristica*, 545-98; MEYER, *Eucharistie*, 179-81; GARCÍA IBÁÑEZ, *L'Eucaristia, dono e mistero*, 145-49.

103 See SCHULZ, *Die byzantinische Liturgie. Glaubenszeugnis und Symbolgestalt*, 2nd ed. (Trier, 1980), esp. 26*-33*, 24-28; MEYER, *Eucharistie*, 139-141; GARCÍA IBÁÑEZ, *L'Eucaristia, dono e mistero*, 141-143; the text of the anaphora in *Præx Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 224-29. German translation in S. HEITZ, *Mysterium der Anbetung. Göttliche Liturgie und Stundengebet der Orthodoxen Kirche* (Cologne, 1986) 372-80.

which he “gave himself over for the life of the world” (cf. Jn 6:51).¹⁰⁴ The Passion of Christ therefore applies to the whole world, while its effect is acquired through faith. In the words of institution over the bread it is a matter of the Body of Christ “that is broken for the forgiveness of sins;” similarly, in the Roman Canon, it is said over the chalice: “For this is the chalice of my Blood, the Blood of the new and eternal covenant, which will be poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins” (“HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI NOVI ET AETERNI TESTAMENTI, QUI PRO VOBIS ET PRO MULTIS EFFUNDETUR IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM”).¹⁰⁵

After the prayer of consecration formulated in the epiclesis, the aim of the consecrated gifts is indicated: “so that those who participate may turn to the purification of the soul, the remission of sins, the communion of the Holy Spirit, the fullness of the Kingdom of Heaven and unimpeded access to You, not however to judgment or to damnation.” What is emphasized therefore is the effect of the Eucharist on those who participate at the Divine Liturgy. The prayer for the deceased is likewise concentrated on the believers, those “who repose in the faith;” but the Sacrifice is offered “also for the whole world, for the holy ... Church, for all, who lead a pure and honest life, for those who have responsibility in the State....” At the center therefore stand the believers, but at the same time the prayer opens to the whole world. The relation between universal and particular orientation is thus presented in a way similar to that found in the Roman Canon. Further study of the ancient Eucharistic Prayers should lead in the same direction.¹⁰⁶

It is interesting that, frequently, immediately before the institution narrative the universal aim of Jesus’ sacrifice is mentioned. So at least since the fourth century in the Alexandrian anaphora of St Mark, according to which Christ on that night “handed himself over

104 The phrase “for the life of the world” is lacking in the manuscript reported in *Prex Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 226. It is found, however, in the more ancient anaphora of St Basil: cf. *Prex Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 234.

105 *Ed.: Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2002) p. 575 (with capitalization); trans. International Committee on English in the Liturgy, *The Order of Mass I* (2006), at <www.usccb.org/romanmissal>. Cf. the Roman Missal of 1962 (and earlier): “Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.”

106 See, for example, the indications in HAMM, *Die liturgischen Einsetzungsberichte*, 85 (the addressees of the words of the Lord in the Eucharistic Prayers).

for our sins, and in the flesh took upon himself death for all.”¹⁰⁷ According to the Liturgy of St Basil and the (later) Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, Christ handed himself over “for the life of the world.”¹⁰⁸ In the Antiochene region it reads sometimes at the same place, “for the life and the salvation of the world.”¹⁰⁹ The last reference comes even at the words over the bread in the East Syrian anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia: “This is my body, which is broken for the life of the world and for the forgiveness of sins.” But no one seems to have dared to change the words of Jesus over the chalice. Thus, even in the just-mentioned East Syrian anaphora: “This is my blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins.”¹¹⁰ In the Ethiopian milieu, on the other hand, occasionally the words over the chalice are amplified in a universalistic sense. Thus in the (difficult to locate chronologically) anaphora of St Cyril of Alexandria: “This chalice is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the redemption of the whole world, and through which sins are forgiven.”¹¹¹ Similar is the West Syrian anaphora of St Ignatius of Antioch: “This is my Blood, which I give for the life of the world, but [which] prepares you and many for the forgiveness of sins and for eternal life.”¹¹²

Sometimes the particular scope of the word “many” is highlighted in an explanatory way. In the Syrian anaphora known under the name of Cyril of Alexandria (or of Jerusalem) it says, for example: “This is my Body, which prepares you and many believers for eternal life.—This is my Blood, which indicates and confirms the testament of my death, and which prepares you and many believers for eternal life.”¹¹³ The recipients of the Eucharist are considered concretely, so for example in the West Syrian anaphora of St Eustatius: “This is my Blood, which prepares you and all the believers who receive it for eternal life.”¹¹⁴ This can also be the case for the words over the

107 *Præx Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 112, 120; MEYER, *Eucharistie*, 146.

108 *Præx Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 234.

109 *Ibid.*, 270 (anaphora of James the brother of the Lord), 278 (anaphora of St Timothy, Pope of Alexandria), 304 (anaphora of St Julius, Pope of Rome).

110 *Ibid.*, 383.

111 *Ibid.*, 197. A similar amplification exists for the words over the bread in an Ethiopian Marian anaphora: *Ibid.*, 166. The oldest relevant manuscripts date back only to the fifteenth century: see MEYER, *Eucharistie*, 146-47.

112 *Præx Eucharistica*, eds Hänggi and Pahl, 289.

113 *Ibid.*, 286.

114 *Ibid.*, 307.

bread: "This is my Body, which is broken and given for you, for the forgiveness of all believers...."¹¹⁵

IV.3. *The Carolingian era as a period of theological clarification*

More detailed expositions are found first in the period of the Carolingians. In this age of fruitful reception of the Fathers of the Church, a theological clarification is prepared that will enter into the Roman Catechism of Pope St Pius V (1566). The decisive catalyst for making the pertinent distinctions was the controversy over predestination.

The exegetical expositions of Matthew 20:28 and 26:28 depend as a rule on the thought of Jerome. This is true already for the ample commentary on Matthew by Hrabanus Maurus (780-856), to whom the modern age adds the title of *Præceptor Germaniae*.¹¹⁶ Concerning the *pro multis*, he (like Jerome himself) does not approach it when dealing with the Last Supper, but rather in commenting on the words of the ransom (Mt 20:28).¹¹⁷ St Paschasius Radbertus (ca. 780-859) expresses himself in the same sense: "He did not say 'for all' but 'for many.' Although he suffered for all in order to grant forgiveness, nevertheless not all have received it completely," as for example Judas, who heard these words.¹¹⁸ In the important work of Paschasius on the Eucharist, one finds also a connection of the exegesis of Jerome on Matthew 20:28 with the Gospel accounts of the Last Supper. He compares the formulations "for you" and "for many:" "There where Luke says 'for you,' Matthew has put 'for many.' Therefore we should believe that Christ said both, because this blood was shed both for the Apostles, and also for many who will believe their words."¹¹⁹

The connection between Matthew 20:28 and 26:28 was not, however, universally made. In an anonymous commentary on Matthew from the second half of the ninth century (possibly of Irish origin), the offering of Jesus "for many" in Matthew 20:28 is referred to the entire human race.¹²⁰ The passage on the blood of the covenant is, on

115 Ibid., 300 (West Syrian anaphora of St Clement, Pope of Rome).

116 See R. KOTTJE, "Hrabanus Maurus," in LThK, 3rd ed., vol. 5 (1996) 292-93; LM, vol. 5 (1999) 144-47.

117 HRABANUS MAURUS, *Expositio in Matthæum* 6.204 (on Mt 20:28) (CChr.SM 174a.534): "Et non dixit, 'dare animam suam redemptionem pro omnibus,' sed 'pro multis,' id est pro his, qui credere voluerunt."

118 PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, *Expositio in Matheo* (CChr.SM 56b.1000-1001).

119 PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, *De corpore et sanguine Domini* 15 (CChr.SM 16.95).

120 ANONYMI IN MATTHÆUM, *In Mt.* 20:28 (CChr.SM 159.164): "'pro multis' in pabulo, ubi semet ipsum optulit; 'pro multis dedit,' hoc est per totum genus humanum."

the other hand, referred to the predestined: "He did not say 'for all,' but rather 'for many,' that is to say for the believers in Christ who are predestined to come to the faith."¹²¹ Also according to St Prudentius, Bishop of Troyes (ca. 846-861), the "for many" (Mt 26:28) is referred to the predestined elect,¹²² a formulation that is well adapted to the Augustinian heritage of the early Middle Ages. He who is saved thanks to the faith that works in charity is chosen.

The topic of predestination led to intense controversies in the Carolingian era.¹²³ They were first provoked by the monk Gottschalk of Orbais (ca. 806-870), who spoke of a "double predestination" (*gemina praedestinationio*).¹²⁴ This term derives from Isidore of Seville:

There exists a double predestination, that of the elect for the Kingdom and that of the reprobate for death. Both happen always with divine counsel: God acts in a way so that the elect follow the sublime and the interior, while he permits that the reprobate delight in the low and the exterior."¹²⁵

Isidore's language is not in itself heretical, but it runs the risk of putting predestination and reprobation on the same plane. Later theology preferred, at least terminologically, to contrast predestination and reprobation: the former refers to grace and celestial glory; the latter, solely to damnation. God tolerates sin but does not will it.¹²⁶

Gottschalk instead insists on the "double predestination" without duly distinguishing between election and reprobation: God predetermines either for heaven or for hell, although there is no predestination for sin. Gottschalk's heresy is evidenced in his denial of God's universal will of salvation: Jesus Christ did not die for the damned.

121 ANONYMI IN MATTHAEUM, *In Mt. 26:26-28* (CChr.SM 159.199).

122 PRUDENTIUS OF TROYES, *Epistula ad Hincmarum et Padulum* 3 (PL 115.976b-977b).

123 On this see J. SCHWANE, *Dogmengeschichte der mittleren Zeit*, Dogmengeschichte 3 (Freiburg i. Br., 1882) 428-47; R. SEEBERG, *Die Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte 3 (Leipzig, 1930) 65-71; E. AEGERTER, "Gottschalk et le problème de la prédestination au 9^e siècle," in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 116 (1937) 187-223; W. HARTMANN, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und in Italien*, Konziliengeschichte A 9 (Paderborn, 1989); G. R. EVANS, "Prädestination IV. Alte Kirche und Mittelalter," in *TRE* 27 (1997) 110-18; SCHEFFCZYK, *Gnadenlehre*, 145-46, 224-26, 430-31; L. HÖDL, M. LAARMANN, "Prädestination/Reprobation A. Christentum," in *LM* 7 (1999) 142-45.

124 See L. HÖDL, "Gottschalk (Godescalco) von Orbais," in *LM* 4 (1999), 1611-12.

125 ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *Sententiae* 2.6.1 (PL 83.606a).

126 So later PETER LOMBARD, *Sent.* I d. 40 c. 2-5 (PL 192.631-632).

The Carolingian controversy recalls the aforementioned controversy over predestination with the Gallic presbyter Lucidus, who towards the end of the fifth century had drawn unilateral consequences from the late-Augustinian doctrine of grace and had denied God's universal salvific will. Prosper of Aquitaine, a friend of Augustine, had already opposed similar ideas. He refuted certain "Gauls" who held "that Christ was not crucified for the salvation of all the world." Hincmar of Reims (ca. 806-882) took the same position against Gottschalk.¹²⁷

Gottschalk's doctrine was condemned in 848 by a synod in Mainz on the initiative of Archbishop Hrabanus Maurus, who himself had been the abbot of the former monk of Fulda. In 849, following this decision, there was a synod at Quiercy led by Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims. Other theologians, however, defended Gottschalk's position; among them were St Remigius, Bishop of Lyon, and Ratramnus of Corbie. Both the Council of Quiercy in 853, presided over by Hincmar of Reims, and that of Valence in 855, presided over by Remigius of Lyon, were important in moving the controversy to its crisis and conclusion. While the Council of Quiercy pronounced against Gottschalk, that of Valence favored him. According to the latter, Christ died only for the predestined (cf. DH 630).

Both parties were reconciled at the Council of Toul in 860,¹²⁸ and accepted a synodal letter of Hincmar that emphasized: Christ died for all.¹²⁹ The pronouncements made against the Council of Quiercy by the Council of Valence were retracted. The deliberations of the Council of Quiercy along with the remaining doctrinal texts of Valence were accepted.

Under the presidency of Hincmar of Reims, then, the Council of Quiercy emphasized:

Just as there is not, has not been, and never will be any man whose nature has not been assumed in Jesus Christ, our Lord, so too there is not, has not been, and never will be anyone for whom he has not suffered. However, not all will be redeemed by the mystery of his Passion. That not all are redeemed by the mystery of his Passion, however, does not have to do with the greatness and fullness of the price of the ransom, but rather is owed to those lacking faith and those who do not believe with that faith '*which operates through charity*' [Gal 5:6]; for the cup of human salvation, which has been prepared

127 See PROSPER OF AQUITAINE, *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionem Gallorum calumniantium* 1.9 (PL 51.164c-166b); HINCMAR OF REIMS, *De praedestinatione Dei et libero arbitrio dissertatio posterior* 27 (PL 125.275b).

128 See DH, p. 286.

129 See HINCMAR OF REIMS, *Ep.* 21 (PL 126.122-132); Mansi, 15:563.

for our infirmity and by divine power, is sufficient by itself to profit all; but if it is not drunk, it does not heal. (DH 624)

Hincmar, in whose work the cited affirmations are transmitted,¹³⁰ forcefully emphasizes the suffering of Christ for all men, but he does not conceal the limitation of the efficacy of salvation to believers, justifying this with Jesus' words of institution: Matthew, Mark, and Luke testify that the body and blood of Christ is offered in sacrifice "not for all, but for you and for many."

They say that the Lord our Savior has attested that, although he suffered for all, nevertheless not all have been redeemed by the mystery of his Passion. That not all for whom he has suffered have been redeemed is due to incredulity, and not to the power and worthiness of the blood, for the value of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is sufficient for the entire world.

The efficacy of the salvation "for many" is seen in analogy with similar biblical statements: the ransom "for many" (Mt 20:28); "God so loved the world to give his only-begotten Son, so that everyone believing in him [!] would not die, but have eternal life" (cf. Jn 3:16); "...by one man's obedience many will be made righteous" (Rom 5:19); "...because he is the firstborn among many brethren" (cf. Rom 8:29); "...wanting to bring many children to glory" (cf. Heb 2:10); "...so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many" (Heb 9:28); "... Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her" (Eph 5:25).¹³¹ Here particularly worthy of note is the connection between the idea of the covenant and the community of the Church, in which faith and election are emphasized. Later on Hincmar stresses, against Gottschalk, that Christ died for all.¹³²

Hincmar therefore accentuates the universal salvific will of God, without thereby giving up the received interpretation of the words of consecration. He thus distinguishes between the aim of the Passion of Christ and the (effective) redemption. "Christ has suffered for all, but not all are redeemed by the mystery of his suffering."¹³³ In the same sense does he interpret especially the words of Jesus

130 See HINC MAR OF REIMS, *De praedestinatione Dei et libero arbitrio disertatio posterior* 27 (PL 125.282b).

131 HINC MAR OF REIMS *De praedestinatione Dei*, 34 (PL 125.363d-364a).

132 Ibid. (PL 125.364d-365a).

133 HINC MAR OF REIMS, *De praedestinatione Dei*, 27 (PL 125.383c); cf. cap. 34 (PL 125.358b).

about the ransom (Mt 20:28)¹³⁴ and the statement of the Epistle to the Hebrews about the taking away of the sins of “many” (Heb 9:28).¹³⁵ The theologians opposed to Hincmar and the Council of Quiercy, however, should be treated with caution. These certainly share the “particular” interpretation of the “many” in the words of consecration, but at the same time they put in doubt the universal salvific will of God. That is, the tendency of this group constitutes the exact opposite of today’s fashion: while theologians nowadays tend to interpret all the statements about Jesus’ offering “for many” with reference to the universal salvific will, there was then an inclination to limit even clear biblical evidence of God’s universal salvific will to the predestined only.¹³⁶

IV.4. *The refinement of the doctrine in the Middle Ages*

One finds the great theologians of the Middle Ages following in the same line as Hincmar of Reims and Paschasius Radbertus.¹³⁷ A key systematic role is played here, already in the eleventh century, by St Peter Damian’s explanation of the words of consecration: “‘The [blood that] is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins’: only for the elect was it shed regarding its efficacy; it was shed for all regarding its sufficiency [*pro solis destinatis effusus est quoad efficaciam; pro omnibus quoad sufficientiam*].”¹³⁸

134 See HINCMAR OF REIMS, *De praedestinatione Dei*, 27; 34 (PL 125.275b; 360c).

135 See HINCMAR OF REIMS, *De praedestinatione Dei*, 28; 34 (PL 125.286c-d; 325d-326a; 360d).

136 Thus St Remigius of Lyon (bishop 852-75), who even, for example, limited the expression in 1 Tim 2:6 (the offering of Christ as ransom for all) to those open to the faith: *Liber de tribus epistolis* 16; 20; 27 (PL 121.1013-15; 1021-22; 1032-33). Similarly PRUDENTIUS, *Epistula ad Hincmarum et Pardulum* 3 (PL 115.976c- 977a). See BADER, “Wandlungsworte,” *Einsicht* 2.2 (1972) 13-15, who overlooks the hyper-Augustinian danger (denial of the universal offer of salvation), as does WILDFEUER, “Treue zum Testament,” 38. The writing transmitted under the name of Remigius was probably written by his deacon, Florus († 860): cf. R. SCHIEFFER, “Remigius von Lyon,” in *LThK*, 3rd ed., vol. 8 (1999) 109; J. PRELOG, “Florus von Lyon,” in *LM*, vol. 4 (1999) 577-78.

137 See already the indications in BADER, “Wandlungsworte,” *Einsicht* 2.3 (1972) 9-15 [Peter Lombard, Balduin of Canterbury, Pope Innocent III, et al.]; 2.6 (1972) 15-18 [Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas].

138 PETER DAMIAN, *Expositio Canonis Missae* (PL 145.884b). Similar texts are found in other expositions of the Mass, for example in HILDEBERT OF LAVARDIN (1056-1134), Archbishop of Le Mans and Tours: *Liber de expositione Missae* (PL 171.1166a-b): “Qui pro vobis et pro multis effunde-

This explanation later came to be generally received, not least by St Thomas Aquinas.¹³⁹ In the *Catena aurea*, Aquinas cites the above-mentioned expression of Chrysostom, but he abbreviates it just before the formulation according to which the eucharistic Blood of the covenant is shed “for the remission of the sins of all the world.” Instead of this, he reproduces a citation from Remigius that specifies the sense of *pro multis* (along the lines of Jerome) in the restricted sense.¹⁴⁰

In the golden period of “monastic theology,” one’s attention is drawn to the principal work of Baldwin, Bishop of Canterbury (d. 1190), which places the Eucharist in the context of the history of salvation.¹⁴¹ According to Baldwin the expression of Matthew according to which the blood of Christ is shed “for many” (Mt 26:28) cannot contradict the statement of Paul, according to which Christ died “for all” (1 Tm 2:6). In Paul it concerns the infinite power of the redemption (*sufficiantiam infinitae virtutis*), in Matthew the end result of limited utility (*eventum definitae utilitatis*). The blood shed for the remission of sins is not advantageous to all, but only to many. The reference to election should not sadden, for after all “many” will always sit with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at the feast in the Reign of Heaven (cf. Mt 8:11).¹⁴²

A still greater importance attaches to the work of the later Pope Innocent III (ca. 1160-1216) on the sacrament of the altar, which contains important affirmations on the Real Presence and transubstantiation.¹⁴³ Worthy of note here is the connection between the phrase “for many” with the statements of Jesus concerning election in the farewell discourse of John. Of those at the Last Supper who drink of the chalice, Jesus does not exclude “anyone, when he says that ‘it is shed for you’; but he excludes many of the others with the words: ‘shed for many for the remission of sins.’ For when Christ, according to John, said to the Apostles: ‘you will be blessed if you put them

tur in remissionem peccatorum,’ utique pro electis, et pro illis qui fervore charitatis, vestigia passionis meae sequi voluerint.” On this literary genre see A. WILMART, “Expositio missae,” in DACL, vol. 5 (1922), 1014-1027; W. KNOCH, “Messerklärung,” in LM, vol. 6 (1999) 561.

139 IV Sent. d. 8 q. 2 art. 2 qa 3 arg. 7 (objection and answer); *In I Cor.* 11 lect. 6.

140 *Catena aurea*, in Mt. cap. 26, lect. 8 (sixth and seventh citations). See BADER, “Wandlungsworte,” *Einsicht* 2.6 (1972) 16-17.

141 See K. SCHNITH, “Balduin von Canterbury,” in LM, vol. 1 (1999) 1371-72.

142 BALDUIN OF CANTERBURY, *Liber de sacramento altaris* (PL 204.667-68).

143 See G. SCHWAIGER, “Innozenz III.” in TRE, vol. 16 (1987) 175-82 at 176.

into practice,” he excluded at the same time [Judas]: ‘I do not speak of you all; I know whom I have chosen’ (Jn 13:18). And again: ‘You are clean, but not every one of you’ (Jn 13:10).”¹⁴⁴

The connection between the words over the chalice and election presupposes, according to these statements, a personal knowledge of Jesus about the elect. This conviction of faith, which corresponds to the Johannine testimony,¹⁴⁵ has been lost to a great extent in present-day theology, but plays a not unimportant role in the traditional explanation of the *pro multis*. Just as had Peter Damian, so too Innocent III emphasizes: the blood of Christ has been shed, in respect to efficacy, only for the predestined, but in respect to sufficient power, for all men.¹⁴⁶

A historically important point of departure for systematic theology in the high Middle Ages is the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard (1095-1160). Through the effusion of the blood of Christ on the cross, the written documents of debt have been destroyed for all those “who believe in Him.” “Therefore it is written: ‘which is shed for many.’”¹⁴⁷ The “many” are “the people of God, that is to say the elect, who are spiritually purified through the blood shed for the remission of sins.”¹⁴⁸

For the scholastic theology of the high Middle Ages we must take into account especially Sts Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventure. Notable in Albertus Magnus (ca. 1200-1280) is the reference to the generally maintained Catholic doctrine:

But with regard to the question, why does he not say ‘for all,’ some observe that the blood of Christ is in truth sufficient for all [*pro omnibus sufficit*]. But since he does not effectually save all [*quia non*

144 INNOCENT III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* 4.13 (PL 217.865a).

145 The Gospel of John stresses repeatedly that Jesus (even on his earthly pilgrimage) sees the Father (Jn 1:18; 8:38; etc.). For this “seeing” the perfect tense is used, which indicates a situation that was initiated in the past and continues into the present. On Jesus’ contemplation of God, which includes a human knowledge of every saved person, see for example A. FEUILLET, “La science de vision de Jésus et les évangiles,” in *Doctor communis* 37 (1983) 158-79 (esp. 159-71); A. ZIEGENAUS, *Jesus Christus. Die Fülle des Heils. Christologie und Erlösungslehre*, Katholische Dogmatik 4 (Aachen, 2000) 420-42; M. HAUKE, “La visione beatifica di Cristo durante la Passione. La dottrina di san Tommaso d’Aquino e la teologia contemporanea,” in *Annales theologici* 21 (2007) 381-98.

146 INNOCENT III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* 4.41 (PL 217.882b): “Pro solis praedestinati effusus est, quantum ad efficientiam. Sed pro cunctis hominibus est effusus quantum ad sufficientiam.”

147 PETER LOMBARD, *Libri sententiarum* III d. 19 n. 1 (PL 192.796).

148 PETER LOMBARD, *In Hebr.* 9:22 (PL 192.476b); cf. *In Hebr.* 9:28 (PL 192.478a).

efficienter salvat omnes], but rather many, therefore—so they say—he says ‘for many’ instead of ‘for all.’ And this explanation is good and Catholic [*Et haec ratio est bona et catholica*].¹⁴⁹

The “for many” refers to the final aim of the work of the salvation of Christ,¹⁵⁰ the good from the point of view of efficacy.¹⁵¹

Thomas Aquinas, as was already mentioned, in his *Catena aurea* distanced himself from the tradition of Chrysostom in the interpretation of the *pro multis* in order to follow the explanation stemming from Jerome. The *Catena aurea*, or *Glossa continua super Evangelia*, dedicated by Aquinas in 1264 to Pope Urban IV, is “a rich collection of exegetical citations from the Fathers of the Church meant as a continuous interpretation of the four Gospels. The work is more than a mere compilation, and attests not only to the critical spirit of Thomas, but above all to his extraordinary familiarity with the patristic tradition.”¹⁵²

Next in the chronological order of his commentaries on scripture is his Commentary on First Corinthians, in which a systematic interpretation is sketched. The words of Paul (“This cup is the new covenant in my blood” [1 Cor 11:25]) are taken to mean the same as if he had said, “The new covenant, which has been confirmed through the blood of Christ, is commemorated (*commemoratur*) through that which is contained in the cup. But it should be noted,” Thomas continues, “that the same words that the Apostle has formulated here are also found in Luke 22:20, without the addition: ‘which is shed for many.’ Luke was, in fact, a disciple of Paul and has followed him in the writing of his Gospel.”¹⁵³

That which is here only hinted at (the sacrifice of the Mass as efficacious memorial of the sacrifice of the Cross), comes more clearly into focus in the Commentary on Matthew:¹⁵⁴

149 ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Liber de sacramento Eucharistiae*, d. VI, tr. II, cap. 3 (Opera omnia 38 [Paris, 1899] 402).

150 ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *In Mt.* 26:27-28: “‘Qui pro multis effundetur,’ ... est finis. Et dicit: *pro multis* effective, licet pro omnibus sufficienter effusus est” (Opera omnia 21/2 [Münster, 1987] 618). See *In Mt.* 20:28 (Opera omnia 21/2, 505): “... *pro multis* efficienter, pro omnibus autem sufficienter.”

151 ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Liber de sacrificio Missae* 3.12: “... ‘et pro multis,’ bonis scilicet efficaciter, pro omnibus tamen *effusus est* sufficienter” (Opera omnia 38 [Paris, 1899] 122).

152 J.-P. TORRELL, *Magister Thomas. Leben und Werk des Thomas von Aquin* (Freiburg i. Br., 1995) 353.

153 THOMAS AQUINAS *In I Cor* lect. 6.

154 It was probably composed in 1269-70: see TORRELL, *Magister Thomas*, 353.

Certainly the blood has been shed for the remission of sins not only for many, but also for all, in the sense of 1 John 2:2: ‘He is the expiation for our sins, but not only for ours, but also for those of the entire world.’ But because some render themselves unworthy to receive such an effect (*se reddunt indignos ad recipiendum talem effectum*), it is said that with regard to efficacy (*quantum ad efficaciam*) it has been shed for the many in whom the Passion of Christ has its effect (*effectum*). However, he says significantly ‘for you and for many,’ because this sacrament procures the remission of sins for those who receive it in the way of a sacrament. That is expressed through the words ‘for you’ [disciples], to whom he had said: ‘Take.’ In a sacrificial way this causes [the remission of sins] also in those who do not receive it, but for whom it is offered. This is indicated by the words ‘for many.’¹⁵⁵

The sacrificial offering of Christ on the cross, which aims at all men, is therefore to be distinguished from its realization in the Eucharist: he who participates in the latter obtains the remission of (venial) sins (through the enkindling of the theological virtue of charity);¹⁵⁶ he for whom it is offered in sacrifice also attains part of the expiatory sacrifice of Christ.

In Thomas’ Commentary on the *Sentences* we find the already classic distinction between sufficiency and efficacy:

The blood of Christ has been shed for all concerning its sufficient power (*quo ad sufficientiam*), but only for the elect as regards its efficacy (*quo ad efficaciam*); this does not mean that it was shed only for the chosen Jews to whom the promise had been given; therefore he says ‘for you,’ that is, from among the Jews, and ‘for many,’ that is, from among the multitude of peoples. Alternatively he indicates the Apostles as priests, by whom the effect of the Passion arrives through the administration of the sacraments to others, and who also pray for themselves and for others.¹⁵⁷

We find similarly formulated thoughts also in Bonaventure’s Commentary on the *Sentences*, which adds a phrase: “Therefore he says: for you priests and for many subjects who are to be converted by you (*et pro multis subditis per vos convertendis*).”¹⁵⁸ In the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass it is a matter therefore of the concrete

155 THOMAS AQUINAS, *In Mt.* 26:28.

156 See ST III q. 79 a. 4.

157 THOMAS AQUINAS, IV Sent. d. 8 q. 2 art. 2 qa 3 arg. 7 (answer).

158 BONAVENTURE, IV Sent. d. 8 pars II art. 1 q. 2 ad 11-12 (*Opera omnia* 4:194-95).

application of the sacrifice of the Cross, through which in the course of time men are to be led to conversion and salvation.

IV.5. The Magisterial reception of the classical explanation in the Roman Catechism

The common distinction according to which the words over the chalice refer to the elect, even if the blood of Christ, regarding its sufficiency, has been shed for all, enters later also into the Roman Catechism in its treatment of the Eucharist. This statement represents the most authoritative declaration of the ordinary Magisterium concerning our question:

The additional words ‘for you and for many’ are taken, some from Matthew, some from Luke, but were joined together by the Catholic Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God. They serve to declare the fruit and advantage of his Passion (*passionis fructum atque utilitatem*). For if we look to its value (*eius virtutem*), we must confess that the Redeemer shed his blood for the salvation of all; but if we look to the fruit which mankind has received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not unto all, but to many of the human race. When therefore [our Lord] said ‘for you,’ he meant either those who were present, or those chosen from among the Jewish people, such as were, with the exception of Judas, the disciples with whom he was speaking. When he added ‘and for many,’ he wished to be understood to mean the remainder of the elect from among the Jews and Gentiles. With reason, therefore, were the words ‘for all’ not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did his Passion bring the fruit of salvation. And this is the purport of the Apostle when he says: ‘Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many’ (Heb 9:28), and also of the words of our Lord in John: ‘I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for those whom you have given me, because they are yours’ (Jn 17:9).¹⁵⁹

IV.6. The contrast with Calvinism and Jansenism

The threat of predestinationism returns acutely in the Reformers, who reject the importance of human collaboration in justification. Particularly strong formulations of a double predestination are found in Calvin,¹⁶⁰ so much so that Catholic apologists are at pains to stress:

¹⁵⁹ *Catechismus Romanus*, ed. P. Rodríguez et al. (Vatican City/Pamplona, 1989) §2.4.24, p. 250.

¹⁶⁰ See T. MAHLMANN, “Prädestination V. Reformation und Neuzeit,” in TRE, vol. 27 (1997) 118-56 (esp. 122-23).

Christ died for all men.¹⁶¹ Even Calvin emphasizes, as does the Roman Catechism, that Christ suffered for all so far as sufficiency is concerned (*sufficenter*), but he suffered efficaciously (*efficaciter*) for the elect only.¹⁶² The similarity of his theological formula, however, does not denote a similarity in content: for Calvin one part of humanity is *a priori* not called to grace; the universal salvific will of God is denied.¹⁶³ Strangely, Calvin interprets the phrase “for many” in the words of the Last Supper (Mt 26:28) in the sense of “all humanity;”¹⁶⁴ the promises in the words of institution are directed, however, only to those who receive the eucharistic elements.¹⁶⁵

Also in Jansenism, which systematizes the Augustinian doctrine of grace in a problematic way, one finds a limitation of the divine will of salvation. According to the Jansenists Jesus Christ did not die on the cross for all, but only for a minority. In 1690 the Holy Office condemned the following error of the Jansenists: “Christ has given himself in oblation to God for us, not only for the elect, but for all believers, and only for them” (DH 2304). This error corresponds to the idea that divine grace is always efficacious: there is no difference between sufficient grace (*gratia sufficiens*), which God offers to all men, and efficient grace (*gratia efficax*), which leads the free will to faith and (with the theological virtue of charity) to salvation. Sufficient grace, which appeals to the free will of men, is here rejected (cf. DH 2306). According to the Jansenist Quesnel, “Grace is the working of the omnipotent hand of God, which nothing can hinder or retard” (DH 2410). In the Jansenist system of thought, the *pro multis* becomes an argument for rejecting the universal offer of salvation.

IV.7. Catholic exegesis in the Modern era

According to the Roman Catechism, the phrase “for many” refers, as mentioned above, to the efficacy of the death of Christ for the salvation of the elect. This interpretation was not, however, universally received by Catholic exegetes of the post-Tridentine period. A notable example of this is the Commentary on Matthew by the

161 See, for example, CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, *Commentarii in Scripturam Sacram*, vol. 8 (Lyon, 1839) 391.

162 CALVIN, CR 36.366, cited in Mahlmann, “Prädestination,” 122.

163 CALVIN *Institutio* 3.23-24. Cf. R. SEEBERG, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 2nd-3rd eds, vol. 4/2 (Erlangen/Leipzig, 1920) 579-80.

164 See CALVIN, *Auslegung der Evangelienharmonie*, vol. 2, on Mt 20:28; 26:28 (Mk 10:45; 14:24); J.-P. MIGNÉ, *Scripturae Sacrae cursus completus*, vol. 21 (Paris, 1866) 1161 (in connection with the Byzantine exegesis of Euthemius and Theophylact).

165 CALVIN *Institutio* 4.17.19; cf. U. KÜHN, *Sakramente*, 2nd ed. (Güterloh, 1990) 117.

Jesuit Cornelius a Lapide (1567-1637), one “of the greatest exegetes of the post-Tridentine era. No theologian in this phase of the history of the Church was more productive than he, with his commentaries on almost all the books of Sacred Scripture.”¹⁶⁶ According to him the “many” in the words of institution mean “all,” for “all are very many.”¹⁶⁷ In the ample comment on the “for many” in the words of Jesus about the ransom (Mt 20:28), he employed both possible interpretations:

It is not as if Christ died solely for the predestined, as the heretics would have it, at one time the so-called predestinationists and most recently Calvin: for Christ suffered absolutely for all men and died for them... [referring to 2 Cor 5:14 and 1 Jn 2:2]. According to Euthymius the words ‘for many’ mean therefore ‘for all’; this is also the sense of ‘many’ in, for example, Mt 26:28 and Rom 5:9. Alternatively, ‘for many’ refers to those who obtain perfect salvation, the fruits of his death among the just, although he has given to all sufficient means of grace for salvation. This sense is expressed by Jerome, Jansenius,¹⁶⁸ Maldonato,¹⁶⁹ and others.¹⁷⁰

Both the interpretations of the “for many” are found also in the meticulous commentaries of the Jesuit Joseph Knabenbaur (1839-1911), which evidence a deep familiarity with the Tradition.¹⁷¹ In the “for many” of the words of institution it is a matter of the fruit of the death of Jesus on the cross, whereby the remission of sins actually is

166 R. NOLL, *Die mariologischen Grundlinien im exegetischen Werk des Cornelius a Lapide SJ (1567-1637)*, Mariologische Studien 16 (Regensburg, 2003) 11.

167 CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, *Commentarii in Scripturam Sacram*, 8:483: “QUI PRO MULTIS. Id est pro omnibus hominibus; hi enim omnes sunt valde multi; Lucas habet *pro vobis*.”

168 Meant is Cornelius Jansen the Elder, Bishop of Ghent (1510-1576): *Concordia evangelica, Commentarii* (Louvain, 1549; 2nd ed. 1571). He is to be distinguished from Cornelius Jansen the Younger (1585-1638), the originator of Jansenism.

169 JUAN DE MALDONADO, S.J. (ca. 1533-1583): *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas*, vol. 1 (Pont-à-Mousson, 1596, etc.).

170 CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, *Commentarii in Scripturam Sacram*, 8:391. The work of Maldonatus and that of J. B. Du Hamel (1624-1706) enter into the biblical commentary of Migne, *Scripturae Sacrae cursus completus*, 21:947-48 (on Mt 20:28); 1160-61 (on Mt 26:28). Here also both opinions are given: in the more extensive comment to Mt 20:28 the exegesis of Jerome is preferred and it is explained that Christ sometimes prays only for the elect (Jn 17:9).

171 On his significance see W. KOESTER, “Knabenbauer,” in *LThK*, 2nd ed., vol. 6 (1961) 355.

effected; in adults free cooperation is needed, which is not found in all men.¹⁷² In the words of Jesus about the ransom, the Greek article is not used as it is in the Epistle to the Romans;¹⁷³ Christ says here “the same as in Jn 17:20 and 10:15: ‘I offer my life for my sheep,’ which is to say that he wants to indicate those who receive the fruit of his death for themselves for always, for those, therefore, for whom he has offered his life effectually [*cum effectu*].”¹⁷⁴

These examples serve to indicate that the Catholic exegetes of the post-Tridentine period did not feel bound to a precise interpretation of the “for many.” Both interpretive currents are represented, even if the stronger accent is certainly on the interpretation that goes back to Jerome (and Origen). However, even the representatives of the interpretation deriving from Apollinaris (and Chrysostom) never dared to translate the “for many” of the New Testament with “for all.” Likewise, supporters of the liturgical renewal before the Second Vatican Council translated the phrase *pro multis* with “for many” in the popular missals.¹⁷⁵

IV.8. *The development after Vatican II; the fateful year 1968.*

While in the first half of the twentieth century, in the commentaries of Knabenbauer, the exegetical plurality surrounding our question is visible in an exemplary way, in the second half there is, especially in the Catholic world, an interpretive monoculture: after the relevant pronouncements of the Protestant exegete Joachim Jeremias, and for the most part in sovereign ignorance of the interpretive tradition, it is affirmed almost universally that the expression “for many” in the Last Supper signifies all men. Despite this, the interpretation of Jeremias did not succeed in establishing itself everywhere. As an example one could cite the recent commentary of the Lutheran New Testament

172 J. KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1907; repr. 1928) 377 (on Mk 14:24; cf. 285-86, on Mk 10:45); idem, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Matthaum*, 3rd ed., vol. 2 (Paris, 1922) 443 (on Mt 26:28; cf. 196, on Mt 20:28).

173 Rom 5:15, 19, compared with “all” in Rom 5:12, 18: *hoi polloi*.

174 KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Matthaum* 2:196; cf. idem, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum*, 286.

175 See H. HAUG, “Die Übersetzung des ‘pro multis’ im neuen Deutschen Messbuch,” (typescript), 10 September 1976, 1. Heinrich Haug, of the Liturgical Institute of Trier, composed the cited memorandum on behalf of the German Bishops’ Conference as Secretary of its Liturgical Commission. For the transmission of this (apparently) unpublished text, the author thanks Mr Heinz Froitzheim, custodian of the archives of the journal *Der Fels*.

scholar Ulrich Luz, where concerning Matthew 26:28 he distances himself from Jeremias:

Polloi ... should first of all be interpreted from the direct context: the one cup is passed among the many disciples who are at the table, and in such a way the expiatory force of the sacrificial death of the one Christ turns to the advantage of many; the disciples who drink from the one cup are identified with the community that celebrates the Lord's Supper, and that in the *peri pollon* will think in the first place of itself. The sense of *peri/hyper pollon* (Mt/Mk) is therefore certainly nothing fundamentally other than the *hyper humon* [for you] (Lk/Pl).¹⁷⁶

If among Catholic exegetes of the later twentieth century one finds a certain interpretive monoculture, among liturgists this tendency has been even more pronounced, as we can see most especially during the liturgical reform following the Second Vatican Council. The then-Secretary of the Liturgical Commission of the German Bishops' Conference, Heinrich Haug, has left us an important account of the steps by which the vernacular translations were decided upon and approved for use in much of central Europe:

In the official translation of the Roman Canon for liturgical use, the International Group of translators from the liturgical commissions of the German-speaking areas decided for the translation 'for the many,' which was to be interpreted catechetically as 'for all.' This translation was approved by the episcopal conferences of the German-speaking lands on 4 October 1967 and confirmed by the Roman Liturgical Council on 14 November.¹⁷⁷

One may note parenthetically that had this decision been implemented consistently afterwards, we would have in the German-speaking areas a situation similar to that of the French-speaking lands, where the *pro multis* is translated as *pour la multitude*. Haug continues:

Shortly thereafter, a movement starting from Italy extended to almost all other countries. It is said that it had obtained the adhesion of the Pope [Paul VI] in person, and was determined to translate the *pro multis* immediately with "for all."¹⁷⁸ When therefore in 1968,

176 LUZ, *Mt 26-28*, 115-16. According to this exegete it is the "community" that is referred to also at Mt 20:28: *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25)*, EKK 1/3 (Düsseldorf, 1997), 166 n. 42.

177 HAUG, "Übersetzung," 1.

178 IAG (Internationale Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Liturgischen Kommissionen im deutschen Sprachgebiet), *Kommentar für die Salzburger Bischofs-*

during the translation process of the three new Eucharistic Prayers produced by the Congregation of Rites, the translation of the *pro multis* again became an issue, the International Group of translators decided, after a special study of the question, for the translation “for all.”¹⁷⁹

This proposal was accepted by the Liturgical Commission of the German Bishops’ Conference with the following rationale: “The translation which has been used up to now, ‘the many,’ is considered a Hebraism by critical studies. ‘For many’ cannot be said [either], because the hearer could misunderstand it as a limitation of the divine will of salvation.”¹⁸⁰ The conference then approved, in its sitting of 23-26 September 1968, the new translation of “for all” by a vote of 48 in favor and one opposed. The remaining episcopal conferences of the German-speaking lands soon followed suit.¹⁸¹

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith was also involved, as its *nihil obstat* was needed for the liturgical texts.

Cardinal [Franjo] Šeper [Prefect, 1968-81] appointed a special commission for the examination of the translation ‘for all,’ which approved it unanimously. Thereafter the translations of the new Eucharistic Prayers and the corresponding adaptations in the Roman Canon were confirmed on 6 December 1968.¹⁸²

Cardinal Šeper later changed his mind. In a letter to Father Tibor Gallus S.J., dated Easter 1980, he writes: “I too am convinced that with the translation ‘for all’ likewise (as with Communion in the hand) a mistake was made....”¹⁸³

Largely because two congregations of the Roman Curia had been involved in the questionable translation, the “steps originating from German-speaking areas undertaken at Rome starting in 1969 against the translation ‘for all’ saw no success.”¹⁸⁴ As was noted earlier, the

versammlung 1974: Das Messbuch, 4. Bemerkungen zu den Hochgebeten, p. 4, cited in HAUG, “Übersetzung,” 1.

179 HAUG, “Übersetzung,” 1.

180 *Akten der Vollversammlung der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz in Fulda*, September 1968, Vorlage der Liturgischen Kommission, p. 5, cited in HAUG, “Übersetzung,” 1.

181 See HAUG, “Übersetzung,” 1-2.

182 *Ibid.*, 2.

183 Cited in WILDFEUER, “Treue zum Testament des Herrn,” 39. Cf. J. WAGNER, *Mein Weg zur Liturgiereform, 1936-1986. Erinnerungen* (Freiburg i. Br., 1993) 289.

184 HAUG, “Übersetzung,” 2.

Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship published its official position in January 1970, defending the relevant permissions against growing criticism.¹⁸⁵ The Congregation responded especially to two questions: whether the relevant translations in some modern languages were sufficiently grounded, and whether the traditional doctrine of the Roman Catechism regarding the question was now superseded. For the question of the legitimacy of the translation it referred to the opinion of the “exegetes,” according to whom the Aramaic foundation of the Latin words *pro multis* means “for all.” Christ died for all, as Augustine also testifies.¹⁸⁶ Then the distinction between the power of Christ’s Passion (for all) and its fruit (for many) is expressly accepted:

The doctrine of the Roman Catechism is in no sense superseded: the distinction that the death of Christ is sufficient for all, but only effective for many, maintains its validity.¹⁸⁷

Passed over in silence was the clear indication of the Catechism according to which the words of Jesus in the institution narrative refer to the fruit of the covenant for the elect, who through their faith arrive at celestial glory.

As the criticism failed to abate, the Congregation’s journal, *Notitiae*, featured a more extended justification by Max Zerwick, S.J., in May 1970.¹⁸⁸ Zerwick was of the opinion that the statements according to which “many” means “all” should be expressed with a bit more caution (*paulo cautius*). “The word ‘many’... does not signify in the strict sense ‘all.’” But because the word “many” does not exclude the totality, it can and does connote it where the context demands it. The aim of the coming of Jesus is the world, therefore humanity in its totality. For a modern language, in contrast to the Semitic way of speaking, the literal translation of the words of the Lord would exclude the universality of the work of the Redemption. On the other hand, the translation “for all” also has its own difficulties, because it could encourage the erroneous opinion that all men will actually be saved.

185 *Notitiae* 6 (1970) 39-40.

186 The citation from AUGUSTINE, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 95, n. 5, indicates the value of the Blood of Christ as a ransom that has the power to redeem all mankind (“... *Sanguis Christi pretium est. Tanti quid valet? Quid, nisi totus orbis? Quid, nisi omnes gentes? ...*”). Augustine is not referring here, however, to the sense of the words of eucharistic institution.

187 *Notitiae* 6 (1970) 39-40. (See n. 12 above.)

188 *Notitiae* 6 (1970) 138-40. (See n. 13 above.)

But “the danger of such an erroneous understanding is estimated hardly to exist among Catholics.”¹⁸⁹

The problem resurfaced a few years later, when the approval of the entire Missal in the vernacular was at issue. When in 1974 the then-auxiliary bishop and exegete Johannes Joachim Degenhardt, subsequently Archbishop of Paderborn and cardinal, at the bishops’ conference in Salzburg “made the proposal to substitute the words ‘for all’ in the Consecration with the original words ‘for many,’ the majority rejected the proposal with the remark that one could not yet again change something.”¹⁹⁰ On 10 December 1974, the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, Cardinal James Knox, definitively confirmed the entire German version of the Roman Missal. Already on 4 February of the same year, the English-language Missal had been approved, with its translation of the *pro multis* as “for all men.”¹⁹¹ The confirmation of the Missal in Italian (“*per tutti*”) had preceded this on 29 November 1972.¹⁹²

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* does not comment on the *pro multis* of the institution narrative, but provides (in its elaborations on the death of Jesus on the cross) a brief interpretation of the passage in Matthew according to which Jesus offers up his life as “a ransom for many” (Mt 20:28): “this last term is not restrictive, but contrasts the whole of humanity with the unique person of the redeemer who hands himself over to save us” (CCC 605).¹⁹³ While this interpretation might be said to ignore the more common strand of the interpretive tradition, which also in the context of the Gospel of Matthew sets the word “ransom” in parallel with the sacrifice “for many” at the Last Supper, the *pro multis* is always correctly translated as “for many” (see CCC 1365). The characteristic distinction made in the Roman Catechism between sufficiency and efficacy is (unfortunately) not treated, even if it is not denied.

189 For discussion of the relevant biblical arguments adduced by Zerwick, see PROSINGER, *Das Blut des Bundes*.

190 WILDFEUER, “Treue zum Testament des Herrn,” 17; cf. HAUG, “Übersetzung” (23 September 1974) 3.

191 *ED.*: Effective 17 November 1981, the word “men” was omitted from the institution narrative as found in all the Eucharistic Prayers approved for use in the United States. See National Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy, *Newsletter* 17 (December 1981), in UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS [USCCB], *Thirty-Five Years of the BCL Newsletter: 1965-2000* (Washington DC: USCCB, 2004) 793.

192 See HAUG, “Übersetzung,” 2-3; WAGNER, *Mein Weg zur Liturgiereform*, 289.

193 Similarly, cf. SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity *Ad gentes* (7 December 1965) 3.

A certain confusion is found in the rendering of the liturgical words of institution in Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* of 2003. In the first Latin (!) version, which also serves as the foundation for the vernacular translations, one reads at first "for all" (*pro omnibus*), and then "for many" (*pro multis*).¹⁹⁴ In the official Latin version published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, the error is corrected: now one reads both times *pro multis*.¹⁹⁵

In his last Holy Thursday letter to priests, Pope John Paul II presented an interpretation of the words of institution that, while making a distinction between referring and implying, stressed the interpretive line deriving from Apollinaris and John Chrysostom:

"Hoc est enim corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur." The body and the blood of Christ are given for the salvation of man, of the *whole* man and of *all* men. This salvation is *integral* and at the same time *universal*, because no one, unless he freely chooses, is excluded from the saving power of Christ's blood: *"qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur."* It is a sacrifice offered for "many," as the Biblical text says (*Mk 14:24; Mt 26:28; cf. Is 53:11-12*); this typical Semitic expression refers to the multitude who are saved by Christ, the one Redeemer, yet at the same time it implies *the totality of human beings* to whom salvation is offered: the Lord's blood is *"shed for you and for all,"* as some translations legitimately make explicit. Christ's flesh is truly given "for the life of the world" (*Jn 6:51; cf. 1 Jn 2:2*).¹⁹⁶

The reference to the "typical Semitic expression" corresponds to the researches of Joachim Jeremias, which in the meantime have been put in doubt by the critical work of Cardinal Vanhoye's student, Franz Prossinger. Even Prossinger's work leaves open the question of whether "many" expresses God's universal salvific will (and thus means "all"), or refers instead to the members of the covenantal people of the Church who are in fact saved. However, arguments are accentuated that connect the "Blood of the Covenant" with the effectively saved "sheep" of Christ's flock, who are "many" but not "all." In the meantime the opinion has spread, even among the supporters of the translation "for all," that the philological arguments adduced by Joachim Jeremias are questionable.¹⁹⁷

194 JOHN PAUL II, Encyclical Letter *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* (17 April 2003) 2, at <www.vatican.va>.

195 AAS 95 (2003) 434.

196 JOHN PAUL II, Letter to Priests for Holy Thursday 2005, §4, at <www.vatican.va>.

197 So, for example, SÖDING, "Für euch," 23-24; GERHARDS, "Wie viel," 81 (= "Pro multis," 59).

Pope Benedict XVI is familiar with the *status questionis* and has directed that the vernacular translations should correspond to their biblical and liturgical foundation. For the English language it is to be expected therefore that *pro multis* will be rendered as “for many.”

There remains, however, the question of a correct explanation of the words of consecration. The study of the testimonies of the Tradition do not lead here to an absolutely clear result. The interpretive tradition deriving from Apollinaris and Chrysostom understands the “for many” in the sense of the universal salvific will of God, while the interpretation stemming from Origen and Jerome refers the words to the believers or the elect. A glance at philology and reception history does not suffice for a solution of the problem. Here a systematic account is needed that locates the words of institution in the mystery of the covenant between Christ and his Church.

V. SYSTEMATIC CONSIDERATIONS

V.1. *Implications of the historical evidence*

From what has been presented so far, let us delineate some observations upon which Catholic theologians should be able agree:

- The Passion of Christ is directed as a salvific offering to all, but its efficacy, because of human resistance, does not affect all, but rather many. “Whichever of the formulations [‘for all’ or ‘for many’] is allowed to stand, we must in any case listen to the whole of the gospel message: that the Lord truly loves everyone and that he died for all. And the other aspect: that he does not, by some magic trick, set aside our freedom but allows us to choose to enter into his great mercy.”¹⁹⁸
- When translating the words of Jesus the greatest possible fidelity to the exact text should be used. Interpretation and translation should not be mixed together if the Liturgy refers directly to what the Lord himself said.
- Philologically, the translation of the Greek *hyper pollôn* and the Latin *pro multis* with “for all” is not correct.
- Both the Eastern and Western liturgical traditions have always—from the very beginning up to the Latin *Missale Romanum* of 2002—faithfully translated the Greek as “for many.”

198 RATZINGER, *God Is Near Us*, 38.

- Almost 2000 years of theological reflection demonstrates a preference for interpreting the eucharistic words “for many,” not in the sense of the universal offer of salvation, but rather in the sense of the efficacy of salvation and implying acceptance of the covenant.
- In the ordinary Magisterium, this interpretation finds special expression in the Roman Catechism, even if this does not of itself denote a definitive dogmatic determination.

The considerations set forth up to this point suffice to justify the correction of the liturgical mistranslation “for all.” There remains only the question whether, for the formulation “for many,” systematic grounds can also be adduced that are bound up with the eucharistic event itself. For if the choice of expression “for many” or “for all” were merely a question of theological perspective, according to which each formulation would have its own, equally valid justification, then one could rightly ask whether all the agitation associated with the correction is worth the trouble.

V.2. The sacrifice of the Mass as the sacramental application (applicatio) of the sacrifice of the Cross

The sacrifice of the Mass, according to the classical Tridentine explanation, *re-presents* (literally, makes present again) the sacrifice of the Cross and *applies* its fruit. Christ at the Last Supper left

to his beloved spouse, the Church, a visible sacrifice (as human nature demands) whereby that bloody Sacrifice once to be completed on the cross might be represented, and the memory of it remain even to the end of the world, and its saving grace be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit (DH 1740; cf. CCC 1366).

The Mass is therefore the memorial (*memoria*), representation (*repraesentatio*), and application (*applicatio*) of the sacrifice of the Cross. When we speak of the sacrifice of the Cross, we find in the New Testament clear formulations that stress the offer of salvation “for all” (especially Jn 1:29; 6:51; 1 Jn 2:2; 1 Tim 2:6; Heb 2:9). Inasmuch as the sacrifice of the Mass represents the sacrifice of Calvary, one cannot see why the words over the chalice cannot also utilize the formulation “for all.” The sacrifice of the Cross and the Eucharistic Sacrifice are always one single Sacrifice: Christ himself is the sacrificial offering, only the manner of sacrifice is different (bloody vs. unbloody) (cf. DH 1743; CCC 1367). Some authors attempt therefore to relativize the precise translation, referring to the aforementioned addition in the Roman

Canon on Holy Thursday: Christ has taken the Passion upon himself “for our salvation and that of all men.”¹⁹⁹

The sacrifice of the Mass is representation of the salvific Passion of Christ. On the other hand, it is also application (*applicatio*) of the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross. This application takes place for those who participate in the liturgical celebration or who receive the graces that are activated through the sacramental event. The celebration of the Mass is an efficacious means, whereby the fruits intended “for all” are accepted by the addressees. The application of the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross happens gradually, in time and space, even if its power extends to all human history. The fruits of the sacramental act are limited by the receptivity of the addressee and are received to that extent by “many.” The biblical formulations “for you” and “for many” signify “not a limitation of the field of action of the salvific death of Jesus, but rather the allotment to the meal participants.”²⁰⁰ Thomas Aquinas once illustrated the difference between the offer of salvation and the efficacy of salvation with the analogy of medicine: in order for the medicine (which is intended for all) to be efficacious, it must be taken.²⁰¹

The Tridentine reference to the celebration of the Mass as the “application” of the sacrifice of the Cross can be seen already in the event of the Last Supper, as the Freiburg theologian Helmut Hoping rightly emphasizes:

When Jesus passes the chalice to the Twelve, these represent Israel and the future Church. In the discussion over the “pro multis” it is mostly overlooked that the words over the chalice are uttered in a liturgical context: on the one hand of the Last Supper..., on the other of the Eucharist as sacramental celebration of the new covenant. The liturgical context of the Eucharist is also presupposed in 1 Cor 10:17-18. The text does not speak of all men, but rather of all those who are united with Christ in the one body. Certainly all men are called to the new covenant that God has established in his Messiah. However, not all have a visible share in the messianic covenant.²⁰²

199 See GERHARDS, “Wie viel,” 82-83 (= “Pro multis,” 63): “It is a matter here of an authentic interpretation from the interior of the liturgy itself, which is more succinct than catechetical explanations.”

200 W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 11,17-14,40)*, EKK 7/3 (Zürich, 1999) 35.

201 See THOMAS AQUINAS, ST III q. 48 a. 1 ad 3.

202 H. HOPING, “‘Für viele’ ist präziser und offener,” in *Konradsblatt* 2 (14 January 2007); cf. idem, “‘Für die vielen.’ Der Sinn des Kelchwortes der römischen Messe,” in *Gestorben für wen?*, 65-79 (esp. 70). See also BAUMERT, SEEWANN, “Eucharistie ‚für alle’ oder ‚für viele’?”, 511.

V.3. *The reciprocity of the covenantal event in the Eucharist*

The characterization of the Mass as application of the graces of the sacrifice of the Cross also serves well for the description of the Precious Blood, whose shedding establishes the new covenant. For a theology of the covenant the distinction between a unilateral imposition on God's part, on the one hand, and a divine disposition whose efficacy requires the positive response of man, on the other, is important. The covenant of God with Abraham, for example, signifies a divine promise that remains valid independent of the comportment of the human partner in the covenant: in Abraham all the families of the earth will be blessed (cf. Gen 12:3). The covenant with the people of Israel, concluded on Mt Sinai and sealed with the blood of Moses (Ex 24:8), is a reciprocal obligation. It therefore becomes void with the infidelity of the ancient people of God. The new and everlasting covenant concluded with the blood of Christ appears then as the antithesis of the covenant of Sinai: "In speaking of a new covenant he treats the first as obsolete" (Heb 8:13).²⁰³ The new covenant prophesied in Jeremiah (Jer 31:31-34) also presupposes the transitory character of the Old Covenant concluded on Sinai. As the covenant of Sinai was concluded with the ancient people of God, so the new covenant is established between Christ and the Church. The keywords "covenant," "election," and "people of God" go together.²⁰⁴

Certainly all men are invited to this covenant, but no one is constrained. For the acceptance of the covenant, the free decision of the faith operating in charity is necessary. If in the biblical accounts of the Last Supper the talk is of the "blood of the covenant" (Mk 14:24; Mt 26:28) and of the new covenant in the blood of Christ (Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25), then the immediate addressees of the making of the covenant are not all men in general, but rather the disciples who believe in Christ: the blood of the Lord is shed "for you" (Lk 22:20) and "for many" (Mk 14:24; Mt 26:28). The covenant is offered in a certain way to all men, but accepted only by many. This relationship between offer of salvation and efficacy of salvation is seen for example in the Epistle to the Hebrews:

... so that by the grace of God he [Christ] might taste death for *every one*. For it was fitting that he, for whom and by whom all things exist,

203 More on this in A. VANHOYE, "Discussioni sulla Nuova Alleanza," in *Rivista teologica di Lugano* 1 (1996) 163-78; idem, *La lettre aux Hébreux. Jésus-Christ, médiateur d'une nouvelle alliance*, Jésus et Jésus-Christ 84 (Paris, 2002) 127-29.

204 See, for example, the survey of Old and New Testament perspectives in B. S. CHILDS, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis, 1993) 413-51.

in bringing *many* sons to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering. (Heb 2:9-10)²⁰⁵

The reciprocity of the covenantal event was cited on the sede-vacantist side as an argument in favor of the doctrine according to which a celebration of the Mass with the words “for all” in place of the *pro multis* is not valid.²⁰⁶ According to the transcendental philosopher Franz Bader, the response of man to the offer of Christ belongs *constitutively* to the covenantal event.²⁰⁷ Therefore the formulation “for all” would be in itself absurd:

Judas is asked to return to the altar from which Jesus has excluded him (“You are clean, but *not all!*”), indeed is carried back against his will.... There, where Judas is, Jesus cannot be. There, where the Mass of Judas is “celebrated,” Jesus does not operate, does not sacrifice, and does not consecrate.²⁰⁸

This argumentation is not properly attentive to the nuances of biblical covenantal theology. The Greek word *diatheke* and the Hebrew *berit* do not mean simply (as “covenant” does in current language) a pact between two partners, but rather a manifestation of salvation on God’s part. Only from the relevant linguistic context can the element of reciprocity be included, especially in the covenant of Sinai.²⁰⁹ The blood of Christ, shed through expiatory love, establishes the new covenant, so that Protestant exegetes especially interpret the Covenant

205 See GRÄSSER, *An die Hebräer*, 129: “*Polloi* has a restrictive sense, which is expressly confirmed in 4:6: it remains for *some* to enter into rest. Christ has died on behalf of every one (2:9d). But not every one makes use of the favor (cf. 2:3; 3:11-12; 12:25) or observes the conditions for communion with Christ (3:14), rather some forfeit the grace of God (12:25), and so not all reach the goal (4:1; 6:6; 10:26; 12:12).” See also A. VANHOYE, *Situation du Christ. Hébreux 1-2*, *Lectio divina* 58 (Paris, 1969) 310-11.

206 See Section VI below.

207 F. BADER, “Das Blut des Bundes für euch und für viele” [published serially], *Einsicht* 1.5 (August 1971) 1-8; 1.8 (November 1971) 35-41 (e.g., at 38: “In the concept blood of the *covenant* is implied necessarily [*denknotwendig*] that this is co-constituted through the positive response of those who want to be allotted the salvation of the crucifixion.”); 2.8 (November 1972) 4-10; 4.10/11 (January/February 1975) 296-304.

208 BADER, “Das Blut des Bundes,” *Einsicht* 1.5 (1971) 8.

209 See VANHOYE, *La lettre aux Hébreux*, 126-128; W. KIRCHSCHLÄGER, “Bund’ in der Herrenmahltradition,” in *Der ungekündigte Bund. Antworten des Neuen Testaments*, ed. H. Frankemölle, *Quaestiones disputatae* 172 (Freiburg i. Br., 1998) 117-34 (esp. 118).

as a unilateral event.²¹⁰ Even in such an interpretation, however, the disposition of God at the Last Supper aims undoubtedly at the obedience of faith and refers in such a way to a reciprocal relationship.²¹¹ In my opinion, the human response of the Church is to be understood not as formally constitutive of the covenant, but rather as an *integrative component* of it. Jesus speaks of the covenant in *his* blood, not in that of the Apostles or Christians.²¹² The covenant “is *realized* in the death of Jesus, *anticipated* in the supper of Jesus with his community of followers, and *renewed* in the memorial representation of this meal.”²¹³ In this perspective the formulation “for all” in the context of the Last Supper would certainly not be absurd (*pace* Bader), but would appear less adequate: for it is not a matter, in the first place, of the universal offer of salvation, but rather of the renewal of the covenant in the sacramental event that is tied to faith and discipleship.

The acceptance of the covenant, and with it the effective limitation of salvation, becomes especially clear in the Lucan formulation according to which the body of Christ is offered in sacrifice “for you.” This subordinate clause

is not found in the old Missal, but it is specifically added in the *Novus Ordo Missae*. With it is implied not the universal offer of salvation, but the limited efficacy of salvation. Does it then make sense to speak of the efficacy when rendering present of the Body of Christ, but of the offer when it comes to the Blood?²¹⁴

In sum, Jesus’ sacrifice “for many” seems to refer to the end-effect of his Passion. The Redeemer offers his life in sacrifice “for the sheep,” for his own who believe in him (Jn 10:15, 26-28): “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life” (Jn 3:16). In the Upper Room Jesus prays for his disciples and “for those who believe in me through their word” (Jn 17:20). This objective fits well in the context of the Last Supper:

Every man who must make a great sacrifice thinks always about its probable success. Furthermore, from this thought man gains

210 See, for example, JEREMIAS, *Abendmahls Worte*, 218; E. GRÄSSER, *Der Alte Bund im Neuen* (Tübingen, 1985), ch. 6.

211 GRÄSSER, *Der Alte Bund im Neuen*, 118-19.

212 See C. SPICQ, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, 3rd ed., vol. 2 (Paris, 1953) 285.

213 KIRCHSCHLÄGER, “Herrenmahltradition,” 126.

214 WILDFEUER, “Treue zum Testament,” 28-29. Similarly GALLUS, “Streitfrage,” 296.

the strength necessary to make the sacrifice. We can suppose that even the God-*Man*, before his Passion, thought that many would be saved through his death on the cross. Perhaps this is why Jesus said prophetically that his blood would be shed for many for the remission of sins.²¹⁵

VI. THE QUESTION OF VALIDITY

The letter of Cardinal Arinze stresses that no doubt exists regarding the validity of a Mass in which, in the consecration of the chalice, an approved text is used that contains an equivalent of the phrase “for all.” This is important in light of the voices that, since the adoption of the erroneous translations, have raised doubts about the validity of the eucharistic celebrations in the national languages.

According to the ordinary magisterium of the Church, exemplarily expressed in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, the validity of the eucharistic consecration depends on the institution narrative: “In the *institution narrative*, the power of the words and the action of Christ, and the power of the Holy Spirit, make sacramentally present under the species of bread and wine Christ’s body and blood, his sacrifice offered on the cross once for all” (CCC 1353; cf. 1412-13). The presence of the Lord’s words underlie the multiple variations in diverse liturgies, all the way to the East Syrian anaphora of “Addai and Mari,” wherein (at least according to the official interpretation of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity)

the words of Eucharistic Institution are indeed present..., not in a coherent narrative way and *ad litteram*, but rather in a dispersed eucharological way, that is, integrated in successive prayers of thanksgiving, praise and intercession.²¹⁶

According to the common opinion of traditional dogmatics, what is essential for the validity of the sacramental form are the words: “This is my body,” “This is my blood” (or “This is the cup of my blood”).²¹⁷

²¹⁵ PIGULLA, “Das für viele vergossene Blut,” 80.

²¹⁶ PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN UNITY, “Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East” (20 July 2001) §3, at <www.vatican.va>. We cannot enter here into the particulars of the controversies surrounding it. The *status questionis* is well presented in *Sull’Anafora dei Santi Apostoli Addai e Mari*, ed. B. Gherardini, Special issue of *Divinitas* (Vatican City, 2004); see D. Berger’s review in *Theologisches* 34 (2004) 692-94, as well as the multilingual collection *Die Anaphora von Addai und Mari. Studien zu Eucharistie und Einsetzungsworten*, ed. U. M. Lang (Bonn, 2007).

²¹⁷ See, for example, F. DIEKAMP, K. JÜSSEN, *Katholische Dogmatik nach den Grundsätzen des heiligen Thomas*, 13th ed., vol. 3 (Münster, 1962) 129-30;

In light of liturgical variety, especially in the Eastern rites, this is the most plausible interpretation.

Since there are, however, other proposed solutions, one can argue that plausibility does not signify the certainty necessary for the valid confection of the Eucharist.²¹⁸ Some authors make recourse to Thomas Aquinas, who prefers the opinion according to which even the words that follow the phrase “*Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei*” belong to the essential form; in them is indicated the power of the blood shed during the Passion (for the attainment of eternal life, the righteousness of the grace of faith, and the remission of sins).²¹⁹ A rule of the Missal of St Pius V is also cited, according to which a modification of the sense of the sacramental form would entail the invalidity of its performance:

If one however were to diminish or change something in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in the change the words would no longer signify the same thing, then he would no longer confect the sacrament (*Si quis autem aliquid diminueret, vel immutaret de forma consecrationis Corporis et Sanguinis, et in ipsa verborum immutatione verba idem non significarent, non conficeret Sacramentum*).²²⁰

For Thomas Aquinas, an addition that changes the significance of the substantial form renders the sacramental act invalid.²²¹ According to the opinion of sedevacantist circles, the erroneous translation of *pro multis* leads therefore to the invalidity of the celebration of the Mass,²²² while a more moderate position makes recourse to the principle of “tutorism”: that is, when it is a matter of the validity of the sacraments, one may not (as is otherwise permissible in the area of morals) follow

J. POHLE, J. GUMMERSBACH, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, 9th ed., vol. 2 (Paderborn, 1937; repr. 1960) 277-82. Among the more recent treatments, see J. AUER, *Allgemeine Sakramentenlehre und Das Mysterium der Eucharistie*, 2nd ed., Kleine Kath. Dogmatik 6 (Regensburg, 1974) 162-65; A. ZIEGENAUS, *Die Heilsgewenwart in der Kirche. Sakramentenlehre*, Kath. Dogmatik 7 (Aachen, 2003) 324-27; GARCÍA IBÁÑEZ, *L'Eucaristia*, 503-510.

218 So G. HERMES, “Die Aussage der Theologie. Zur Frage der Gültigkeit der Konsekration,” in *Der Fels* 7 (1976) 136-139 at 136: The idea that the words after *sanguinis mei* “do not belong to the essential form of the Sacrament, ... is only probable, but by no means certain.”

219 THOMAS AQUINAS, ST III q. 78 a. 3 resp. See *In 1 Cor.* 11, lect. 6.

220 *De defectibus in celebratione missarum occurrentibus* V.1. Appealed to, for example, by HERMES, “Aussage,” 138, and A. HOLZER, *Novus Ordo Missae oder Die Zerstörung der heiligen Messe* (Stegen über Freiburg, 1975) 46-48.

221 THOMAS AQUINAS, ST III q. 60 a. 8.

222 See HOLZER, *Novus Ordo Missae*, 29-74; W. SIEBEL, *Katholisch oder konziliar. Die Krise der Kirche heute* (Munich/Vienna, 1978) 323-36.

a merely probable opinion, but rather should hold to the *via tutior* (the safer way).²²³ Here problems and moral uncertainties arise which have anguished many believers, especially seminarians and priests.²²⁴ These problems have not always been “resolved” in open dialogue, but often with the “wooden hammer” of Church officialdom.²²⁵ But suppressed problems tend to return again, as is evident regarding our topic since the release of Cardinal Arinze’s letter.

Of course, in the critique of the erroneous translation, Church membership and the theological equilibrium this entails cannot be forgotten. Thomas Aquinas, according to whom an addition to the sacramental form that distorts its sense renders a sacrament invalid, starts naturally from the fact that a rite accepted by the Church and performed with the intention of doing what the Church does can never be invalid.²²⁶ That the minimum necessary for the validity consists in the words “This is my body; This is my blood” seems such a well-founded theological opinion, that here one should have moral certainty. In the cited passage, Aquinas speaks of the integrity of the affirmation (*integritas locutionis*), which can, however, be distinguished from the formal substance.²²⁷ “To the ‘form’ of a sacramental sign belongs always only that which indicates the material on hand and makes it a sign of grace, but not the specification of substantial peculiarities or effects of the sacrament, which in any case could never

223 HERMES, “Aussage,” 138-39, appealing to the condemnation of Laxism by Pope Innocent XI (1679). The Pope condemned the following opinion: “In the administration of the sacraments, it is not illicit to follow the probable opinion concerning the validity of the sacrament and to take no notice of the safer opinion” (DH 2101).

224 See, for example, WILDFEUER, “Treue zum Testament,” 40.

225 A typical example of such is the handling by the German Bishops’ Conference, led by Cardinal Döpfner, of the arguments appearing in 1976 in the journal *Der Fels*. The editor of the journal, Fr Georg Hermes, S.A.C., was threatened with suspension without being afforded the chance to defend his position. The occasion triggering the controversy was the article “Weg im Zwielicht” in *Der Fels* 7 (March 1976) 67-70, for which the editors took collective responsibility. The contribution of Leo Scheffczyk, cited below, was a compromise made possible by Cardinal Höffner (successor to Döpfner as president of the bishops’ conference), and concluded the discussion of the validity in *Der Fels*. See Siebel, *Katholisch oder konziliar*, 402-406. More precise documentation can be found in the archives of *Der Fels*.

226 ST III q. 60 a. 8 resp.: If he who says the words “intends by such addition or suppression to perform a rite other than that which is recognized by the Church [*qui non sit ab Ecclesia receptus*], it seems that the sacrament is invalid: because he seems not to intend to do what the Church does.”

227 See POHLE, GUMMERSBACH, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, 2:281-82.

be complete.”²²⁸ In another place he also admits: “If the priest were to say only those words [‘This is my Body,’ ‘This is the cup of my Blood’] with the intention of performing this sacrament, this sacrament would be valid.”²²⁹

Is the insertion of the formula “for all” in the words of institution an addition that ruins the sense of the words of the Lord? Leo (later Cardinal) Scheffczyk was not happy with the erroneous translation, but concluded:

The sacrifice of Christ made present in the Eucharist is, according to the intention of Christ and according to its power of effectiveness, there “for all”; the actual effect, however (because of lacking human participation and the mystery of the election of divine grace), redounds to the profit of “many.” Since these two affirmations are dogmatically connected with each other, and the one possesses a necessary affinity with the other—since therefore at bottom both truths are always to be *thought together* in a theologically informed faith (but not always *spoken together*), an affirmation in which *only one* truth is mentioned is not dogmatically erroneous or against the sense of the Eucharistic mystery, even if, as a *translation* of a text which in itself expresses *the other* truth, it may be criticized.²³⁰

The validity of the consecration is not therefore put in doubt by the erroneous translation. But, Scheffczyk continues,

since the reasons for such a translation are not very convincing, the question that is difficult to suppress is why the experts have proposed such an “unhappy” change, and why they have insisted on imposing it. One should not be surprised therefore if, in consideration of such a combination of circumstances, there arises the accusation of carelessness, lack of piety, and reformist obstinacy, which is

228 L. SCHEFFCZYK, “Die Frage nach der Gültigkeit. Die Konsekrationsformel in der neuen Liturgie,” in *Der Fels* 8 (1977) 179-83 at 180.

229 ST III q. 78 a. 1 ad 4. On the interpretation of the texts – relevant here also is *In I Cor* 11, lect. 6 – there exist different understandings among Thomists. While Billuart (1685-1757) distinguishes between the integrity and the substance of the form, Gonet (ca. 1616-81) and older Thomists equate the two. See POHLE, GUMMERSBACH, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, 2:281-82; HOLZER, *Novus Ordo Missae*, 61-69. The opinion of Gonet may be preferable as Thomist exegesis; it is not, however, compatible with the evidence of liturgical history. Thomas starts from the mistaken assumption, right in *In I Cor*. 11, lect. 6, that the relevant statements of Pseudo-Dionysius are those of a contemporary disciple of St Paul.

230 SCHEFFCZYK, “Gültigkeit,” 182.

acknowledged in some other new translations, but which here is rightly considered particularly serious.²³¹

VII. ECUMENICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It must be emphasized that fidelity to Sacred Scripture is also ecumenically significant. The “lexographical feats” of Joachim Jeremias have not, so far as is known to the author, led in any way to changes in the words of institution in the Protestant liturgy of the Last Supper. Especially among the Lutherans one finds an interpretation referring the words of institution directly to believers. While Martin Luther’s *Order of Mass and Communion* of 1523 bears the phrase “for many” in the words of institution, in the *German Mass* of 1526 the consecration of the chalice refers to the community that celebrates the Supper with words oriented to Luke and Paul, “for you.” This is connected with the Lutheran eucharistic doctrine, “because to affirm an efficacy beyond the circle of communicants would be, for Lutherans, at the least equivocal.”²³² This concentration on the community that celebrates the Eucharist agrees in a certain sense with the Tridentine doctrine, according to which in the sacrifice of the Mass it is a matter of the application of the sacrifice of the Cross. However, the effect of the celebration of the Catholic Mass, as efficacious representation of the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, goes beyond the circle of communicants and is directed to all who are disposed to the reception of this effect: “for you and for many.”

The Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* also translated the words of the Lord literally as “for many.” The same can be said for the Eastern Orthodox Churches and Oriental Orthodox Churches, which consider themselves bound to Sacred Scripture and to the traditions of the Fathers. “The decision of Rome to return to the translation of ‘for many’ in the words over the chalice can, on ecumenical grounds, only be welcomed.”²³³

231 SCHEFFCZYK, “Gültigkeit,” 180. Similarly RATZINGER, *God Is Near Us*, 37: “Neither of the two formulae can express the whole of this; each needs correct interpretation, which sets it in the context of the Christian gospel as a whole. I leave open the question of whether it was sensible to choose the translation ‘for all’ here and, thus, to confuse translation with interpretation, at a point at which the process of interpretation remains in any case indispensable.”

232 F. LURZ, *Die Feier des Abendmahls nach der Kurpfälzischen Kirchenordnung von 1563* (Stuttgart, 1998) 154, cited in Gerhards, “Wie viel,” 82 (= “Pro multis,” 62).

233 M. THEOBALD, “‘Pro multis’ – Ist Jesus nicht ‘für alle’ gestorben? Anmerkungen zu einem römischen Entscheid,” in *Orientierung* 71 (2007)

VIII. PASTORAL CONSIDERATIONS

The precise translation of *pro multis*, with a corresponding explanation, also has practical consequences. When Max Zerwick in 1970 justified the erroneous translation along the lines of Joachim Jeremias, he still thought that the phrase “for all” had its own difficulties, “since for some it could mean that all are actually saved, but the danger of such an erroneous understanding is estimated hardly to exist among Catholics.”²³⁴ That which the old-fashioned Jesuit theologian considered improbable in 1970, however, has in many circles today become already the *opinio communis*. That according to the words of Jesus there will be many who (through their own fault) will not enjoy eternal blessedness (e.g. Lk 13:22-24), would be defined as “infernalism” by an accomplished theologian who enjoys the highest sympathy at the top levels of the Church.²³⁵ Even the words of the Lord himself here become ideologically charged: whoever takes them seriously is considered “fundamentalist.”²³⁶ In the present situation, there surely exists no danger worth mentioning of falling into the erroneous Jansenist doctrine according to which Jesus died only for the elect.²³⁷ That “some circles” who insist on a correct translation of *pro multis* want to limit the salvific will of God²³⁸ is a claim made without any objective evidence.²³⁹ Very often, however, we do find an unbalanced optimism

21-24 at 24; cf. idem, “Pro multis,” in *Gestorben für wen?*, 42-43; HOPING, “Für die vielen,” 74.

234 ZERWICK, “Pro multis,” 140.

235 See in this connection, and with further literature, M. HAUKE, “Sperare per tutti? Il ricorso all’esperienza dei santi nell’ultima grande controversia di Hans Urs von Balthasar,” *Rivista teologica di Lugano* 6.1 (2001) 195-220; idem, “Auf den Spuren des Origenes: Größe und Grenzen Hans Urs von Balthasars,” *Theologisches* 35 (2005) 554-62.

236 Thus the Rahner disciple H. VORGRIMLER, *Geschichte der Hölle* (Munich, 1993) 440-41. For the biographical background of this polemic, see D. BERGER, “‘Man könnte meinen, man sei im Irrenhaus.’ Herbert Vorgrimlers Lebenserinnerungen,” *Theologisches* 36 (2006) 353-62.

237 A fear expressed, for example, by GERHARDS, “Wie viel,” 80 (= “Pro multis,” 57-58): “... after more than thirty years one has become so habituated to the open formulation [*sic* - M.H.] ‘for all,’ that the limiting ‘for many’ must be understood exclusively, as if Jesus had not shed his blood for all men.”

238 Thus GERHARDS, “Wie viel,” 81 (= “Pro multis,” 60): “... the interpretation of ‘pro multis’ in the sense of a limitation of the salvific will of God is to be excluded.... However some circles who oppose the open interpretation ‘for all’ would like ‘for many’ to be understood in just such a sense.”

239 At least, none known to this writer. Gerhards also gives no evidence.

with regard to salvation, according to which all men will ultimately be saved. Some observers see in this the decisive motive for the translation “for all.”²⁴⁰ The translation “for many,” on the contrary, stresses the importance of faith and charity for eternal salvation.

In a contribution to the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Christian Geyer has written in a very pointed way that this revision may mark the beginning of a positive change of climate for the Church:

[Catholicism] seemed ... to have destroyed an essential characteristic of differentiation when it systematically let fall into the background, or rather expelled, the category of the salvation of souls. We are all going to Heaven—this is the popular version of the “certainty of salvation.” Spokesmen for Catholicism maintained that their Church could become in the bat of an eye a religion for all—for those of other confessions as well as for non-believers.

But this envelopment strategy appeared not to work. The pagans preferred rather to remain pagans than to be added to the Vatican statistics as Anonymous Christians. And the Christians themselves, freed from the pressure of thinking about the soul’s salvation, shifted into the role of zealous moderators of religion who propagate one God for all, reached by following any road at all, whether Christian, Islamic, or atheist.

However, with this harmonious formula Christianity did not become a religion for all, but rather remained statistically a religion for many, and in reality for ever fewer. Now the Catholic Church draws its conclusions and wants to change its missals.... The salvation of souls should not be imagined a mechanistic affair.... That which Christ has earned for all must nevertheless be willed by each singularly. Thus does one confront the self-defeating image of being, in comparison with others, a harmless religion even capable of winking at atheism. Catholicism is, it appears, not as innocuous as it often acts. It is again about something.²⁴¹

The precise translation of the words of consecration underlines in any case the seriousness of the Christian life. In order to belong to those whom Christ has chosen, an active care for one’s personal salvation is necessary. In a time when the biblical concept of election

240 For example GAMBER, “Übersetzung,” 67; P. HACKER, “Für viele vergossen,” in *Una Voce Korrespondenz* 6 (1976) 47-52 at 52: “The false optimism regarding salvation is, next to the silence about the immortal soul ... the most unnoticed and therefore the most effective incursion of unbelief into the Church.”

241 C. GEYER, “Für viele,” in FAZ, 22 December 2006, no. 298, p. 33.

has been thrown into a limbo of forgetfulness, such a wake-up call is most timely.

A further pastoral reason is the intellectual coherence between Sacred Scripture and the liturgy. Let us take as an example Palm Sunday: in the reading of the Passion narrative according to Matthew or Mark, the covenant of Christ is directed to “many,” while the same word in the core of the celebration of the Mass is translated as “all.” A critical observer remarks: “As I know from experience, those who are made aware of this discrepancy actually react with a great deal of confusion, though only because it is evident that one is mistranslating in the liturgy and manipulating the word of Christ.”²⁴²

To translate *pro multis* with “for the many”²⁴³ would be a shabby compromise that would help no one. This was attempted already in the provisional translation of the German missal before it was replaced by “for all.”²⁴⁴ From the Latin alone, such a translation would certainly be possible from a purely philological point of view, because without an article one cannot distinguish between “many” and “the many.” This is not the case, however, for the biblical foundation, which is Greek. The Greek can use the article or omit it, with consequent changes in meaning, and in the Gospels it is omitted: “for many” (*hyper pollôn*) and not “for the many” (*hyper tôn pollôn*).

The Holy Father is to be thanked for courageously restoring the authenticity of the liturgy. May he, the successor of St Peter, also find the spiritual acceptance that his intrepid decision merits.

Fr Manfred Hauke, a native of Hanover, Germany, is Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Patristics at the Theological Faculty of Lugano, Switzerland. He is a member of the Pontificia Academia Mariana Internationalis; chairman of the Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Mariologie; editor of the series Collana di Mariologia; and co-editor of the series Quaestiones thomisticae and the journals Sedes Sapientiae: Mariologisches Jahrbuch and Forum Katholische Theologie. He also sits on the editorial boards of Rivista teologica di Lugano and Ephemerides liturgicae. A full list of his published works can be found at <www.manfred-hauke.de>.

242 WICK, “Fehler,” 12.

243 Favored for example by HOPING, “Für die vielen,” 76; against, appealing to the Greek text, the New Testament scholar T. SÖDING, “Für euch,” 19.

244 See HAUG, “Übersetzung,” 1.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES

AAS	<i>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</i>
CCC	<i>Catechism of the Catholic Church</i> , rev. ed. Vatican City, 1997
CChr.SL	Corpus Christianorum, series latina
CChr.SM	Corpus Christianorum, series medievalis
CR	Corpus Reformatorum
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
DACL	<i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i>
DH	H. Denzinger and P. Hünermann (eds), <i>Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum</i> . 40th ed. Freiburg i.Br., 2005
EKK	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
FAZ	<i>Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung</i>
FC	Fontes christiani
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
HDG	Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte
HThK	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
LACL	S. Döpp, W. Geerlings (eds), <i>Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur</i> . 3rd ed. Freiburg i.Br., 2002
LQF	Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen
LM	<i>Lexikon des Mittelalters</i>
LThK	<i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i>
PG	Patrologia graeca
PL	Patrologia latina
ST	<i>Summa theologiae</i>
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur