

chrism on the head, so that those who receive the imposition of the hand may not wash the head, except at the time of the baptistery. To these the reply can be given that the coming of the Holy Spirit should fittingly be celebrated by everyone who has received Him for so long as the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles is in general celebrated by the Church, that is seven days. And worthily so, since there are seven gifts of the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit came to His host among seven companions. It is worthy that each one have his day and that a banquet be prepared for each one on his day. Wisdom has one day, the intellect another, counsel another, fortitude another, knowledge another, piety another, fear another. Christ customarily gave such banquets among His hosts, as did the Holy Spirit also.

EIGHTH PART

On the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

I. On the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.

The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is one of those upon which salvation principally depends and it is peculiar among all, since from it is all sanctification. For that victim who was offered once for the salvation of the world gave virtue to all the preceding and subsequent sacraments, so that from it they sanctify all who are to be freed through it.

II. When the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was instituted.

Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself instituted the sacrament of His body and blood when after the supper of the old pasch, changing the bread and wine into His own body and blood by divine power, He gave it to His apostles to be eaten and He ordered that after this they should do the same in commemoration of Him.

III. Whether at the supper He gave His mortal or immortal body.

Certain persons are inclined to ask what the nature of the body was that our Lord Jesus Christ gave to His disciples, that is, whether capable of suffering or incapable of suffering, mortal or immortal, and other things pertaining to this question. I think, as I have professed also in other places, that divine secrets of this kind are more to be venerated than to be discussed. I think that this suffices for simple faith, if we say that He gave such as He wished and again that He himself knew the nature of what He gave. For He gave such as He wished, because He was omnipotent and was able to give all that He wished. Now He knew the nature of what He gave, because He was wisdom and He was unable

to be ignorant of what it was. So he frees himself more lightly of the question and perhaps he subsists more safely within himself who does not say: He gave the mortal, lest he seem to speak against the dignity of the sacrament, and does not say: He gave the immortal, lest he be thought to believe contrary to that truth of the mortal body which was in Christ before the resurrection. Thus it is better perhaps that we presume to define neither, although on the other hand we believe that the body was one.

But if an answer must be made, then without prejudice to the truth I accede to this with greater inclination, that He be said to have given over that body incapable of suffering and immortal, insofar indeed as pertains to the sanctification of the sacrament. Now if anyone thinks that an objection must be raised on the ground that before the resurrection our Lord Jesus Christ bore a mortal body, we ourselves profess this also without doubt, that our Lord Jesus was mortal according to the humanity which He took on, because if we did not believe that He was mortal we would deny His death. Therefore, human nature in Christ was mortal, but by will, not by necessity. For from the time when human nature through grace, clean of all sin by the word of God, was joined into unity of person, it was made free from every necessity and obligation of death, so that it owed nothing to death in as much as it had no sin. Yet He endured mortality of His own free will, because He wished to endure death, and if He had not endured mortality He could by no means have died. Thus then of His own will He bore mortality, that He might taste death and thus put mortality aside. Since, therefore, He was mortal by will not by necessity, according as reason and the order of time demanded, before He put off mortality through complete death, He sometimes put it aside in part when He wished, and again He took it back when He wished, so that in this very question He proved that, in so far as He endured it, it was not of necessity, because by His power, in so far as He wished, He was able not to have it, not to endure it at all.

We read in the Gospel that, when the Lord Jesus Christ preached the word of life and invited mortals and those destined to die to live, the zealous enemy, who could not be convinced by reason, in his fury wished to destroy Him. And so, as it were, upon Him who had nothing more than the mortal, "upon Him they laid hands, and they led Him to a high mountain, that He might cast Himself thence," (Cf. Luke 4, 4 and 9). That He himself might show that He indeed was mortal, He endured being held and, that He might again show that He bore mortality and capability of suffering by will, not by necessity, He did not endure that He cast Himself down. When He was to be led, He bore patiently being held. But when He was to cast Himself down, passing mightily through the midst of them He went away. As much as He wished, He was held, and as much as He wished, He was not held. In so far as He wished and when He wished He admitted the nature of mortality. In so far as He did not wish to

endure it and when He did not wish, by his power He removed this from Himself. He said: "He passing through the midst of them went His way," (Cf. Luke 4, 30). You do not think do you that Christ withdrew Himself from the hands of the enemy by struggling when He was held by them, so that passing free through the midst of them He went His way? Thus is fortitude of body alone to be praised in Him, not virtue of Godhead? It is not fitting so, but He showed Himself of what nature He wished, admitting to Himself from that which He bore of His own accord to what extent He wished.

If then Christ according to time at some period laid aside in part the nature of mortality, according to the reason of divine dispensation, before He put it off when about to live always, and again when time demanded assumed it, what wonder is it if it is said that at some time because of and by reason of time, according to something, He laid all that aside, in which, however, when time demanded He was still to suffer? If then this could have been, that He himself bore Himself in His hands and without corruption of Himself gave Himself to the disciple to be eaten, and yet He who gave and who was given, who carried and who was carried, was the same, what wonder is it if it is said that He, in that which He gave, was mortal and, in that which was given, was immortal, and yet He himself who gave as a mortal and who was given as an immortal were not two but the one Himself? How was He not given as a mortal who was taken invisibly and was eaten incorruptibly? He was taken invisibly in so far as I speak with reference to the proper form of His body, not with reference to the appearance of His sacrament. For He was taken invisibly since in that which was taken what He himself was, was not seen. For Christ was taken and the appearance of bread and wine alone was seen. On this account I say: He was taken invisibly and what He was, was not seen. If, therefore, in that which He gave, what He himself was, was seen and in that which was given what He was, was not seen, although in that which He gave He was held and crucified and in that which was given He was broken and was not divided, was eaten and was not corrupted, why do you wonder if in that which He gave He is called mortal, in that which was given He is proclaimed to have been immortal and incapable of suffering? However, may these words be such that on this subject, which lies hidden, the present prejudice may not be raised in anyone.

IV. *Whether that was the body of Christ which Judas received through the dipped bread.*

They also ask this, whether what He gave to His betrayer through the dipped bread must be believed to have been the body of Christ. He said: "When Jesus had dipped the bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon," (Cf. John 13, 26). But, as blessed Augustine says, not as some think, reading carelessly,

did Judas then receive the body of Christ. For it must be understood that He had already distributed the sacrament of His body and blood to all these, where even Judas himself was, just as holy Luke very clearly relates. And then we come to this, where according to John's narrative through the morsel dipped and offered He very openly portrays His betrayer, perhaps signifying his feigning by the dipping of the bread. For all things that are dipped are not washed off but some are dipped that they may be stained. Now if this dipping signifies some good, not undeservedly did damnation follow what was displeasing to the same good. And indeed these are the words of the blessed Augustine on this question, whether Judas in the morsel received the body of Christ. Yet as a result of the fact that the Lord gave to His betrayer a dipped morsel to mark him, custom has it that the faithful should not receive the body of Christ when dipped.

V. *That the paschal lamb was the figure of the body of Christ.*

Just as at one time circumcision, in so far as it had to do with effecting the remission of sins, took the place of baptism, and the Red Sea presented a likeness and figure of the same, so the paschal lamb, whose flesh was eaten by the people and by whose blood the posts of the houses were marked, preceded in the figure of the sacrament of the body of Christ. After the truth came, the sign was taken from their midst, when indeed there was nothing in the future to be signified but something in the present to be received. Yet the figure remained as long as the thing did not yet exist, and it was exhibited first in likeness which afterwards was to be completed in truth. Egypt, the world; the devil, the destroyer; Christ, the lamb; the blood of the lamb, the passion of Christ; the house of souls, the bodies; the home of thoughts, hearts. These we dip with blood through faith in the passion, the others we dip with blood through imitation of the passion, opposing the sign of the cross within and without against adverse powers.

Finally we eat the flesh of the lamb when by taking His true body in the sacrament we are incorporated with Christ through faith and love. Elsewhere what is eaten is incorporated. Now when the body of Christ is eaten, not what is eaten but he who eats is incorporated with Him whom he eats. On this account Christ wished to be eaten by us, that He might incorporate us with Him. This is the sacrament of the body of Christ and the substance of the sacrament of the body of Christ. He, who eats and is incorporated, has the sacrament and has the substance of the sacrament. He who eats and is not incorporated has the sacrament but has not the substance of the sacrament. Just as he who is incorporated, even if he does not happen to eat, has the substance of the sacrament, although he has not the sacrament. He who takes has the sacrament, he who believes and loves has the substance of the sacrament. Therefore, it is better for him who believes and loves, even if he cannot take and eat, than for him who takes and eats and does not believe nor love or if he believes does not love.

VI. *That the sacrament of the altar is also a figure as far as pertains to the appearance of bread and of wine, and is the substance as far as pertains to the truth of the body of Christ.*

There are those who think that they have drawn a defence of error from certain passages in the Scriptures, saying that in the sacrament of the altar the body and blood of Christ do not truly exist but only an image of this and an appearance and figure, especially because Scripture sometimes says that what is taken in the Eucharist of the altar is the image or the appearance of that which will be received by participation with Jesus. These surely would not fall into the noose of this error, if they received the sacraments of God with right and humble faith or treated the Scriptures with fitting intelligence. But now, since in the sacraments of God they prefer their own meaning of faith in the Scriptures, they condemn holding a sane form of interpretation and it comes about that the words of truth cause them to be more befogged, until the intellect wrongly ministers error instead of truth. This, however, is not the fault of Scripture but the blindness of those who read and do not understand. And it is not the confusion of God's sacraments but the perverseness of those who presume.

Now here they have erred dangerously from so many manifest opinions and undoubted assertions, preferring certain ambiguous things and in them selecting the lie rather than the truth, not because this was said there but rather because this rather was believed by them. What then! Is the sacrament of the altar then not truth because it is a figure? Then neither is the death of Christ truth because it is a figure, and the resurrection of Christ is not truth because it is a figure. For the Apostle declares manifestly that the death of Christ and the resurrection are a figure and an image and a likeness and a sacrament and an example, saying: "Christ died for our sins and rose again for our justification," (Cf. Rom. 4, 24 and 25). And the Apostle Peter says: "Christ suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow in his steps," (Cf. 1, Peter, 21). Therefore, the death of Christ was an example, that we die for sin, and His resurrection was an example, that we live for justice. On this account then was it not truth? Then Christ did not truly die and did not truly rise, if His death or resurrection was not true. Far be it from the truth! For of Him it was written: "Surely he hath borne our infirmities and carried our sorrows," (Is. 53, 4). The death of Christ was true, and yet it was an example, and the resurrection of Christ was true and was an example. Why can the sacrament of the altar not be a likeness and truth? In one respect, indeed, a likeness; in another, truth.

VII. *That there are three things in the sacrament of the altar: the appearance of bread and wine, the truth of the body of Christ, spiritual grace.*

For although the sacrament is one, three distinct things are set forth there, namely, visible appearance, truth of body, and virtue of spiritual grace. For the

visible species which is perceived visibly is one thing, the truth of body and blood which under visible appearance is believed invisibly another thing, and the spiritual grace which with body and blood is received invisibly and spiritually another. For what we see is the appearance of bread and wine, but what we believe under that appearance is the true body which hung on the cross and the true blood of Jesus which flowed from His side. We do not believe that through bread and wine the body and blood alone are signified but that under the appearance of bread and wine the true body and the true blood are consecrated, and that the visible appearance indeed is the sacrament of the true body and of the true blood, but that the body and blood are the sacrament of spiritual grace. And just as the appearance is perceived there, whose thing or substance is not believed to be there, so the thing whose appearance is not perceived is believed truly and substantially to be present there; for the appearance of bread and wine is seen, and the substance of the bread and wine is not believed, but the substance of the body and blood of Christ is believed and yet it is not discerned. Therefore, what is seen according to appearance is the sacrament and the image of that which is believed according to the truth of the body, and what is believed according to the truth of the body is the sacrament of that which is perceived according to spiritual grace.

Thus the sacrament of the altar and the Divine Eucharist in the true body and blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ is an image according to the appearance of bread and wine, in which it is perceived, and the thing is according to the truth of its substance, in which it is there believed and perceived. And again, that we now take Christ on the altar visibly, according to the appearance of the sacrament, and corporally, according to the truth of the body and blood of Christ, is the sacrament, and the image is that we should take the same Himself in the heart invisibly and spiritually according to the infusion of grace and the participation of the Holy Spirit. So the most divine Eucharist, which is treated visibly and corporally on the Altar, according to the appearance of bread and wine and according to the truth of the body and blood of Christ, is a sacrament and a sign and an image of the invisible and spiritual participation with Jesus, which is being accomplished within the heart through faith and love.

VIII. *Why Christ instituted the sacrament of His body and blood under the appearance of bread and wine.*

The wisdom of God which manifests itself through visible things wished to show that the refectation of souls is food, and He proposed flesh assumed as edible food that He might through the food of the flesh invite to the taste of Divinity. But lest again human infirmity might shudder at the touch of flesh in the taking of it, He veiled it with the appearance of the usual and principle food, and proposed that it be so taken that sense might be fostered in the one and faith might

be built up in the other. For sense is fostered in the one, when it receives only the usual and customary things; while faith is built up in the other, when in that which one sees he recognizes the nature of what he does not see. So the appearance of bread and wine is proposed, that the full and perfect refection may be taught to be in the taking of the body and blood of Christ, by reason of the divinity of Christ. Now full refection is food and drink, but bread and wine are the principal substance of food and drink. And the appearance is proposed from the principal substance of refection, that He may be taken in it and through it the truth of the body and blood of Christ may be signified; just as He himself testifies, saying: "My flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed," (Cf. John 6, 56).

Yet the Saviour himself likewise shows that this assumption of body and blood alone without the spiritual effect does not confer salvation, when He says: "It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing," (John 6, 64). Accordingly, the virtue and the fulness of the spiritual refection which is in the body and blood of Christ is signified through the appearance of bread and wine; but it is perfected in the reception of grace by the infusion of internal and eternal refection. So, although the three are there in one, in the first is found the sign of the second, but in the second the cause of the third, in the third truly the virtue of the second and the truth of the first, and these three are in one and are one sacrament. Thus it is clear that the assumption of the most divine Eucharist is a sacrament and the image of the participation with Jesus, since that which we receive visibly as His sacrament is a sign that we should be united with Him spiritually. Now the Eucharist, that is good grace, is itself, of course, called the most divine and holy victim, since it makes people divine and makes those participants in divinity who partake of it in a worthy manner. And since truth itself is also a sign, in which the true flesh of Christ is taken under the appearance of bread, in His flesh worthily taken the reception and the participation and the society of divinity are also presented, on this account most divine, most holy, and sanctifying all things that sanctify and are holy.

IX. *Of what nature the change of bread and wine into the body of Christ is to be understood.*

Through the words of sanctification the true substance of bread and the true substance of wine are changed into the true body and blood of Christ, the appearance of bread and wine alone remaining, substance passing over into substance. But the change itself is not to be believed to be according to union but according to transition, since by no means does essence add unto increase of essence, so that through what is added that to which it is added becomes greater, but it happens by transition that what is added becomes one with that to which

it is added. Nor do we say that in the bread the body of Christ is so consecrated that the body of Christ receives being from bread, nor, so to speak, that a new body has suddenly been made from a changed essence; rather we say that essence has been changed into the true body itself and that the substance of bread and wine has not been reduced to nothing because it ceased to be what it was, but rather that it has been changed because it began to be something else which it was not, and the thing itself which began to be did not receive being from it because it was bread, but it itself received its being when it ceased to be what it was. This we have distinguished rather strongly on account of those who pass judgment on faith according to their own reason, and proceeding with their own feeling strive to assert either that this alone is what is perceived or that it is such as is believed, specifically, that because the appearance of bread and wine alone is perceived the substance of bread and wine is there or, because the substance of the body and blood of Christ is believed, the appearance and quality of bread and wine are passibly in that which is perceived, as if the appearance of that whose substance is not present could not appear, or the substance of that whose form does not appear lies hidden.

X. *What those three portions signify, which are made of the body of Christ in the sacrament of the altar.*

These three portions which are made on the altar from the body and blood of Christ have a mystic signification. For the entire Church is the body of Christ, namely, the head with its members, and there are found in that body, so to speak, three parts of which the whole body consists. One part is the head itself. For the head is both head and likewise a part of the body. And so the head itself is one part of the body. Another part of the body consists of those members which immediately followed the head, and they are together with the head itself, where the head itself is. As it is written: "Wheresoever the body shall be, there shall the eagles also be gathered together," (Matt. 24, 28; Luke 17, 37). Therefore, those who already have passed from this life, whose bodies rest in the sepulchres and whose souls are with Christ, these are another part of the body and are, as it were, these two parts at the same time, namely, the head and this other part of the body.

Therefore, on the altar two parts are reserved apart outside the chalice, as it were, outside suffering, since the head itself already immortal and incapable of suffering has arisen from the dead neither to die more nor to suffer more. And similarly those who as saints have passed from this life and already glory and rejoice with their head, themselves also awaiting the resurrection of their flesh and immortality, now feel neither any pain nor suffering, and they are at the same time those two parts outside the chalice and outside suffering,

since these have crossed over first. The third part is placed in the chalice, signifying those who still live in suffering until they themselves also go out of this life and pass over to their head where they neither may die nor suffer more.

XI. *That the body of Christ, when it seems to be divided, is divided according to appearance alone, but remains entire according to itself, thus entire in individual parts, just as in different places it is one and the very same.*

Do not think, when you see the parts in the sacrament of the altar, that the body of Christ has, as it were, been divided or separated from itself or as if torn limb from limb. He himself remains whole in Himself; neither is He divided nor parted. But what pertained to the mystical signification had to be shown you in appearance. Therefore, He shows you the external appearance, by which your sense is instructed, and He preserves the internal incorruption of His body, in which His unity is not divided. One part is seen and, as it were, seems to be a part, and the whole is there, and another part is seen and, as it were, seems to be another, and is the same and the whole itself. Although a third part is seen similarly, it is itself the same and the whole. The whole is here and the whole is there. Nor is it less in part than in the whole nor greater in the whole than in the part. Whatever member of the parts you make, the whole is in each.

Do not wonder. This is the work of God. If He can be one in diverse places, why can He not also be whole in individual parts? Both are wonderful but they are not false because of the fact that they are wonderful. And it is true that it is wonderful; yet let it not be wonderful because it is the work of God. It is not wonderful if the Marvelous One works marvelous things. How, you say, can one body be at the same time in diverse places? He is here, He is there. And the whole is in both places and in many places similarly. Do not wonder. He who made place made body and the place in the body and the body in place. And He who effected that one body was in one place effected as He wished, and if He had wished He would have done otherwise. For when He wishes He does otherwise, and He is just as He himself always wishes. Now since He himself made one body to be in one place, you have seen what was done and you know nothing except what you saw was done. So you marvel when you see or hear anything other than you are accustomed to see and hear. Now He himself does not marvel when He does anything other than what He is accustomed to do, since when He did that He knew even then that He could have done otherwise if He had wished. Therefore, when you begin to marvel at anything and your thoughts perhaps say to you: How can this be?, consider Him who does this and the thing will cease to be marvelous, whatever it may be. And if perhaps it shall not cease to be marvelous, yet it will not be incredible. If the doer is considered omnipotent, whatever the thing will be, it will not be impossible.

XII. *That those things which seem unworthy in the body of Christ are done according to appearance only.*

Do not be horrified that it so happens sometimes, as it customarily happens, that you see some things take place in this sacrament which will seem to be unworthy. This is so in the evident appearance only. He shows you the appearance, He preserves the truth for Himself. He exhibits to your sense the likeness of the corporeal, that your sense in all things may be trained in its own. He preserves the truth of inviolable and immortal nature for His body, lest it be corrupted in its own. If He should withdraw from likeness in something, it would not be a true sacrament, and He would betray Himself there, and He would take away room for faith and would not then be believed. But that would be seen which should not be done. And thus in so far as pertains to us He preserves through all things the likeness of corruptible food and yet in so far as pertains to Himself He does not lose the truth of an inviolable body. He seems to be gnawed to pieces and He remains uncorrupted. He seems to be affected or sullied and He perseveres unviolated. He endures that these things be done about Him, lest our sense perceive something strange, but He does not receive these things in Himself, lest His incorruptible nature lose its purity. So great is the dignity and cleanness of Christ's body that it can neither be affected by any corruption nor stained by sordidness. And so if at any time you see these things take place do not fear for Him but be solicitous for yourself. He himself cannot be injured, you can be harmed who can believe badly.

XIII. *What happens to the body of Christ and its corporeal presence after the taking of the sacrament.*

But perhaps your thoughts again ask you what happens to the body of Christ after it has been taken and eaten. Such are the thoughts of men that they scarcely wish to be quiet in these things which especially are not to be questioned. So your heart says to you: What happened to the body of Christ after I took and ate it? Then give heed. Do you seek the corporeal presence of Christ? Seek it in heaven. There is Christ sitting at the right hand of God the Father. He wished to be with you temporarily when and as long as it was necessary. He showed His corporeal presence to you temporarily, that He might raise you to the spiritual presence. So He came to you corporeally and showed His corporeal presence to you temporarily, that through it the spiritual might be found which was not taken away. Thus by taking on flesh He once came into the world and according to corporeal presence He associated with men temporarily that He might raise them to seek and find the spiritual presence. Afterwards, when the dispensation was completed, according to corporeal presence He withdrew and according to spiritual presence He remained. For that He might show that

according to spiritual presence He did not withdraw, when according to corporeal presence He arranged to go away, He said: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matt. 28, 20).

Thus then in His sacrament now He comes temporarily to you and He is by means of it corporeally with you, that you through His corporeal presence may be raised to seek the spiritual and be assisted in finding it. When you hold His sacrament in your hands, He is with you corporeally. When you take it in your mouth, He is with you corporeally. When you eat it and when you taste it, He is with you corporeally. Finally in sight, in touch, in taste, He is with you corporeally. As long as the sense is affected corporeally, His corporeal presence is not taken away. But after the corporeal feeling in receiving fails, then the corporeal presence is not to be sought but the spiritual is to be retained; the dispensation is completed, the perfect sacrament remains as a virtue; Christ passes from mouth to heart. It is better for you that it pass into your mind than into your stomach. That food is of the soul not of the body. Do not seek in Him the custom of corporeal food. He came to you that He might be eaten, not that He might be consumed. He comes that He may be tasted, not that He may be incorporated. Augustine heard a voice from heaven, because this could not have been said or replied to him by the earthly. I am the food of the great, increase and you will eat me, not that you may change me into you as the food of your flesh but you will be changed into me. And so discern prudently what has been exhibited to the sense in the sacrament of God, what has been accommodated to the spirit, so that, if it is customary, after the reception has been completed you may feel something again. In this also the appearance according to propriety is made serviceable to the sense, that the truth of the likeness may be preserved everywhere. For if in anything, in so far as must be shown to the sense, the likeness should fail, without doubt there would be no sacrament there. But the thing itself would be betrayed and made manifest by an evident miracle, which is not fitting as long as faith holds place. After this then, if you seek the corporeal presence of Christ, seek it in heaven. Seek there where he was even before He began to be with you corporeally through His sacrament and whence He did not depart when He came to you.

XIV. That the celebration of the body of Christ is called the mass, and when and by whom it was first instituted and why it is called the mass.

The celebration of the mass is carried on for a commemoration of the passion of Christ, just as He Himself ordered the Apostles giving them His body and blood, saying: "Do this for a commemoration of me," (Luke 22, 19). The blessed apostle Peter is said to have been the first of all to celebrate this mass at Antioch, in which at the beginning of faith only three prayers were said, starting from that place where it is said: Therefore this oblation. The other

different parts were added by the Holy Fathers afterwards at various times. Now the mass was said as if transmitted or as if a transmission, because the faithful people through the ministry of the priest who performs the duty of a mediator between God and man transmit prayers and vows and oblations to God. Even the sacred victim Himself can be called a mass because He was transmitted first, namely, by the Father to us that He might be with us, afterwards by us to the Father that He might intercede for us with the Father; first, by the Father to us through the Incarnation, afterwards to the Father by us through the Passion; now in the sacrament first by the Father to us through sanctification, by which He begins to be with us, afterwards to the Father by us through oblation, by which He intercedes for us.

Now the mass (*missa*) has been so called as some think from "sending forth," (*emittendo*) because when the priest begins to consecrate the body of the Lord the catechumens are sent outside (*emittuntur*). For when the gospel has been read, the deacon proclaims: If any catechumen is present, let him go out. Catechumens should not be present at the sacred mysteries which are not committed to any save the baptized and Christians, just as of some who bore the stamp of catechumens and not yet of the reborn it is written: "But Jesus did not trust himself unto them," (John 2, 24).

NINTH PART

On the Sacraments that have been Instituted for Practice and that All are Sanctified through the Word of God.

I. On the sacraments that have been instituted for practice and that all are sanctified through the word of God.

There are certain sacraments in the Church and, although salvation does not depend on them principally, yet salvation is increased from them according as devotion is exercised. Although all these cannot be enumerated at present, nevertheless we should not omit certain ones as examples of all. So of these sacraments some consist of such things as the water of aspersion, the reception of ashes, the blessing of branches and of candles, and other such things. Now others consist of deeds such as the sign of the cross, the blowing of exorcization, the spreading of the hands, the bending of the knees, and other acts of this kind. Others consist of words, like the invocation of the Trinity and whatever else is done in this manner. Now all these things are sanctified by the word of God, whether they are sanctified through the utterance of words by invoking divine power or receive the effect of sanctification through the same divine