

The Supper, the Cross, and the Mass

Sacramental Presence Without Time Travel

A source-first theological study

Contents

1	A Powerful Image Under Examination	1
2	Four New Testament Controls	1
3	Chronology Is Part of the Evidence	2
4	Passover, New Exodus, and Covenant	2
5	Anamnesis, Offering, and Sacrifice	3
6	The Last Supper: Anticipation Without Fiction	3
7	What the Fathers Actually Say	3
8	Aquinas: Sign, Sacrament, and Sacrifice	4
9	The Church's Deliberate Vocabulary	4
10	Doctrine and Theological Models	5
11	Liturgical Theology: One Prayer, Whole Pasch	5
12	Objections and Replies	6
13	A More Exact Map	7
14	What the Image May and May Not Do	7
15	Conclusion: One Act, Sacramentally Given	7
A	Scope, Method, and Qualifications	8
B	References	8

1 A Powerful Image Under Examination

One sometimes hears a striking explanation of the Eucharist: at the Last Supper Christ carried the apostles forward to Calvary, whereas at every later Mass he carries the Church backward to Calvary. The image tries to defend three Catholic convictions at once. The Supper is truly sacrificial; the Cross is the one unrepeatable sacrifice; and the Mass is more than a lesson about an absent event.

Those convictions are sound. The proposed temporal mechanism is not. Scripture, the Fathers, the scholastic synthesis, and the Church's authoritative teaching speak of institution, memorial, sacramental representation, participation, application, and presence. They do not teach that the apostles left the upper room's time, or that worshippers at Mass leave theirs. The image can be saved only as consciously figurative shorthand. Taken literally, it obscures the very sacramental realism it was meant to protect.

The better claim is both more exact and more profound. At the Supper, before the bloody immolation on the Cross, Christ sacramentally gave under separate signs the Body he was about to hand over and the Blood he was about to shed. On Calvary he consummated that self-offering in history once for all. At every Mass after Calvary, the same living Christ makes that one sacrifice present under sacramental signs and joins the Church's offering to his. The relations "before" and "after" remain real. The sacrifice is one because the victim and offerer are the same: Christ makes his once-for-all self-offering sacramentally present and offers through the ministry of priests, while only the manner of offering differs. Its unity does not require several congregations to occupy one clock-time.

2 Four New Testament Controls

The words look toward an approaching death

The institution narratives do not present the meal as relocation to a future event. They present Jesus interpreting and giving his approaching death. Matthew and Mark join the cup to covenant blood poured out "for many"; Luke joins the body "given for you" and the cup poured out to the command of memorial (Matt 26:26–29; Mark 14:22–25; Luke 22:14–20). The future Passion already determines the gift's sacrificial meaning. Yet the narrative continues from supper to Gethsemane, arrest, trial, and execution. It does not collapse these events into one historical instant.

Paul holds institution, death, and expectation together

Paul reports the tradition received from the Lord: the bread and cup are Christ's Body and new-covenant Blood; the action is done in his memory; and eating and drinking proclaim the Lord's death until his coming (1 Cor 11:23–26). The celebration therefore has a threefold reach. It obeys the institution given on the night of betrayal, proclaims the accomplished death, and awaits the future coming. Paul's grammar preserves the distinction among institution, accomplished death, and awaited coming. In the rite Christ sacramentally makes his once-for-all Pasch present and applies its fruits while the Church still lives between Cross and Parousia.

Hebrews forbids repetition, not participation

Hebrews insists that Christ entered the sanctuary by his own blood and offered himself once for all (Heb 7:23–28; 9:11–28; 10:10–14). This excludes a series of new deaths or supplementary immolations. It does not require the Cross to be a vanished object available only to recollection. Christ's priesthood endures, he lives to intercede, and his self-offering has permanent efficacy. The Catholic account of the Mass must therefore hold together the historical *once* and the priestly *always*. Literal return to the Friday of the Passion is not needed to do so.

Biblical memorial is covenantal action

Catholic tradition reads Christ's memorial command within Israel's Passover grammar. The Passover memorial does not tell each generation that it has become the generation physically leaving Egypt. It places each generation

within the covenant identity and saving claim of the Exodus (Exod 12:14, 24–27; 13:3–10; Deut 5:2–3). In the new covenant the Church teaches that memorial is not bare recollection: Christ himself and his Pasch are sacramentally made present (CCC 1363–1364). This exceeds subjective remembering without becoming a theory of chronological transport.

3 Chronology Is Part of the Evidence

The Gospel chronology should not be recruited into a theory it does not state. The Synoptics frame the preparations and meal in Passover language: the disciples prepare the Passover, Jesus reclines with the Twelve, and the meal opens directly into Gethsemane and the Passion (Matt 26:17–30; Mark 14:12–26; Luke 22:7–23). John’s Gospel does not narrate the bread-and-cup institution. It places the foot washing and farewell discourse before the Passover feast and gives the Passion an intense paschal configuration (John 13:1; 18:28; 19:14, 31–36). The relation between the Synoptic and Johannine calendars has generated several scholarly proposals. No proposed solution is needed for the present doctrinal conclusion, and none warrants silently rewriting one Evangelist through another.

All four narratives agree on the sequence that matters here: Jesus’ final meal with his disciples precedes arrest, trial, crucifixion, death, and burial. The Resurrection follows. The Evangelists can present the meal as interpreting the death and the death as fulfilling the meal without saying that the company at table becomes chronologically simultaneous with the crucifixion. Narrative sequence is not a crude obstacle that sacramental theology must overcome. It is the created history in which the Word incarnate chose to institute, suffer, die, and rise.

The institution narratives also differ in wording and arrangement. Matthew and Mark emphasize covenant blood poured out for many and the eschatological promise of the kingdom. Luke and Paul include the command of memorial and explicitly connect the body with self-gift “for you.” Luke’s longer cup wording and Paul’s received tradition closely align without becoming identical transcripts. Catholic doctrine does not depend on collapsing them into one reconstructed sentence. Their convergent grammar is sufficient: Jesus takes, blesses or gives thanks, breaks, gives, identifies the gifts with his Body and Blood, interprets his approaching death covenantally, and commands an ecclesial repetition ordered to memory and expectation.

4 Passover, New Exodus, and Covenant

The Eucharist is intelligible within Israel’s worship before it is intelligible as a theory about time. In Exodus the Passover is simultaneously a dated deliverance, a household meal, a sacrificial sign, and a perpetual memorial. Later celebrants do not add another escape from Pharaoh to the first. They receive their identity from God’s accomplished deliverance and submit themselves anew to its covenantal claim (Exod 12:1–28; 13:3–10). Deuteronomy can address a later generation as the people with whom the Lord made covenant at Horeb (Deut 5:2–3). This is corporate and liturgical identification, not a denial that generations are historically distinct.

The prophets deepen the pattern. Isaiah joins a new exodus, the Servant’s self-offering, covenant renewal, and the feast of salvation (Isa 40:1–11; 42:6; 49:6–12; 52:13–53:12; 55:1–3). Jeremiah promises a new covenant in which the law is written within and sins are forgiven (Jer 31:31–34). Ezekiel joins cleansing, a new heart, the Spirit, restored communion, and a Davidic shepherd (Ezek 36:24–28; 37:21–28). These texts do not constitute a single hidden script for the upper room. They establish the scriptural world in which Jesus’ covenant cup, commanded memorial, self-gift, and promised kingdom belong together.

The New Testament then identifies Christ with the paschal fulfillment from several angles. John the Baptist calls him the Lamb of God (John 1:29, 36). John’s Passion marks paschal preparation and applies the unbroken-bone scripture to Jesus (John 19:14, 36). Paul calls Christ “our Pasch” and joins the cup and bread to participation in Christ’s Blood and Body (1 Cor 5:7–8; 10:16–18). First Peter applies lamb and sacrificial language to redemption by Christ’s precious blood (1 Pet 1:18–21). Revelation presents the slain and living Lamb as the center of heavenly worship (Rev 5:6–14).

This scriptural complex is simultaneously retrospective, present, and eschatological. Christian liturgy receives the fruit of an accomplished exodus, participates in the new covenant now, and moves toward the Lamb’s wedding feast. The Eucharist is memorial because God has acted; sacrifice because the living High Priest sacramentally makes

present and offers his once-for-all self-offering; communion because the Church receives and becomes one Body; and pledge because the kingdom is not yet seen in fullness.

5 Anamnesis, Offering, and Sacrifice

The Greek noun *anamnesis* occurs in the institution command in Luke 22:19 and 1 Corinthians 11:24–25 and in Hebrews’ contrast between repeated sacrifices and the annual remembrance of sins (Heb 10:3). Lexical range alone cannot prove a complete Catholic theology. Context controls. At the Supper the command is attached to Christ’s Body given and covenant Blood poured out. In Paul the action proclaims the Lord’s death until he comes. The Church’s Eucharistic anamnesis is therefore enacted proclamation under Christ’s command, not merely an internal recollection.

The New Testament also controls how “sacrifice” is used. Christ hands himself over in obedience and love (Rom 5:6–11; Gal 2:20; Eph 5:2, 25). Hebrews presents him as high priest who offers himself and enters the heavenly sanctuary, while excluding repeated immolations. Revelation’s Lamb is slain yet standing. The Church’s offering is derivative and participatory: believers offer their bodies as a living sacrifice, praise, alms, and mutual service through Christ (Rom 12:1; Phil 4:18; Heb 13:15–16; 1 Pet 2:5).

Three errors follow from confusing these registers. First, one can make “memorial” so mental that Christ’s objective sacramental action disappears. Second, one can make “sacrifice” mean another killing and thereby contradict Hebrews. Third, one can make ecclesial offering compete with Christ’s. The Catholic synthesis avoids all three. Anamnesis is the Church’s effective liturgical memorial under Christ’s command. Christ offered himself once for all; in the Mass that same offering is sacramentally made present and the living Christ is offered unbloodily, without a new immolation. The Church offers only because she is incorporated into Christ and receives from him what she offers.

6 The Last Supper: Anticipation Without Fiction

Calling the Supper an anticipation can sound weak if it means merely a dramatic forecast. Catholic doctrine means more. Christ did not offer the apostles a symbolic rehearsal whose truth would begin only the next afternoon. He gave them his Body and Blood and instituted the sacramental form in which his one sacrifice would remain with the Church.

The temporal asymmetry must nevertheless be retained. At the Supper the historical shedding of blood was still future. On the Cross it occurred. The Council of Trent and later magisterial teaching present the Supper as the institution and true sacramental offering of Christ’s Body and Blood before their bloody immolation on the Cross; the Second Vatican Council says that Christ instituted the Eucharistic sacrifice on the night he was betrayed in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross (Trent, session XXII, chs. 1–2; *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 47; CCC 1323, 1365–1367).

“Anticipatory sacramental presence” is therefore a careful theological description if its limits are stated. It says that the coming self-offering gave the Supper its sacrificial content and that Christ truly gave himself under sacramental signs. It does not say that the bloody sacrifice had already happened historically, that the apostles watched the Crucifixion from the upper room, or that Christ died twice. Supper and Cross are historically distinct moments within Christ’s one self-offering: at the first he institutes the Eucharist and truly offers and gives his Body and Blood under sacramental signs; at the second he consummates that self-offering through bloody immolation.

7 What the Fathers Actually Say

The patristic evidence is rich but does not supply the proposed time-travel formula. Its recurrent centers are reality of Christ’s flesh, ecclesial offering, memorial, heavenly worship, and participation in the one sacrifice.

Justin Martyr describes bread, wine, thanksgiving, communion, and distribution, and says that Christians receive the food as the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus (*First Apology* 65–67). Irenaeus argues from the Eucharist against contempt for creation: earthly bread receives God’s invocation and becomes Eucharist, and communicants’ bodies

are destined for resurrection (*Against Heresies* IV.18.4–5). Both witnesses join sacramental realism to creation and resurrection.

Ambrose links Christ’s effective word to the institution narrative and gives a Western sequence of anamnesis, offering, the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek, and the heavenly altar (*De sacramentis* IV.5.21–23; IV.6.27). Augustine calls the whole redeemed city a universal sacrifice offered through the great High Priest and says that the Church celebrates this in the sacrament of the altar (*City of God* X.6).

These four edition-identified witnesses are representative rather than an exhaustive patristic survey. They confess reality, offering, memorial, creation, resurrection, and ecclesial participation. Their bold sacramental language does not require literal relocation to a future or past civil date.

8 Aquinas: Sign, Sacrament, and Sacrifice

Aquinas gives conceptual precision to what the Fathers confess liturgically. The Eucharist is a memorial of the Lord’s Passion, the fulfillment of figures, and a pledge of future glory (*Summa theologiae* III, q. 73, a. 4). These temporal directions coexist in one sacrament without erasing the order among them.

In treating the rite as sacrifice, Aquinas says that celebration of the sacrament is an image representing Christ’s Passion, while the consecrated sacrament itself contains Christ who suffered (III, q. 83, a. 1). “Image” does not mean unreality, because the sign contains the signified Christ substantially. “Contains” does not mean a second Passion, because Christ now exists risen and impassible. The whole risen Christ is present under either species; the separate consecrations sacramentally represent the separation of Body and Blood in death without dividing Christ or making him suffer now (III, q. 76, a. 2). The sacramental mode makes present the victim and represents the Passion; it does not reproduce the Passion’s bloody mode.

This distinction is exactly what chronological language tends to blur. A person transported to Calvary would encounter the suffering Christ under the historical appearances proper to that event. At Mass the faithful encounter the whole risen Christ substantially present under either species, and his sacrifice in an unbloody sacramental manner. The difference is not a deficiency to be explained away. It belongs to what the Eucharist is.

Cause, representation, and application

Aquinas also distinguishes the sacrament’s relation to past, present, and future: it commemorates the Passion, contains present grace and unity, and prefigures future glory (III, q. 73, a. 4). The Passion is the cause of the Eucharist’s sacrificial efficacy, but causality does not require clock-time identity. A past historical cause can remain effective; the sacrament is the divinely instituted instrument by which its fruit is communicated here and now.

In III, q. 79, a. 1, Aquinas treats the sacrament’s principal effect as spiritual nourishment and union with Christ through grace and charity. In III, q. 83, a. 1, he treats the celebration as a representation of the Passion and as an offering for living and dead. These distinctions matter: Christ’s objective presence and sacrifice do not depend on a communicant’s imaginative ability to reconstruct Calvary.

9 The Church’s Deliberate Vocabulary

Trent teaches that at the Last Supper Christ identified himself as the priest foretold according to the order of Melchizedek, offered his Body and Blood under bread and wine, and commanded the apostles and their successors to offer them. The sacrifice of the Mass is the same sacrifice as Calvary because the victim is the same and Christ, now offering through the ministry of priests, is the same offerer; only the manner of offering differs: bloody on the Cross, unbloody in the Mass (session XXII, chs. 1–2).

The Second Vatican Council calls the Eucharist a memorial of Christ’s death and resurrection by which the sacrifice of the Cross is perpetuated (*Sacrosanctum Concilium* 47). The Catechism gathers the tradition: anamnesis is not bare recollection; Christ’s Passover is made present; the sacrifice remains always actual; the Eucharist represents—that is, makes present—the Cross and applies its fruit; and Cross and Eucharist are one sacrifice (CCC 1362–1372).

John Paul II accordingly writes that the Eucharist does not merely evoke the Passion but makes it sacramentally present, while insisting that Christ's death and resurrection remain unique events of history (*Ecclesia de Eucharistia* 11–12). Benedict XVI describes the institution as the anticipation and sacramental concentration of the sacrifice that would be carried out on Calvary, and situates Eucharistic memorial within the whole Paschal Mystery (*Sacramentum Caritatis* 9–11).

This vocabulary is not timid. “Makes present,” “same sacrifice,” and “always actual” say more than psychological remembrance. Yet the Church does not identify sacramental presence with literal time travel. Her chosen terms protect both realism and the unrepeatable historical character of the Pasch.

10 Doctrine and Theological Models

Not every true theological sentence has the same authority. Several claims in this study belong to the Church's received doctrinal synthesis:

- Christ instituted the Eucharist at the Last Supper and commanded its celebration in his memory.
- By the consecration of bread and wine, their whole substances are changed into Christ's Body and Blood; the whole risen Christ is present truly, really, and substantially under either species.
- Calvary is Christ's unique, complete, once-for-all sacrifice.
- The Mass is a true sacrifice and the same sacrifice as Calvary: Christ is the same principal priest and victim, while the manner of offering is sacramental and unbloody.
- Eucharistic memorial makes the Paschal sacrifice present and applies its fruit; it is not bare mental recollection.
- The Church and faithful participate in and are joined to Christ's offering without supplementing its sufficiency.
- The Eucharist is also banquet, communion, ecclesial unity, and pledge of future glory.

Other formulations are theological models or explanatory syntheses. Saying that the Supper “anticipates” Calvary is well grounded and used by modern magisterial theology, but proposed accounts of *how* a future sacrifice can be sacramentally given require care. Saying that the sacrifice of Christ is “eternally present” may intend his enduring heavenly priesthood or the permanent efficacy of his completed offering; it becomes misleading if it denies that the Passion occurred once in created history. Speaking of the sacrifice of the Cross as made present in the Mass is sound when “present” is sacramental; it becomes false if it implies renewed suffering or local replication of the hill, crowd, and execution.

“The apostles were carried forward” and “we are carried back” are still more remote models. They are not dogma, conciliar language, or a conclusion established by the Fathers. Their best content is already expressed more securely by anticipation, anamnesis, representation, and participation. Theological freedom does not require adopting an unnecessary mechanism, especially where the mechanism generates new errors.

11 Liturgical Theology: One Prayer, Whole Pasch

The General Instruction's account of Eucharistic Prayer keeps the doctrine from becoming an abstraction. Thanksgiving addresses the Father for creation and salvation. The Sanctus joins earthly praise to heavenly worship. The institution narrative speaks Christ's words within prayer. Anamnesis remembers not an isolated death but, according to the prayer, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and awaited coming. The oblation, distinctly, offers the one sacrifice under sacramental signs. Epiclesis and communion petitions ask that recipients become one body in the Spirit. Intercessions stretch across living and dead, local and universal Church. Doxology returns everything to the Father through the Son in the Spirit (GIRM 79).

The 2002 typical edition of the Roman Missal supplies one concrete instance. The Roman Canon's *Unde et memores* remembers Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension before offering the holy victim and gifts. This bounded Roman evidence is not a universal causal anatomy of consecration. It nonetheless shows why “back to Calvary” is too narrow:

the Church celebrates and sacramentally participates in the Paschal Mystery in praise of the Father and expectation of fulfillment.

The distinction between representation and reenactment is equally important. The liturgy does not stage another Last Supper or crucifixion. The altar is not a theatrical set, the priest is not acting the role of a deceased founder, and the fraction does not mime Christ being killed again. Sacramental signs effect what Christ promises in the mode he instituted. Their restraint belongs to their truth.

12 Objections and Replies

If the Mass does not take us to Calvary, is it only symbolic?

No. The alternative between physical time travel and empty symbolism is false. Catholic sacramental causality is real precisely as sacramental. The whole Christ is made truly, really, and substantially present under either species; his one sacrifice is represented and offered; its fruit is applied; the Church truly participates. None of these claims depends on the assembly acquiring the historical coordinates of Jerusalem.

How could the Supper anticipate a sacrifice not yet completed?

It did not make the completed historical death a past event. Christ then truly offered his Body and Blood under sacramental signs while freely moving toward their bloody immolation. His words identified the gifts with the Body to be given and Blood to be poured out; his divine authority instituted the sacramental mode; his obedient self-offering gave the act its unity. “Anticipation” preserves this relation without pretending to solve it through chronology.

Does “once for all” make later offering impossible?

It makes another immolation impossible and unnecessary. Hebrews opposes Christ’s single effective offering to repeated sacrifices unable to perfect the worshipper. The Mass does not put Christ to death again. It sacramentally offers the same living Christ whose completed self-offering has permanent efficacy. Later application and participation do not imply deficiency in the Cross any more than later baptisms imply another death and resurrection of Christ.

Does the heavenly liturgy make every Mass timeless?

The worship of the risen Lamb and Christ’s enduring intercession establish a real heavenly dimension (Heb 7:25; 9:24; Rev 5). “Timeless,” however, can confuse divine eternity, angelic or heavenly duration, Christ’s glorified human life, and earthly liturgical succession. Each Mass occurs at a real created time and place. Its communion with heavenly worship does not abolish those coordinates.

May a preacher still use the forward/backward image?

Only with immediate qualification, and usually a better phrase is available. An image may be rhetorically memorable while catechetically expensive. If it causes hearers to imagine renewed suffering, literal relocation, a merely mental reconstruction, or a Eucharist facing only backward, it has failed. “The Supper sacramentally anticipates the Cross; the Mass sacramentally makes the one Paschal sacrifice present” is less cinematic and more faithful.

13 A More Exact Map

Moment	What occurs	Relation to the one sacrifice
Last Supper	Christ institutes the Eucharist and truly gives his Body and Blood under sacramental signs.	Sacramental anticipation of the self-offering to be consummated in blood; not an observed future execution.
Calvary	Christ freely offers himself through his historical, bloody death.	The unique historical immolation, accomplished once for all.
Resurrection and Ascension	The crucified Christ rises, enters glory, and exercises an enduring heavenly priesthood.	The victim is living and impassible; his completed offering has permanent efficacy.
Every later Mass	By consecration the whole Christ is made truly, really, and substantially present under either species; the Church offers his one sacrifice in sacramental representation and receives its fruit.	Real sacramental presence and participation; neither another death nor travel to a past date.

This map also corrects a false symmetry. It is not quite right to say that the Supper points “forward” in precisely the same way that Mass points “backward.” The Supper occurs within Christ’s own movement toward his Passion and institutes the sacrament before the immolation. Later Masses occur after the Resurrection and Ascension, in the Church’s movement toward his return. They remember the whole Pasch, offer the living Christ, apply the fruit of the Cross, and anticipate the heavenly banquet. The Eucharist does not face only backward.

14 What the Image May and May Not Do

Used explicitly as poetry, the original image may awaken a true intuition: Calvary is not sealed away from Christian worship, and the apostles received more than a prediction. But it should immediately be translated into the Church’s grammar.

- Say that the Last Supper *sacramentally anticipated* the Cross; do not say that the apostles literally arrived at a future execution.
- Say that the Mass *sacramentally makes present* the one sacrifice; do not say that the congregation leaves its historical time.
- Say that Christ is the same priest and victim; do not imagine the risen Lord suffering or dying again.
- Say that anamnesis is effective ecclesial memorial; do not reduce it either to mental recall or to a hidden physical mechanism.
- Say that the Eucharist looks toward the Lord’s return and heavenly banquet as well as toward the Cross.
- Say which statement is doctrine and which is an explanatory model; do not present one theologian’s mechanism as “what the Church teaches.”

These qualifications do not drain the mystery. They prevent an imaginative model from becoming a rival explanation. Sacraments are not weak because they are sacramental. Through created signs and the power of Christ and the Spirit, they communicate the saving reality in the mode Christ instituted.

15 Conclusion: One Act, Sacramentally Given

The proposed formula contains a true protest against a merely memorialist Eucharist, but its literal content should be rejected. The apostles were not transported forward in chronological time, and later worshippers are not transported backward. No authoritative or patristic source examined for this study teaches such a mechanism.

What the sources do teach is stronger than recollection and more exact than time travel. At the Supper Christ offered and gave his Body and Blood under sacramental signs, in anticipation of the sacrifice he was about to consummate. On Calvary he offered himself in blood once for all. Risen and ascended, he remains the living High Priest. In every Mass he makes his one sacrifice present in an unbloody sacramental manner, joins his Body the Church to his offering, applies the fruit of the Pasch, and gives himself as food on the journey toward glory. The historical events remain unrepeatable; their saving reality is not absent.

A Scope, Method, and Qualifications

This English theological article tests one popular explanation of the relation among the Last Supper, Calvary, and later Masses. It is not an exposition of one Missal, a history of Eucharistic rites, a complete treatise on sacrifice or transubstantiation, or a judgment about any person's informal catechesis. Scripture, conciliar and papal teaching, the Catechism, representative Fathers, and Aquinas govern the answer. "Time travel" means literal relocation of a person to another historical time; consciously poetic language is judged by the doctrinal claims it is used to carry.

Patristic breadth is representative rather than exhaustive. The negative finding is bounded to the identified, inspected witnesses; it is not a full-text search or an author-wide computational proof that no Christian writer has ever used a similar metaphor. English biblical wording is paraphrased except for brief conventional phrases. Scripture, official texts, and historical translations retain their own rights status and are not relicensed by the project's CC BY 4.0 grant.

Sources were checked through 2026-07-27. Internal source, theological-boundary, and production review do not constitute independent theological or ecclesiastical approval. No imprimatur or nihil obstat is claimed.

B References

Scripture

Exodus 12–13; Deuteronomy 5; Isaiah 40, 42, 49, 52–55; Jeremiah 31; Ezekiel 36–37; Matthew 26; Mark 14; Luke 22; John 1, 13, 18–19; Romans 5 and 12; 1 Corinthians 5 and 10–11; Galatians 2; Ephesians 5; Philippians 4; Hebrews 7–10 and 13; 1 Peter 1–2; Revelation 5.

Early Christian witnesses

Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 65–67, Dods and Reith translation in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 1 (1887); Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* IV.18.4–5, Roberts and Rambaut translation in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 1 (1887); Ambrose, *De sacramentis* IV.5.21–23 and IV.6.27, Latin in *Patrologia Latina* 16 (1880); Augustine, *City of God* X.6, Marcus Dods translation (1871), checked with Hoffmann's CSEL 40 Latin (1899–1900).

Scholastic source

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* III, qq. 73, 76, 79, and 83.

Authoritative teaching

Council of Trent, session XXII, chapters 1–2 and canon 3 on the Sacrifice of the Mass; Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 47; *Catechism of the Catholic Church* 1322–1323, 1362–1377, 1382, 1390, 1402–1405; *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* 79; John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* 11–12; Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis* 9–11.

Last revised (UTC): 2026-07-27T13:27:22Z

Reuse and rights. To the extent Triptych holds the rights, project-created content and design are licensed under CC BY 4.0. Scripture, liturgical or official texts, received prayers or hymns, quotations, fonts, and other third-party material retain their own status; public-domain material remains public domain. Identify changes. Attribution implies neither Triptych nor ecclesiastical approval. See LICENSE and THIRD_PARTY.md in the source.