

## Concerning Communion in the Hand

*Matias Augé*

In the span of two years [1989-1990], five editions of a small book by Enrico Zoffoli regarding communion in the hand were published.<sup>1</sup> The little work was intended to be an introduction to a critical understanding of the practice of receiving communion in the hand, a practice which had begun some years previously in Italy [December 3, 1989].<sup>2</sup> The author himself states this when he affirms that his position “expresses a critical conscience, without having the spirit or the tone of a dispute” [p. 123].

This interests us, not only because the study has had, to all appearances, a remarkable diffusion, but also because it is clothed with a certain scientific gravity – he cites no less than 127 authors between ancient and modern – and, as the subtitle says, purports to tell the “true history” of communion in the hand.

With our contribution we do nothing other than follow the invitation addressed by the author to his readers at the end of the book, where he makes use of Saint Thomas’ words: “If someone [...] should wish to counter all that we have stated, let him not speak in dark corners or address unlearned people [...] but let him go ahead and write, if he has the courage to do so...” [quoted on pp. 124-125].

Zoffoli is not an unknown author: a member of the Pontifical Academy of Saint Thomas, he has published numerous and voluminous works of philosophy, theology, Passionist hagiography, and also a book on the Holy Mass.

In the *Preamble* to the fifth edition, the author says that he has been induced to edit and augment this new edition of his book “encouraged by the flattering judgments of eminent members of the hierarchy.” And he adds: “One illustrious theologian, for his part, deigned to define the treatise as *aureus*” and added: ‘It will be a milestone in the history of this last part of the century.’” The reader is intrigued by these complimentary phrases, although he or she does not know just who the “eminent personalities of the hierarchy” are, nor the “illustrious theologian,” who have so generously praised this little work.

To give a certain direction to our exposition, we will first summarize the contents of the booklet and then move on to its critical highlights, which will focus exclusively on the historical part which constitutes, without a doubt, the pivotal point of the author’s arguments.

The book displays on its cover an illustration taken from the Bible of Saint Louis from the 13<sup>th</sup> century [Toledo], in which Christ gives communion on the tongue to his apostles. The choice of this illustration is no doubt programmatic, as will be seen.

After the *Preamble* mentioned above, the text is divided into 17 short chapters: the origin of the new praxis, sense of the concession, unilateral and insufficient motivations, negative results, the thought of the Church, evolution of Eucharistic devotion, essential

terms of the dogma, the reason for its rejection, “physical” and “anthropological” concepts of the consecrated bread, education for Eucharistic devotion, profanations, inevitable dropping and scattering of the fragments, demands of hygiene, from freedom-of-choice to anarchy, praise of the hand? (sic), balance, by way of a summary: give and take.

There follows a conclusion, a brief mention of bibliographic resources, and the index of persons. There is no doubt, as already mentioned, that the most important part, given the nature of this little work, is the historical one; to it the Passionist priest dedicates seventeen pages (35-51). It’s time to devote our attention to it.

\* \* \*

Father Zoffoli’s thesis can be summed up using his own words: “thorough investigations<sup>3</sup> have shown that the practice of communion in the hand did not at all remain in force until the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, as J.A. Jungmann argued, followed by A. Bugnini [...] Such a position is entirely arbitrary, historically untenable...” [p. 38]. Later, Zoffoli offers us a series of data on the history of the minister of communion together with some other data on the history of communion on the tongue and in the hand – the only data relevant to the case.

After a brief exposition of this data, the author exclaims: “What is striking, insofar as it illuminates the historical context in which everything happened, is that the new liturgical practice, derived from the Rome of Saints Eutychian, Innocent I, Leo, Agapitus, and Gregory the Great, was adopted by the synod of Rouen for reasons of greater reverence toward the Eucharist...” [p. 41]. These words offer us the arrangement to follow in our critical reflections.

The text of Pope Saint Eutychian (257-283) says: *Nullus praesumat tradere communionem laico vel foeminae ad deferendum infirmo.*<sup>4</sup> Clearly, the text in question does not prove anything about the practice of giving communion in the hand or on the tongue; it simply forbids the laity to take communion to the sick.

The passage concerning Saint Agapitus, who was Pope from 535 to 536, speaks of the healing of a paralyzed mute at the moment when the Pontiff placed the host on his tongue: *...Cumque ei dominicum corpus in os mitteret, illa diu muta ad loquendum lingua soluta est...*<sup>5</sup> We do not know which thorough investigations Zoffoli might have consulted, but clearly he did not read, among others, F.X. Funk,<sup>6</sup> because, if he had read him, he would have been aware that the German scholar had previously observed about that episode: “The case is such a singular one that whoever might want to deduce something from it regarding the common practice – which is precisely Zoffoli’s case – would clearly be making a mistake. Here we have the case of an extremely weak man, and from that point of view it is understood that the Eucharist could not have been given to him in the hand.”<sup>7</sup> What’s more, communion had to be given in a visible way in order for it to be perceived as the cause of the mute man’s tongue being unbound; for this reason it was logical to place the host on his tongue.<sup>8</sup>

As far as Gregory the Great is concerned, the episode that John the Deacon narrates about Gregory in the *Life* is well known: the pontiff, seeing the irreverent attitude of a matron at the moment of communion, immediately withdrew his hand from the mouth of the woman.<sup>9</sup> This episode is reported by Zoffoli in support of his thesis.

We believe, however, that our author did not read Jungmann well, whom he cited as an adversary to be opposed, because if he had read it, he would not have presented the episode as a clear witness of the new rite, as if the Austrian liturgical did not know it, but he would have tried to refute the argument of Jungmann, who writes precisely about this: “The famous anecdote narrated by John the Deacon must be eliminated from consideration (of single notices from the earliest period), *Vita S. Gregorii* II, 41, the story about the matron who in receiving the sacrament from the hands of the pope begins to laugh, because she recognized the bread that she herself had offered, at which the pope quickly withdrew his hand *ab eius ore*.”<sup>10</sup>

Jungmann considers the episode a legend, interpolated, from the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>11</sup> But even if the fact were true, the explanation that John the Deacon, in his narration, made use of rites common in his time is more than probable. In the episode in question it would demonstrate the formula used in offering the Eucharist: it is a formula from the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>12</sup>

We note, finally, that in these episodes we are always dealing with exceptional cases, that is, always and only of the sick.

But our author seems to be more pleased with other, more ancient witnesses. On page 40 he states: “In 404, under Innocent I (+ 417), a synod was celebrated which, among the various canons, also imposes the rite of communion on the tongue.” This statement has no bibliographical reference provided. We have tried to determine the accuracy of this claim and, as a result of our investigations, it can be said that under Innocent I two Roman synods were celebrated: the first in 402 and the second on January 27, 417.<sup>13</sup> None of the canons of these two synods speaks of communion on the tongue.

The synod of 402 issued 16 canons concerning the ordination of bishops and clerics, several impediments to marriage and virginity. The synod of 417 dealt with Pelagius and Celestius, as can be deduced from various letters of Pope Innocent I, sent to several bishops of Africa who had asked him to validate, with the apostolic authority, the decisions taken by them at the synods of Milevum and of Carthage in 416.

Our scholar, again on page 40, then quotes a text of Pope Saint Leo the Great (440-461), for which, however, he gives an inaccurate bibliographical description. This is a passage taken from a sermon of the pontiff in which Leo, speaking of those who do not profess a correct faith in the Eucharistic presence, affirms: *Hoc enim ore sumitur quod fide creditur, et frustra ab illis AMEN respondetur, a quibus contra id quod accipitur, disputatur*.<sup>14</sup> To present this text as a witness in favor of communion on the tongue is possible only if one makes a superficial interpretation of the Latin text. The expression *ore sumitur* and similar ones are frequent in the ancient and modern liturgical texts: already in the Veronese Sacramentary, the oldest document of the Roman liturgy, we

find the classic prayer after communion that is expressed in these terms: *Quod ore sumpsimus, domine, quaesumus, mente capiamus...*<sup>15</sup> It is established that *ore sumere* simply means “to receive [the Sacrament],” which, naturally, is received through the mouth and therefore does not affirm in itself any rite in particular; even receiving the host in the hand, it then is necessarily carried to the mouth!<sup>16</sup> Therefore, the affirmation in question can be contemporary to the usage of communion on the hand and, in any case, does not prove that Pope Leo the Great distributed communion on the tongue.

Continuing, the author offers us [cf. p. 41] a witness that, according to him, confirms that the Roman usage [!] of receiving communion on the tongue was passed to the regions of Gaul in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. In support of this, he quotes the bishop of Rouen Audoenus (610-684), who, after seeing the aforementioned practice in Rome, is supposed to have imposed it in his diocese at the Synod of Rouen, celebrated – it is our author speaking – between 649 and 653. In this regard he quotes MANSI X, 1199-1200, where the canon in question is reported, at number 2: ... *nulli autem laico aut foeminae Eucharistiam in manibus ponat, sed tantum in os eius cum his verbis...*<sup>17</sup>

We observe, though, that the same Mansi, in a note, states that the practice of communion in the hand *vix ante saeculum nonum prohibitum fuisse* and that therefore, as many scholars affirm, the aforementioned canon of the synod of Rouen *canonibus antiquis adversari notum est*. Palazzini takes up the same observation stating about this synod: “... Some historians think of King Louis the Stammerer, who died in 879, and therefore put this council in the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, but above all for the contents of the canons, which they hold to belong to the period after the seventh century,” and adds: “There is no doubt [...] that some canons are of a Carolingian inspiration.”<sup>18</sup>

Of the aforementioned synod, other authors have recently studied it. Odette Pontal, speaking of the council of Rouen of 688/9 writes: “This council has nothing to do with another council of Rouen, dated to 650 or 878/80, to which some canons in the collections come to be attributed. Even today it has not been clarified if and when this supposed council took place.”<sup>19</sup>

In an even more recent work, Wilfried Hartmann, in the course of studying “some synods of the Frankish kingdom of the West, before and around 900, that were up for discussion,” writes on that of Rouen: “In the synodal manual of Reginald di Prum, bearing the title ‘*ex concilio Rotomagensi*’ are eight canons for which it is not possible to indicate a source.”<sup>20</sup>

Other witnesses could be quoted that confirm the date of this synod. At any rate, the research, even though halted, as noted by Pontal regarding the results of E. Seckel, is inclined – “historian” Zoffoli permitting – toward the mid-ninth century.

And it is precisely because of this conviction that neither J. Gaudemet in *Sources Chrétiennes* 353 nor C. De Clercq in *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* 148 and 148A mention the canons of the synod of Rouen. On the contrary, the latter in his edition states: “In the province of Rouen in this period (that is, between 511 and 695) no

mention is made of any council.”<sup>21</sup> Things being thus, we think that our author should have evaluated the critical difficulties before making solemn and definitive statements.

Our conclusion then sounds quite different: it is not possible to prove, with the texts used by Zoffoli, that in 5<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> century Rome communion was distributed in the mouth nor that in the 7<sup>th</sup> century this practice passed into the regions of Gaul.

\* \* \*

What is most striking in this “true history” is the omission of extremely clear witnesses from the ancient tradition that speak without a shadow of a doubt about communion given in the hand. We’re talking about documents known to historians of the liturgy, which Jungmann collected in his classical work *Missarum sollemnia*.<sup>22</sup>

In order not to repeat things already noted before regarding “thorough investigations,” we limit ourselves here to recalling some of the most important texts of the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> centuries, which bear witness to the usage of communion given on the hand both in the East and in the West.

In the year 692 the important synod called in “Trullo” was celebrated in Constantinople, at which more than 200 eastern bishops took part. In Canon 101, receiving communion in hands arranged in the form of a cross is obligatorily prescribed; criticized were those who believed they were doing better by receiving it in small containers and vessels of gold, silver, or other precious materials, as if inert matter were more worthy to welcome the body of Christ than the image of God, that is, than the human body.<sup>23</sup> This canon proves in an irrefutable way that at the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century it was common usage in the East to distribute communion in the hand. The irony of this case is that Zoffoli also quoted from this council, which he called “ecumenical,”<sup>24</sup> as a way of recalling that “...it is forbidden, in the presence of a bishop, a priest or a deacon, for the laity to communicate themselves; in that case, they would be excommunicated” [p. 37]. The reference is to canon 58. I spoke of the irony of this case, because in it the zealous author sees his attempts come to nothing to prove that the faithful should not receive communion in the hand, because it was forbidden to them *per se*.

The Trullan council of 692 is clear proof that communion in the hand is spoken of, and thus it is acknowledged, and that at the same time the laity are forbidden to communicate themselves. Even if this council was not approved by Rome, it still reflects the usage of the eastern church at the time.

In the West, we have the testimonies of Saint Cesarius of Arles (+ 542), and of the synods of the regions of Gaul from the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> centuries, that confirm the same practice. Men received communion on the bare hand, but women on the hand covered with a veil. The text of Saint Cesarius of Arles is clear: *Omnes viri, quando communicare desiderant, lavant manus suas; et omnes mulieres nitida exhibeant linteamina, ubi corpus Christi accipiant*.<sup>25</sup> The synod of Auxerre of 561-605 also mentions this custom, forbidding women to receive communion on their bare hands: *Non licet mulieri nudam manum eucharistiam accipere*<sup>26</sup> It should be noted that Saint Cesarius of Arles was always attentive to Roman usages in liturgical matters. We have an example from the

synod of Vaison of 529, chaired precisely by the Bishop of Arles, in which the chant of the Kyrie was introduced in the Mass and in the morning and evening prayers to follow the usage of the apostolic see.<sup>27</sup>

In the 8<sup>th</sup> century we have very clear testimonies according to which communion in the hand was always in force both in the East and in the West. Saint Bede the Venerable [+735], speaks of a monk who at the moment of receiving Viaticum, “holding the Eucharist in his hands, asked pardon of the confreres of the community.”<sup>28</sup> Saint John Damascene (+ 749), in describing the rite of communion, exhorts the faithful in these terms: “Let us draw closer to him with ardent desire and let us receive the Body of the crucified Lord with our hands open one upon the other in the form of a cross.”<sup>29</sup>

\* \* \*

Zoffoli several times in his work identifies communion on the tongue as a respectful way of receiving communion, and communion in the hand as a disrespectful way of receiving communion.<sup>30</sup> On page 49 he comes to affirm: “The custom of placing the Eucharist in the hand, experienced for centuries and recognized realistically as dangerous, because it exposed the Blessed Sacrament to all profanations of negligence and of disbelief, represents in the history of eucharistic devotion a past that the Church has had the right-duty to move beyond, approving and favoring the contrary one.”

Even the limited data that we have presented here demonstrate instead that the faithful of the first eight centuries, receiving communion in the hand, were invited to do so with great respect: washing of hands for men, a veil on the hand for women, their hands arranged in the form of a cross as directed by the synod “in Trullo” and by Saint John Damascene... The danger of desecration was always taken into account. The ancient council I of Zaragoza, in the year 380, says in canon 3: *Eucaristiae gratiam si quis probatur acceptam in ecclesiam non sumsisse, anathema sit in perpetuum*.<sup>31</sup> This canon is taken up later by the council I of Toledo, years of 397-400, and a few centuries later, by the council XI of Toledo, in the year 675.<sup>32</sup> On the subject of these dangers, Browe writes: “In many *Penitenziali* of the VII-X centuries we find this penance imposed: *Quicumque sacrificium perdiderit et nescit ubi sit, annum peniteat*. Originally such a prescription was related to the custom of giving the host in the hand; later the paragraph is directed against priests.”<sup>33</sup>

But more than the danger of desecration, it was the growing veneration for the Eucharistic sacrament that led to the new rite of communion in the mouth. One must be aware of another piece of information, judged to be decisive by some authors: the passage from communion in the hand to communion in the mouth coincides with the passage from leavened bread to unleavened bread. The fine particles of unleavened bread, which already in the 9<sup>th</sup> century takes on a roundish shape and becomes ever thinner, adhere much better to the mouth than do the solid pieces of leavened bread.<sup>34</sup>

We are in agreement with the author that growth is one of the essential properties of the church. In its history, the church of God has undoubtedly progressed in its comprehension of the Eucharistic mystery and therefore a return to ancient usages is not always and necessarily an enrichment. We note, however, that the progress in this

case, as in others, was not always linear, but it was, in fact, frequently at the mercy of doctrinal polemics.

The positive reassessment of the dimension of the real presence in the mid-ninth century, and the consequent increase in the manifestations of respect and of adoration toward the eucharist, proceed apace with a conspicuous distancing from actual eucharistic communion. Respect becomes distancing!

The current recovery of a *respectful* “familiarity” with the Eucharist is positive; without denying the progress of history, it purifies it at the same time of polemical excesses.

\* \* \*

We have done some critical highlighting in Zoffoli’s little work. We could do so further. That said, though, we believe that it is enough to make the readers understand the development of the discourse in the volume in question. In conclusion, one more emphasis on the theological method that guides the author in his reflections.

In the chapter on the “essential dogmatic terms,” in which he proposes to sketch briefly the essential lines of eucharistic doctrine that make his case, he begins with these words: “To the quotation of the biblical texts known to all, and to that of the witness of the Fathers [which would oblige us to exceed the pre-set limits] we prefer to recall the definitions of the magisterium” [p. 52].

We are amazed at this way of doing theology. Scripture, fathers, and magisterium are connected and conjoined, and so they cannot subsist independently in a true theological discourse. Starting immediately and only with the magisterium, one risks interpreting it inadequately with Scripture and the fathers. The magisterium then does not make the other factors of doctrinal progress superfluous.

After what has been said, the reader will judge if Zoffoli’s book deserves to be called *aureus*, and if the illustrious theologian who defined it as such is right when he adds: “it will be a milestone in the history of this last part of the century.”

To us it seems, though, that this little volume is simply a classic example of that literature that betrays the lack of full acceptance of the liturgical reforms by some sectors of the Church; a literature that sometimes emphasizes minor novelty rituals, making dogmatic problems out of them, because it does not know the “true” history and the traditional meaning.

That this is the author’s position is evidenced by the insistence with which he speaks in the book’s conclusion of “purity of faith,” “heretical theological currents,” “defense of dogma,” etc. [p. 124].

In the *Preamble* of this little volume that we dealt with, the author writes: “I know that I make myself unpopular with some; but I also feel that the cause to which I have pledged myself is worthy of the sacrifice of life” [p. 6].

With all due respect for the good intentions of the Passionist priest, I believe that it is not worth sacrificing oneself for a cause based on reasoning that is so unsolid – indeed, from a historical point of view, so difficult to sustain.

#### NOTES

*Translated from Italian by Franciso Schulte, OSB. Original: “A proposito della comunione sulla mano,” Ecclesia Orans 8 (1991), 293-304. Reprinted with permission of the author.*

1 E. ZOFFOLI, *Comunione sulla mano? Il vero pensiero della chiesa secondo la vera storia del nuovo rito*, fifth revised and expanded edition, Roma 1990, p. 131.

2 The decree of the Italian Episcopal Conference is from 19 July 1989. See the text in *Rivista Liturgica* 76 (1989) 555.

3 It is a cause of objection that the author, when he should do so, never does quote the sources that are supposed to be the foundation of his assertions, but he settles for generic affirmations such as thorough investigations and the like. Investigations by whom? By the authors quoted in the brief mention of bibliographic resources? It only takes a quick glance to realize that those authors mostly form part of those nostalgic little groups which, in liturgical matters, diminish – often and gladly – the historical data.

4 EUTICHIAN, *Exhortatio ad presbyteros*: PL 5, 165.

5 GREGORY THE GREAT, *Dialog*. III, 3: edited by A. DE VOGUE´ - P. ANTIN, in *Sources Chre´tiennes* 260, Paris 1979, 268-271; PL 77, 224. The episode is read even now in the Greek Orthodox morning office on the feast of Saint Agapitus, April 17 (cf. J. HOFMANN, *Der hl. Papst Agapit I. und die Kirche von Byzanz*, in *Ostkirchliche Studien* 40, 1991, 128-129). Hofmann holds that the source of the text is the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great, translated quite early into Greek (cf. HOFMANN, *l.c.*, 130-131).

6 F.X. FUNK, *Der Kommunionritus*, in Id., *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen* 1, Paderborn 1897, 293-308.

7 *O.c.*, 299.

8 Cf. *ib.*

9 “... Ille continuo dexteram ab ejus ore convertens...” (John the Deacon, *S. Gregorii Vita* II, 41: PL 75, 103).

10 J.A. JUNGMANN, *Missarum sollemnia* II, Wien 1948, 463 note 51; Spanish edition (BAC 68), Madrid 1963, 949 note 52.

11 Cf. *o.c.*, 38 note 2 and 473 note 117; Spanish edition, 579 note 2 and 958 note 119.

12 Cf. *o.c.*: 473 note 117; Spanish edition, 958 note 119.

13 Thus J.C. HEFELE, *Histoire des Conciles* II, 1, Paris 1908, 136-137.187; Ph. JAFFÉ, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* I, Graz 1956, 44-49; P. PALAZZINI (ed.), *Dizionario dei Concili* IV, Roma 1966, 147-148.

14 LEO THE GREAT, *De ieiunio septimi mensis*, 3: CCL 138A, 566; PL 54. 452. See the same text in the edition edited by R. DOLLE in *Sources Chrétiennes* 200, Paris 1973, 127.

15 *Sacramentarium Veronense* n. 531: ed. L.E. MOHLBERG-L. EIZENHOFER-P. SIFFRIN, Roma 1956, 70.

16 Cf. A. BLAISE, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques*. Work revue by A. Dumas, Turnhout 1966, 407-408, § § 261-262.

17 According to the edition of Wasserschleben, the canon sounds like this: “Nulli autem laico aut feminae eucharistiam in manibus ponat, sed tantum in ore cum his verbis...” (REGINONE, *Libri duo de synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis* I, 202, ed. F.W.H. Wasserschleben, Leipzig 1840, 102-103).

18 P. PALAZZINI (ed.), *Dizionario dei concili* IV, Rome 1966, 332.

- 19 O. PONTAL, *Die Synoden im Merowingerreich* (Konziliengeschichte, Reihe A: Darstellungen), Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich 1986, 204. And in a note he refers to the study by E. SECKEL, *Die ältesten Canones von Rouen: Historische aufsatze. Karl Zeumer zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht...*, Weimar 1910, 611-635, sustaining that up to now, the research has not gone beyond the results of the German scholar.
- 20 W. Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und in Italien* (Konziliengeschichte, Reihe A: Darstellungen), Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich 1989, 385. On this same page, no. 34, the author indicates the canons: They are: Reginone I, 202; II, 1.67.68.165.395.411.419... Again by the same author, cf. *Die karolingische Reform und die Bibel*, in *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 18 (1986) 72.
- 21 CCL 148A, 417.
- 22 See also the historical synthesis of A. BUGNINI, *Sulla mano come in trono*, in *Notitiae* 9 (1973) 289-291.
- 23 Cf. MANSI XI, 985-988; J.C. HEFELE, *Histoire des Conciles* III, 1, Paris 1909, 575; P. Palazzini (ed.), *Dizionario dei Concili*, I, Rome 1963, 339.
- 24 An elementary knowledge of church history suffices to know that this council is not ecumenical, indeed it has never been approved by Rome. If, as Zoffoli says, it were an ecumenical council, its canons would have universal value!
- 25 Cesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 227: CCL 104, 899-900.
- 26 *Syn. Autissiodorensis*, can. 36: CCL 148A, 269. In this regard, cf. the study of P. BROWE, *Kommunion in der gallikanischen Kirche der Merowinger-und Karolingerzeit*, in: *Theologische Quartalschrift* 102 (1921) 47-48.
- 27 Cf. *Conc. Vasense*, 3: CCL 148A, 79.
- 28 "... afferte mihi Eucharistiam. Accepta in manu..." (BEDE, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV, 24: PL 95, 214).
- 29 We present here the Latin text of PG: "Accedamus ad eum ardenti desiderio, compositisque in crucis formam manibus, crucifixi corpus suscipiamus..." (John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* IV, 13: PG 94, 1150).
- 30 This attitude leads the author to offer a piteous list of profanations that, according to him, are on the rise in our days due precisely to communion in the hand (pp. 74-78). It amazes us that all of Zoffoli's information on this point should be so deficient and so one-way. A list of profanations of this type could be made up from witnesses belonging to the period in which communion was received only on the tongue.
- 31 The text is taken from the edition of J. VIVES, *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos* (España cristiana, textos 1), Barcelona-Madrid 1963, 17.
- 32 Cf. *o.c.*, 23 and 363-364.
- 33 P. BROWE, *Die Kommunion...*, 48.
- 34 Cf. J.A. Jungmann *o.c.*, 468; Spanish edition, 949. See also A. BUGNINI, *Sulla mano come in trono...*, 292.