TREATISE ON THE SACRAMENTS (Questions [60]-90)

THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL (Questions [60]-65)

ONLY 4 SACRAMENTS ARE TREATED IN DETAILS BY ST. THOMAS

Q. 60 WHAT IS A SACRAMENT? (EIGHT ARTICLES)

   After considering those things that concern the mystery of the incarnate Word, we must consider the sacraments of the Church which derive their efficacy from the Word incarnate Himself. First we shall consider the sacraments in general; secondly, we shall consider specially each sacrament.

   Concerning the first our consideration will be fivefold: (1) What is a sacrament? (2) Of the necessity of the sacraments; (3) of the effects of the sacraments; (4) Of their cause; (5) Of their number.

   Under the first heading there are eight points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A1THEP1) Whether a sacrament is a kind of sign?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A2THEP1) Whether every sign of a sacred thing is a sacrament?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A3THEP1) Whether a sacrament is a sign of one thing only, or of several?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A4THEP1) Whether a sacrament is a sign that is something sensible?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A5THEP1) Whether some determinate sensible thing is required for a sacrament?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A6THEP1) Whether signification expressed by words is necessary for a sacrament?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A7THEP1) Whether determinate words are required?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A8THEP1) Whether anything may be added to or subtracted from these words?

1/ Whether a sacrament is a kind of sign?

  *I answer that,* All things that are ordained to one, even in different ways, can be denominated from it: thus, from health which is in an animal, not only is the animal said to be healthy through being the subject of health: but medicine also is said to be healthy through producing health; diet through preserving it; and urine, through being a sign of health. Consequently, a thing may be called a "sacrament," either from having a certain hidden sanctity, and in this sense a sacrament is a "sacred secret"; or from having some relationship to this sanctity, which relationship may be that of a cause, or of a sign or of any other relation. But now we are speaking of sacraments in a special sense, as implying the habitude of sign: and in this way a sacrament is a kind of sign.

2/ Whether every sign of a holy thing is a sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Signs are given to men, to whom it is proper to discover the unknown by means of the known. Consequently a sacrament properly so called is that which is the sign of some sacred thing pertaining to man; so that properly speaking a sacrament, as considered by us now, is defined as being the "sign of a holy thing so far as it makes men holy."

3/ Whether a sacrament is a sign of one thing only?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A2THEP1)) a sacrament properly speaking is that which is ordained to signify our sanctification. In which three things may be considered; viz. the very cause of our sanctification, which is Christ's passion; the form of our sanctification, which is grace and the virtues; and the ultimate end of our sanctification, which is eternal life. And all these are signified by the sacraments. Consequently a sacrament is a sign that is both a reminder of the past, i.e. the passion of Christ; and an indication of that which is effected in us by Christ's passion, i.e. grace; and a prognostic, that is, a foretelling of future glory.

4/ Whether a sacrament is always something sensible?

  *I answer that,* Divine wisdom provides for each thing according to its mode; hence it is written (Wis. 8:1) that "she . . . ordereth all things sweetly": wherefore also we are told ([Mt. 25:15](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++25:15)) that she "gave to everyone according to his proper ability." Now it is part of man's nature to acquire knowledge of the intelligible from the sensible. But a sign is that by means of which one attains to the knowledge of something else. Consequently, since the sacred things which are signified by the sacraments, are the spiritual and intelligible goods by means of which man is sanctified, it follows that the sacramental signs consist in sensible things: just as in the Divine Scriptures spiritual things are set before us under the guise of things sensible. And hence it is that sensible things are required for the sacraments; as Dionysius also proves in his book on the heavenly hierarchy (Coel. Hier. i).

5/ Whether determinate things are required for a sacrament?

  *I answer that,* In the use of the sacraments two things may be considered, namely, the worship of God, and the sanctification of man: the former of which pertains to man as referred to God, and the latter pertains to God in reference to man. Now it is not for anyone to determine that which is in the power of another, but only that which is in his own power. Since, therefore, the sanctification of man is in the power of God Who sanctifies, it is not for man to decide what things should be used for his sanctification, but this should be determined by Divine institution. Therefore in the sacraments of the New Law, by which man is sanctified according to 1 Cor. 6:11, "You are washed, you are sanctified," we must use those things which are determined by Divine institution.

### 6/ Whether words are required for the signification of the sacraments?

  *I answer that,* The sacraments, as stated above ([Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A2THEP1),3), are employed as signs for man's sanctification. Consequently they can be considered in three ways: and in each way it is fitting for words to be added to the sensible signs. For in the first place they can be considered in regard to the cause of sanctification, which is the Word incarnate: to Whom the sacraments have a certain conformity, in that the word is joined to the sensible sign, just as in the mystery of the Incarnation the Word of God is united to sensible flesh.

   Secondly, sacraments may be considered on the part of man who is sanctified, and who is composed of soul and body: to whom the sacramental remedy is adjusted, since it touches the body through the sensible element, and the soul through faith in the words. Hence Augustine says (Tract. lxxx in Joan.) on Jn. 15:3, "Now you are clean by reason of the word," etc.: "Whence hath water this so great virtue, to touch the body and wash the heart, but by the word doing it, not because it is spoken, but because it is believed?"

   Thirdly, a sacrament may be considered on the part of the sacramental signification. Now Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii) that "words are the principal signs used by men"; because words can be formed in various ways for the purpose of signifying various mental concepts, so that we are able to express our thoughts with greater distinctness by means of words. And therefore in order to insure the perfection of sacramental signification it was necessary to determine the signification of the sensible things by means of certain words. For water may signify both a cleansing by reason of its humidity, and refreshment by reason of its being cool: but when we say, "I baptize thee," it is clear that we use water in baptism in order to signify a spiritual cleansing.

7/ Whether determinate words are required in the sacraments?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A6THEP1), ad 2), in the sacraments the words are as the form, and sensible things are as the matter. Now in all things composed of matter and form, the determining principle is on the part of the form, which is as it were the end and terminus of the matter. Consequently for the being of a thing the need of a determinate form is prior to the need of determinate matter: for determinate matter is needed that it may be adapted to the determinate form. Since, therefore, in the sacraments determinate sensible things are required, which are as the sacramental matter, much more is there need in them of a determinate form of words.

8/ Whether it is lawful to add anything to the words in which the sacramental form consists?

  *I answer that,* With regard to all the variations that may occur in the sacramental forms, two points seem to call for our attention. one is on the part of the person who says the words, and whose intention is essential to the sacrament, as will be explained further on ([Question [64]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64OUTP1), [Article [8]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A8THEP1)). Wherefore if he intends by such addition or suppression to perform a rite other from that which is recognized by the Church, it seems that the sacrament is invalid: because he seems not to intend to do what the Church does.

   The other point to be considered is the meaning of the words. For since in the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above ([Article [7]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A7THEP1), ad 1), we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid. Now it is clear, if any substantial part of the sacramental form be suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed; and consequently the sacrament is invalid. Wherefore Didymus says (De Spir. Sanct. ii): "If anyone attempt to baptize in such a way as to omit one of the aforesaid names," i.e. of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "his baptism will be invalid." But if that which is omitted be not a substantial part of the form, such an omission does not destroy the essential sense of the words, nor consequently the validity of the sacrament. Thus in the form of the Eucharist---"For this is My Body," the omission of the word "for" does not destroy the essential sense of the words, nor consequently cause the sacrament to be invalid; although perhaps he who makes the omission may sin from negligence or contempt.

   Again, it is possible to add something that destroys the essential sense of the words: for instance, if one were to say: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father Who is greater, and of the Son Who is less," with which form the Arians baptized: and consequently such an addition makes the sacrament invalid. But if the addition be such as not to destroy the essential sense, the sacrament is not rendered invalid. Nor does it matter whether this addition be made at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end: For instance, if one were to say, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father Almighty, and of the only Begotten Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete," the baptism would be valid; and in like manner if one were to say, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; and may the Blessed Virgin succour thee, the baptism would be valid.

   Perhaps, however, if one were to say, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary," the baptism would be void; because it is written ([1 Cor. 1:13](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++1:13)): "Was Paul crucified for you or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" But this is true if the intention be to baptize in the name of the Blessed Virgin as in the name of the Trinity, by which baptism is consecrated: for such a sense would be contrary to faith, and would therefore render the sacrament invalid: whereas if the addition, "and in the name of the Blessed Virgin" be understood, not as if the name of the Blessed Virgin effected anything in baptism, but as intimating that her intercession may help the person baptized to preserve the baptismal grace, then the sacrament is not rendered void.

 Q. 61 OF THE NECESSITY OF THE SACRAMENTS (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the necessity of the sacraments; concerning which there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP061.html#TPQ61A1THEP1) Whether sacraments are necessary for man's salvation?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP061.html#TPQ61A2THEP1) Whether they were necessary in the state that preceded sin?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP061.html#TPQ61A3THEP1) Whether they were necessary in the state after sin and before Christ?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP061.html#TPQ61A4THEP1) Whether they were necessary after Christ's coming?

1/ Whether sacraments are necessary for man's salvation?

  *I answer that,* Sacraments are necessary unto man's salvation for three reasons. The first is taken from the condition of human nature which is such that it has to be led by things corporeal and sensible to things spiritual and intelligible. Now it belongs to Divine providence to provide for each one according as its condition requires. Divine wisdom, therefore, fittingly provides man with means of salvation, in the shape of corporeal and sensible signs that are called sacraments.

   The second reason is taken from the state of man who in sinning subjected himself by his affections to corporeal things. Now the healing remedy should be given to a man so as to reach the part affected by disease. Consequently it was fitting that God should provide man with a spiritual medicine by means of certain corporeal signs; for if man were offered spiritual things without a veil, his mind being taken up with the material world would be unable to apply itself to them.

   The third reason is taken from the fact that man is prone to direct his activity chiefly towards material things. Lest, therefore, it should be too hard for man to be drawn away entirely from bodily actions, bodily exercise was offered to him in the sacraments, by which he might be trained to avoid superstitious practices, consisting in the worship of demons, and all manner of harmful action, consisting in sinful deeds.

   It follows, therefore, that through the institution of the sacraments man, consistently with his nature, is instructed through sensible things; he is humbled, through confessing that he is subject to corporeal things, seeing that he receives assistance through them: and he is even preserved from bodily hurt, by the healthy exercise of the sacraments.

2/ Whether before sin sacraments were necessary to man?

  *I answer that,* Sacraments were not necessary in the state of innocence. This can be proved from the rectitude of that state, in which the higher (parts of man) ruled the lower, and nowise depended on them: for just as the mind was subject to God, so were the lower powers of the soul subject to the mind, and the body to the soul. And it would be contrary to this order if the soul were perfected either in knowledge or in grace, by anything corporeal; which happens in the sacraments. Therefore in the state of innocence man needed no sacraments, whether as remedies against sin or as means of perfecting the soul.

3/ Whether there should have been sacraments after sin, before Christ?

  *I answer that,* Sacraments are necessary for man's salvation, in so far as they are sensible signs of invisible things whereby man is made holy. Now after sin no man can be made holy save through Christ, "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood, to the showing of His justice . . . that He Himself may be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ" ([Rm. 3:25,26](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+3:25,26)). Therefore before Christ's coming there was need for some visible signs whereby man might testify to his faith in the future coming of a Saviour. And these signs are called sacraments. It is therefore clear that some sacraments were necessary before Christ's coming.

4/ Whether there was need for any sacraments after Christ came?

  *I answer that,* As the ancient Fathers were saved through faith in Christ's future coming, so are we saved through faith in Christ's past birth and Passion. Now the sacraments are signs in protestation of the faith whereby man is justified; and signs should vary according as they signify the future, the past, or the present; for as Augustine says (Contra Faust. xix), "the same thing is variously pronounced as to be done and as having been done: for instance the word 'passurus' [going to suffer] differs from 'passus' [having suffered]." Therefore the sacraments of the New Law, that signify Christ in relation to the past, must needs differ from those of the Old Law, that foreshadowed the future.

Q. 62 OF THE SACRAMENTS' PRINCIPAL EFFECT, WHICH IS GRACE (SIX ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the effect of the sacraments. First of their principal effect, which is grace; secondly, of their secondary effect, which is a character. Concerning the first there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1) Whether the sacraments of the New Law are the cause of grace?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A2THEP1) Whether sacramental grace confers anything in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A3THEP1) Whether the sacraments contain grace?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A4THEP1) Whether there is any power in them for the causing of grace?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A5THEP1) Whether the sacraments derive this power from Christ's Passion?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A6THEP1) Whether the sacraments of the Old Law caused grace?

1/ Whether the sacraments are the cause of grace?

  *I answer that,* We must needs say that in some way the sacraments of the New Law cause grace. For it is evident that through the sacraments of the New Law man is incorporated with Christ: thus the Apostle says of Baptism ([Gal. 3:27](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Gal++3:27)): "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ." And man is made a member of Christ through grace alone.

   Some, however, say that they are the cause of grace not by their own operation, but in so far as God causes grace in the soul when the sacraments are employed. And they give as an example a man who on presenting a leaden coin, receives, by the king's command, a hundred pounds: not as though the leaden coin, by any operation of its own, caused him to be given that sum of money; this being the effect of the mere will of the king. Hence Bernard says in a sermon on the Lord's Supper: "Just as a canon is invested by means of a book, an abbot by means of a crozier, a bishop by means of a ring, so by the various sacraments various kinds of grace are conferred." But if we examine the question properly, we shall see that according to the above mode the sacraments are mere signs. For the leaden coin is nothing but a sign of the king's command that this man should receive money. In like manner the book is a sign of the conferring of a canonry. Hence, according to this opinion the sacraments of the New Law would be mere signs of grace; whereas we have it on the authority of many saints that the sacraments of the New Law not only signify, but also cause grace.

   We must therefore say otherwise, that an efficient cause is twofold, principal and instrumental. The principal cause works by the power of its form, to which form the effect is likened; just as fire by its own heat makes something hot. In this way none but God can cause grace: since grace is nothing else than a participated likeness of the Divine Nature, according to 2 Pt. 1:4: "He hath given us most great and precious promises; that we may be [Vulg.: 'you may be made'] partakers of the Divine Nature." But the instrumental cause works not by the power of its form, but only by the motion whereby it is moved by the principal agent: so that the effect is not likened to the instrument but to the principal agent: for instance, the couch is not like the axe, but like the art which is in the craftsman's mind. And it is thus that the sacraments of the New Law cause grace: for they are instituted by God to be employed for the purpose of conferring grace. Hence Augustine says (Contra Faust. xix): "All these things," viz. pertaining to the sacraments, "are done and pass away, but the power," viz. of God, "which works by them, remains ever." Now that is, properly speaking, an instrument by which someone works: wherefore it is written ([Titus 3:5](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Titus+3:5)): "He saved us by the laver of regeneration."

2/ Whether sacramental grace confers anything in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts?

  *I answer that,* As stated in the FS, Question [110], Articles [3],4, grace, considered in itself, perfects the essence of the soul, in so far as it is a certain participated likeness of the Divine Nature. And just as the soul's powers flow from its essence, so from grace there flow certain perfections into the powers of the soul, which are called virtues and gifts, whereby the powers are perfected in reference to their actions. Now the sacraments are ordained unto certain special effects which are necessary in the Christian life: thus Baptism is ordained unto a certain spiritual regeneration, by which man dies to vice and becomes a member of Christ: which effect is something special in addition to the actions of the soul's powers: and the same holds true of the other sacraments. Consequently just as the virtues and gifts confer, in addition to grace commonly so called, a certain special perfection ordained to the powers' proper actions, so does sacramental grace confer, over and above grace commonly so called, and in addition to the virtues and gifts, a certain Divine assistance in obtaining the end of the sacrament. It is thus that sacramental grace confers something in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts.

3/ Whether the sacraments of the New Law contain grace?

  *I answer that,* A thing is said to be in another in various ways; in two of which grace is said to be in the sacraments. First, as in its sign; for a sacrament is a sign of grace. Secondly, as in its cause; for, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1)) a sacrament of the New Law is an instrumental cause of grace. Wherefore grace is in a sacrament of the New Law, not as to its specific likeness, as an effect in its univocal cause; nor as to some proper and permanent form proportioned to such an effect, as effects in non-univocal causes, for instance, as things generated are in the sun; but as to a certain instrumental power transient and incomplete in its natural being, as will be explained later on ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A4THEP1)).

4/ Whether there be in the sacraments a power of causing grace?

  *I answer that,* Those who hold that the sacraments do not cause grace save by a certain coincidence, deny the sacraments any power that is itself productive of the sacramental effect, and hold that the Divine power assists the sacraments and produces their effect. But if we hold that a sacrament is an instrumental cause of grace, we must needs allow that there is in the sacraments a certain instrumental power of bringing about the sacramental effects. Now such power is proportionate to the instrument: and consequently it stands in comparison to the complete and perfect power of anything, as the instrument to the principal agent. For an instrument, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1)), does not work save as moved by the principal agent, which works of itself. And therefore the power of the principal agent exists in nature completely and perfectly: whereas the instrumental power has a being that passes from one thing into another, and is incomplete; just as motion is an imperfect act passing from agent to patient.

5/ Whether the sacraments of the New Law derive their power from Christ's Passion?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1)) a sacrament in causing grace works after the manner of an instrument. Now an instrument is twofold. the one, separate, as a stick, for instance; the other, united, as a hand. Moreover, the separate instrument is moved by means of the united instrument, as a stick by the hand. Now the principal efficient cause of grace is God Himself, in comparison with Whom Christ's humanity is as a united instrument, whereas the sacrament is as a separate instrument. Consequently, the saving power must needs be derived by the sacraments from Christ's Godhead through His humanity.

   Now sacramental grace seems to be ordained principally to two things: namely, to take away the defects consequent on past sins, in so far as they are transitory in act, but endure in guilt; and, further, to perfect the soul in things pertaining to Divine Worship in regard to the Christian Religion. But it is manifest from what has been stated above ([Question [48]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48A1THEP1),2,6; [Question [49]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49A1THEP1),3) that Christ delivered us from our sins principally through His Passion, not only by way of efficiency and merit, but also by way of satisfaction. Likewise by His Passion He inaugurated the Rites of the Christian Religion by offering "Himself---an oblation and a sacrifice to God" ([Eph. 5:2](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Eph++5:2)). Wherefore it is manifest that the sacraments of the Church derive their power specially from Christ's Passion, the virtue of which is in a manner united to us by our receiving the sacraments. It was in sign of this that from the side of Christ hanging on the Cross there flowed water and blood, the former of which belongs to Baptism, the latter to the Eucharist, which are the principal sacraments.

6/ Whether the sacraments of the Old Law caused grace?

  *I answer that,* It cannot be said that the sacraments of the Old Law conferred sanctifying grace of themselves, i.e. by their own power: since thus Christ's Passion would not have been necessary, according to Gal. 2:21: "If justice be by the Law, then Christ died in vain."

   But neither can it be said that they derived the power of conferring sanctifying grace from Christ's Passion. For as it was stated above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A5THEP1)), the power of Christ's Passion is united to us by faith and the sacraments, but in different ways; because the link that comes from faith is produced by an act of the soul; whereas the link that comes from the sacraments, is produced by making use of exterior things. Now nothing hinders that which is subsequent in point of time, from causing movement, even before it exists in reality, in so far as it pre-exists in an act of the soul: thus the end, which is subsequent in point of time, moves the agent in so far as it is apprehended and desired by him. On the other hand, what does not yet actually exist, does not cause movement if we consider the use of exterior things. Consequently, the efficient cause cannot in point of time come into existence after causing movement, as does the final cause. It is therefore clear that the sacraments of the New Law do reasonably derive the power of justification from Christ's Passion, which is the cause of man's righteousness; whereas the sacraments of the Old Law did not.

   Nevertheless the Fathers of old were justified by faith in Christ's Passion, just as we are. And the sacraments of the old Law were a kind of protestation of that faith, inasmuch as they signified Christ's Passion and its effects. It is therefore manifest that the sacraments of the Old Law were not endowed with any power by which they conduced to the bestowal of justifying grace: and they merely signified faith by which men were justified.

Q. 63 OF THE OTHER EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS, WHICH IS A CHARACTER (SIX ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the other effect of the sacraments, which is a character: and concerning this there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A1THEP1) Whether by the sacraments a character is produced in the soul?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A2THEP1) What is this character?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A3THEP1) Of whom is this character?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A4THEP1) What is its subject?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A5THEP1) Is it indelible?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A6THEP1) Whether every sacrament imprints a character?

1/ Whether a sacrament imprints a character on the soul?

  *I answer that,* As is clear from what has been already stated ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A5THEP1)) the sacraments of the New Law are ordained for a twofold purpose; namely, for a remedy against sins; and for the perfecting of the soul in things pertaining to the Divine worship according to the rite of the Christian life. Now whenever anyone is deputed to some definite purpose he is wont to receive some outward sign thereof; thus in olden times soldiers who enlisted in the ranks used to be marked with certain characters on the body, through being deputed to a bodily service. Since, therefore, by the sacraments men are deputed to a spiritual service pertaining to the worship of God, it follows that by their means the faithful receive a certain spiritual character. Wherefore Augustine says (Contra Parmen. ii): "If a deserter from the battle, through dread of the mark of enlistment on his body, throws himself on the emperor's clemency, and having besought and received mercy, return to the fight; is that character renewed, when the man has been set free and reprimanded? is it not rather acknowledged and approved? Are the Christian sacraments, by any chance, of a nature less lasting than this bodily mark?"

2/ Whether a character is a spiritual power?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A1THEP1)), the sacraments of the New Law produce a character, in so far as by them we are deputed to the worship of God according to the rite of the Christian religion. Wherefore Dionysius (Eccl. Hier. ii), after saying that God "by a kind of sign grants a share of Himself to those that approach Him," adds "by making them Godlike and communicators of Divine gifts." Now the worship of God consists either in receiving Divine gifts, or in bestowing them on others. And for both these purposes some power is needed; for to bestow something on others, active power is necessary; and in order to receive, we need a passive power. Consequently, a character signifies a certain spiritual power ordained unto things pertaining to the Divine worship.

   But it must be observed that this spiritual power is instrumental: as we have stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A4THEP1)) of the virtue which is in the sacraments. For to have a sacramental character belongs to God's ministers: and a minister is a kind of instrument, as the Philosopher says (Polit. i). Consequently, just as the virtue which is in the sacraments is not of itself in a genus, but is reducible to a genus, for the reason that it is of a transitory and incomplete nature: so also a character is not properly in a genus or species, but is reducible to the second species of quality.

3/ Whether the sacramental character is the character of Christ?

  *I answer that,* As has been made clear above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A1THEP1)), a character is properly a kind of seal, whereby something is marked, as being ordained to some particular end: thus a coin is marked for use in exchange of goods, and soldiers are marked with a character as being deputed to military service. Now the faithful are deputed to a twofold end. First and principally to the enjoyment of glory. And for this purpose they are marked with the seal of grace according to Ezech. 9:4: "Mark Thou upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and mourn"; and Apoc. 7:3: "Hurt not the earth, nor the sea, nor the trees, till we sign the servants of our God in their foreheads."

   Secondly, each of the faithful is deputed to receive, or to bestow on others, things pertaining to the worship of God. And this, properly speaking, is the purpose of the sacramental character. Now the whole rite of the Christian religion is derived from Christ's priesthood. Consequently, it is clear that the sacramental character is specially the character of Christ, to Whose character the faithful are likened by reason of the sacramental characters, which are nothing else than certain participations of Christ's Priesthood, flowing from Christ Himself.

4/ Whether the character be subjected in the powers of the soul?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A3THEP1)), a character is a kind of seal by which the soul is marked, so that it may receive, or bestow on others, things pertaining to Divine worship. Now the Divine worship consists in certain actions: and the powers of the soul are properly ordained to actions, just as the essence is ordained to existence. Therefore a character is subjected not in the essence of the soul, but in its power.

5/ Whether a character can be blotted out from the soul?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A3THEP1)), in a sacramental character Christ's faithful have a share in His Priesthood; in the sense that as Christ has the full power of a spiritual priesthood, so His faithful are likened to Him by sharing a certain spiritual power with regard to the sacraments and to things pertaining to the Divine worship. For this reason it is unbecoming that Christ should have a character: but His Priesthood is compared to a character, as that which is complete and perfect is compared to some participation of itself. Now Christ's Priesthood is eternal, according to Ps. 109:4: "Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech." Consequently, every sanctification wrought by His Priesthood, is perpetual, enduring as long as the thing sanctified endures. This is clear even in inanimate things; for the consecration of a church or an altar lasts for ever unless they be destroyed. Since, therefore, the subject of a character is the soul as to its intellective part, where faith resides, as stated above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A4THEP1), ad 3); it is clear that, the intellect being perpetual and incorruptible, a character cannot be blotted out from the soul.

6/ Whether a character is imprinted by each sacrament of the New Law?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1),5), the sacraments of the New Law are ordained for a twofold purpose, namely, as a remedy for sin, and for the Divine worship. Now all the sacraments, from the fact that they confer grace, have this in common, that they afford a remedy against sin: whereas not all the sacraments are directly ordained to the Divine worship. Thus it is clear that penance, whereby man is delivered from sin, does not afford man any advance in the Divine worship, but restores him to his former state.

   Now a sacrament may belong to the Divine worship in three ways: first in regard to the thing done; secondly, in regard to the agent; thirdly, in regard to the recipient. In regard to the thing done, the Eucharist belongs to the Divine worship, for the Divine worship consists principally therein, so far as it is the sacrifice of the Church. And by this same sacrament a character is not imprinted on man; because it does not ordain man to any further sacramental action or benefit received, since rather is it "the end and consummation of all the sacraments," as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii). But it contains within itself Christ, in Whom there is not the character, but the very plenitude of the Priesthood.

   But it is the sacrament of order that pertains to the sacramental agents: for it is by this sacrament that men are deputed to confer sacraments on others: while the sacrament of Baptism pertains to the recipients, since it confers on man the power to receive the other sacraments of the Church; whence it is called the "door of the sacraments." In a way Confirmation also is ordained for the same purpose, as we shall explain in its proper place ([Question [65]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A3THEP1)). Consequently, these three sacraments imprint a character, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, and order.

Q. 64 OF THE CAUSES OF THE SACRAMENTS (TEN ARTICLES)

   In the next place we have to consider the causes of the sacraments, both as to authorship and as to ministration. Concerning which there are ten points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A1THEP1) Whether God alone works inwardly in the sacraments?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A2THEP1) Whether the institution of the sacraments is from God alone?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A3THEP1) Of the power which Christ exercised over the sacraments;

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A4THEP1) Whether He could transmit that power to others?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A5THEP1) Whether the wicked can have the power of administering the sacraments?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A6THEP1) Whether the wicked sin in administering the sacraments?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A7THEP1) Whether the angels can be ministers of the sacraments?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A8THEP1) Whether the minister's intention is necessary in the sacraments?

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A9THEP1) Whether right faith is required therein; so that it be impossible for an unbeliever to confer a sacrament?

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A10THEP1) Whether a right intention is required therein?

1/ Whether God alone, or the minister also, works inwardly unto the sacramental effect?

  *I answer that,* There are two ways of producing an effect; first, as a principal agent; secondly, as an instrument. In the former way the interior sacramental effect is the work of God alone: first, because God alone can enter the soul wherein the sacramental effect takes place; and no agent can operate immediately where it is not: secondly, because grace which is an interior sacramental effect is from God alone, as we have established in the FS, Question [112], Article [1]; while the character which is the interior effect of certain sacraments, is an instrumental power which flows from the principal agent, which is God. In the second way, however, the interior sacramental effect can be the work of man, in so far as he works as a minister. For a minister is of the nature of an instrument, since the action of both is applied to something extrinsic, while the interior effect is produced through the power of the principal agent, which is God.

2/ Whether the sacraments are instituted by God alone?

  *I answer that,* As appears from what has been said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A1THEP1); [Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1)), the sacraments are instrumental causes of spiritual effects. Now an instrument has its power from the principal agent. But an agent in respect of a sacrament is twofold; viz. he who institutes the sacraments, and he who makes use of the sacrament instituted, by applying it for the production of the effect. Now the power of a sacrament cannot be from him who makes use of the sacrament: because he works but as a minister. Consequently, it follows that the power of the sacrament is from the institutor of the sacrament. Since, therefore, the power of the sacrament is from God alone, it follows that God alone can institute the sacraments.

3/ Whether Christ as man had the power of producing the inward sacramental effect?

  *I answer that,* Christ produces the inward sacramental effect, both as God and as man, but not in the same way. For, as God, He works in the sacraments by authority: but, as man, His operation conduces to the inward sacramental effects meritoriously and efficiently, but instrumentally. For it has been stated ([Question [48]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48A1THEP1),6; [Question [49]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49A1THEP1)) that Christ's Passion which belongs to Him in respect of His human nature, is the cause of justification, both meritoriously and efficiently, not as the principal cause thereof, or by His own authority, but as an instrument, in so far as His humanity is the instrument of His Godhead, as stated above ([Question [13]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP013.html#TPQ13OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP013.html#TPQ13A2THEP1),3;[Question [19]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP019.html#TPQ19OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP019.html#TPQ19A1THEP1)).

   Nevertheless, since it is an instrument united to the Godhead in unity of Person, it has a certain headship and efficiency in regard to extrinsic instruments, which are the ministers of the Church and the sacraments themselves, as has been explained above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A1THEP1)). Consequently, just as Christ, as God, has power of "authority" over the sacraments, so, as man, He has the power of ministry in chief, or power of "excellence." And this consists in four things. First in this, that the merit and power of His Passion operates in the sacraments, as stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A5THEP1)). And because the power of the Passion is communicated to us by faith, according to Rm. 3:25: "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation through faith in His blood," which faith we proclaim by calling on the name of Christ: therefore, secondly, Christ's power of excellence over the sacraments consists in this, that they are sanctified by the invocation of His name. And because the sacraments derive their power from their institution, hence, thirdly, the excellence of Christ's power consists in this, that He, Who gave them their power, could institute the sacraments. And since cause does not depend on effect, but rather conversely, it belongs to the excellence of Christ's power, that He could bestow the sacramental effect without conferring the exterior sacrament. Thus it is clear how to solve the objections; for the arguments on either side are true to a certain extent, as explained above.

4/ Whether Christ could communicate to ministers the power which He had in the sacraments?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A3THEP1)), Christ had a twofold power in the sacraments. one was the power of "authority," which belongs to Him as God: and this power He could not communicate to any creature; just as neither could He communicate the Divine Essence. The other was the power of "excellence," which belongs to Him as man. This power He could communicate to ministers; namely, by giving them such a fulness of grace---that their merits would conduce to the sacramental effect---that by the invocation of their names, the sacraments would be sanctified---and that they themselves might institute sacraments, and by their mere will confer the sacramental effect without observing the sacramental rite. For a united instrument, the more powerful it is, is all the more able to lend its power to the separated instrument; as the hand can to a stick.

5/ Whether the sacraments can be conferred by evil ministers?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A1THEP1)), the ministers of the Church work instrumentally in the sacraments, because, in a way, a minister is of the nature of an instrument. But, as stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1),4), an instrument acts not by reason of its own form, but by the power of the one who moves it. Consequently, whatever form or power an instrument has in addition to that which it has as an instrument, is accidental to it: for instance, that a physician's body, which is the instrument of his soul, wherein is his medical art, be healthy or sickly; or that a pipe, through which water passes, be of silver or lead. Therefore the ministers of the Church can confer the sacraments, though they be wicked.

6/ Whether wicked men sin in administering the sacraments?

  *I answer that,* A sinful action consists in this, that a man "fails to act as he ought to," as the Philosopher explains (Ethic. ii). Now it has been said ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A5THEP1), ad 3) that it is fitting for the ministers of sacraments to be righteous; because ministers should be like unto their Lord, according to Lev. 19:2: "Be ye holy, because I . . . am holy"; and Ecclus. 10:2: "As the judge of the people is himself, so also are his ministers." Consequently, there can be no doubt that the wicked sin by exercising the ministry of God and the Church, by conferring the sacraments. And since this sin pertains to irreverence towards God and the contamination of holy things, as far as the man who sins is concerned, although holy things in themselves cannot be contaminated; it follows that such a sin is mortal in its genus.

7/ Whether angels can administer sacraments?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A3THEP1); [Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A5THEP1)), the whole power of the sacraments flows from Christ's Passion, which belongs to Him as man. And Him in their very nature men, not angels, resemble; indeed, in respect of His Passion, He is described as being "a little lower than the angels" ([Heb. 2:9](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Heb++2:9)). Consequently, it belongs to men, but not to angels, to dispense the sacraments and to take part in their administration.

   But it must be observed that as God did not bind His power to the sacraments, so as to be unable to bestow the sacramental effect without conferring the sacrament; so neither did He bind His power to the ministers of the Church so as to be unable to give angels power to administer the sacraments. And since good angels are messengers of truth; if any sacramental rite were performed by good angels, it should be considered valid, because it ought to be evident that this is being done by the will of God: for instance, certain churches are said to have been consecrated by the ministry of the angels [\*See Acta S.S., September 29]. But if demons, who are "lying spirits," were to perform a sacramental rite, it should be pronounced as invalid.

8/ Whether the minister's intention is required for the validity of a sacrament?

  *I answer that,* When a thing is indifferent to many uses, it must needs be determined to one, if that one has to be effected. Now those things which are done in the sacraments, can be done with various intent; for instance, washing with water, which is done in baptism, may be ordained to bodily cleanliness, to the health of the body, to amusement, and many other similar things. Consequently, it needs to be determined to one purpose, i.e. the sacramental effect, by the intention of him who washes. And this intention is expressed by the words which are pronounced in the sacraments; for instance the words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father," etc.

9/ Whether faith is required of necessity in the minister of a sacrament?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A5THEP1)), since the minister works instrumentally in the sacraments, he acts not by his own but by Christ's power. Now just as charity belongs to a man's own power so also does faith. Wherefore, just as the validity of a sacrament does not require that the minister should have charity, and even sinners can confer sacraments, as stated above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A5THEP1)); so neither is it necessary that he should have faith, and even an unbeliever can confer a true sacrament, provided that the other essentials be there.

10/ Whether the validity of a sacrament requires a good intention in the minister?

  *I answer that,* The minister's intention may be perverted in two ways. First in regard to the sacrament: for instance, when a man does not intend to confer a sacrament, but to make a mockery of it. Such a perverse intention takes away the truth of the sacrament, especially if it be manifested outwardly.

   Secondly, the minister's intention may be perverted as to something that follows the sacrament: for instance, a priest may intend to baptize a woman so as to be able to abuse her; or to consecrate the Body of Christ, so as to use it for sorcery. And because that which comes first does not depend on that which follows, consequently such a perverse intention does not annul the sacrament; but the minister himself sins grievously in having such an intention.

Q. 65 OF THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the number of the sacraments: and concerning this there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A1THEP1) Whether there are seven sacraments?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A2THEP1) The order of the sacraments among themselves;

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A3THEP1) Their mutual comparison;

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A4THEP1) Whether all the sacraments are necessary for salvation?

1/ Whether there should be seven sacraments?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A5THEP1); [Question [63]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A1THEP1)), the sacraments of the Church were instituted for a twofold purpose: namely, in order to perfect man in things pertaining to the worship of God according to the religion of Christian life, and to be a remedy against the defects caused by sin. And in either way it is becoming that there should be seven sacraments.

   For spiritual life has a certain conformity with the life of the body: just as other corporeal things have a certain likeness to things spiritual. Now a man attains perfection in the corporeal life in two ways: first, in regard to his own person; secondly, in regard to the whole community of the society in which he lives, for man is by nature a social animal. With regard to himself man is perfected in the life of the body, in two ways; first, directly [per se], i.e. by acquiring some vital perfection; secondly, indirectly [per accidens], i.e. by the removal of hindrances to life, such as ailments, or the like. Now the life of the body is perfected "directly," in three ways. First, by generation whereby a man begins to be and to live: and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Baptism, which is a spiritual regeneration, according to Titus 3:5: "By the laver of regeneration," etc. Secondly, by growth whereby a man is brought to perfect size and strength: and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Confirmation, in which the Holy Ghost is given to strengthen us. Wherefore the disciples who were already baptized were bidden thus: "Stay you in the city till you be endued with power from on high" ([Lk. 24:49](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++24:49)). Thirdly, by nourishment, whereby life and strength are preserved to man; and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is the Eucharist. Wherefore it is said ([Jn. 6:54](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++6:54)): "Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you."

   And this would be enough for man if he had an impassible life, both corporally and spiritually; but since man is liable at times to both corporal and spiritual infirmity, i.e. sin, hence man needs a cure from his infirmity; which cure is twofold. one is the healing, that restores health: and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Penance, according to Ps. 40:5: "Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee." The other is the restoration of former vigor by means of suitable diet and exercise: and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Extreme Unction, which removes the remainder of sin, and prepares man for final glory. Wherefore it is written ([James 5:15](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?James+5:15)): "And if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him."

   In regard to the whole community, man **is perfected in two ways.** First, by receiving power to rule the community and to exercise public acts: and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is the sacrament of order, according to the saying of Heb. 7:27, that priests offer sacrifices not for themselves only, but also for the people. Secondly in regard to natural propagation. This is accomplished by Matrimony both in the corporal and in the spiritual life: since it is not only a sacrament but also a function of nature.

   We may likewise gather the number of the sacraments from their being instituted as a remedy against the defect caused by sin. For Baptism is intended as a remedy against the absence of spiritual life; Confirmation, against the infirmity of soul found in those of recent birth; the Eucharist, against the soul's proneness to sin; Penance, against actual sin committed after baptism; Extreme Unction, against the remainders of sins---of those sins, namely, which are not sufficiently removed by Penance, whether through negligence or through ignorance; order, against divisions in the community; Matrimony, as a remedy against concupiscence in the individual, and against the decrease in numbers that results from death.

   Some, again, gather the number of sacraments from a certain adaptation to the virtues and to the defects and penal effects resulting from sin. They say that Baptism corresponds to Faith, and is ordained as a remedy against original sin; Extreme Unction, to Hope, being ordained against venial sin; the Eucharist, to Charity, being ordained against the penal effect which is malice. order, to Prudence, being ordained against ignorance; Penance to Justice, being ordained against mortal sin; Matrimony, to Temperance, being ordained against concupiscence; Confirmation, to Fortitude, being ordained against infirmity.

2/ Whether the order of the sacraments, as given above, is becoming?

  *I answer that,* The reason of the order among the sacraments appears from what has been said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A1THEP1)). For just as unity precedes multitude, so those sacraments which are intended for the perfection of the individual, naturally precede those which are intended for the perfection of the multitude; and consequently the last place among the sacraments is given to order and Matrimony, which are intended for the perfection of the multitude: while Matrimony is placed after order, because it has less participation in the nature of the spiritual life, to which the sacraments are ordained. Moreover, among things ordained to the perfection of the individual, those naturally come first which are ordained directly to the perfection of the spiritual life, and afterwards, those which are ordained thereto indirectly, viz. by removing some supervening accidental cause of harm; such are Penance and Extreme Unction: while, of these, Extreme Unction is naturally placed last, for it preserves the healing which was begun by Penance.

   Of the remaining three, it is clear that Baptism which is a spiritual regeneration, comes first; then Confirmation, which is ordained to the formal perfection of power; and after these the Eucharist which is ordained to final perfection.

3/ Whether the Eucharist is the greatest of the sacraments?

  *I answer that,* Absolutely speaking, the sacrament of the Eucharist is the greatest of all the sacraments: and this may be shown in three ways. First of all because it contains Christ Himself substantially: whereas the other sacraments contain a certain instrumental power which is a share of Christ's power, as we have shown above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A4THEP1), ad 3, [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A4A5THEP1)). Now that which is essentially such is always of more account than that which is such by participation.

   Secondly, this is made clear by considering the relation of the sacraments to one another. For all the other sacraments seem to be ordained to this one as to their end. For it is manifest that the sacrament of order is ordained to the consecration of the Eucharist: and the sacrament of Baptism to the reception of the Eucharist: while a man is perfected by Confirmation, so as not to fear to abstain from this sacrament. By Penance and Extreme Unction man is prepared to receive the Body of Christ worthily. And Matrimony at least in its signification, touches this sacrament; in so far as it signifies the union of Christ with the Church, of which union the Eucharist is a figure: hence the Apostle says ([Eph. 5:32](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Eph++5:32)): "This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the Church."

   Thirdly, this is made clear by considering the rites of the sacraments. For nearly all the sacraments terminate in the Eucharist, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii): thus those who have been ordained receive Holy Communion, as also do those who have been baptized, if they be adults.

   The remaining sacraments may be compared to one another in several ways. For on the ground of necessity, Baptism is the greatest of the sacraments; while from the point of view of perfection, order comes first; while Confirmation holds a middle place. The sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction are on a degree inferior to those mentioned above; because, as stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A2THEP1)), they are ordained to the Christian life, not directly, but accidentally, as it were, that is to say, as remedies against supervening defects. And among these, Extreme Unction is compared to Penance, as Confirmation to Baptism; in such a way, that Penance is more necessary, whereas Extreme Unction is more perfect.

4/ Whether all the sacraments are necessary for salvation?

  *I answer that,* Necessity of end, of which we speak now, is twofold. First, a thing may be necessary so that without it the end cannot be attained; thus food is necessary for human life. And this is simple necessity of end. Secondly, a thing is said to be necessary, if, without it, the end cannot be attained so becomingly: thus a horse is necessary for a journey. But this is not simple necessity of end.

   In the first way, three sacraments are necessary for salvation. Two of them are necessary to the individual; Baptism, simply and absolutely; Penance, in the case of mortal sin committed after Baptism; while the sacrament of order is necessary to the Church, since "where there is no governor the people shall fall" ([Prov. 11:14](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Prov++11:14)).

   But in the second way the other sacraments are necessary. For in a sense Confirmation perfects Baptism; Extreme Unction perfects Penance; while Matrimony, by multiplying them, preserves the numbers in the Church.

BAPTISM (Questions [66]-71)

Q. 66 OF THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM (TWELVE ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider each sacrament specially: (1) Baptism; (2) Confirmation; (3) the Eucharist; (4) Penance; (5) Extreme Unction; (6) Order; (7) Matrimony.

   Concerning the first, our consideration will be twofold: (1) of Baptism itself; (2) of things preparatory to Baptism.

   Concerning the first, four points arise for our consideration: (1) Things pertaining to the sacrament of Baptism; (2) The minister of this sacrament; (3) The recipients of this sacrament; (4) The effect of this sacrament.

   Concerning the first there are twelve points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A1THEP1) What is Baptism? Is it a washing?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A2THEP1) Of the institution of this sacrament;

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A3THEP1) Whether water be the proper matter of this sacrament?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A4THEP1) Whether plain water be required?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A5THEP1) Whether this be a suitable form of this sacrament: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A6THEP1) Whether one could baptize with this form: "I baptize thee in the name of Christ?"

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A7THEP1) Whether immersion is necessary for Baptism?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A8THEP1) Whether trine immersion is necessary?

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A9THEP1) Whether Baptism can be reiterated?

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A10THEP1) Of the Baptismal rite;

    [(11)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A11THEP1) Of the various kinds of Baptism;

    [(12)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A12THEP1) Of the comparison between various Baptisms.

1/ Whether Baptism is the mere washing?

  *I answer that,* In the sacrament of Baptism, three things may be considered: namely, that which is "sacrament only"; that which is "reality and sacrament"; and that which is "reality only." That which is sacrament only, is something visible and outward; the sign, namely, of the inward effect: for such is the very nature of a sacrament. And this outward something that can be perceived by the sense is both the water itself and its use, which is the washing. Hence some have thought that the water itself is the sacrament: which seems to be the meaning of the passage quoted from Hugh of St. Victor. For in the general definition of a sacrament he says that it is "a material element": and in defining Baptism he says it is "water."

   But this is not true. For since the sacraments of the New Law effect a certain sanctification, there the sacrament is completed where the sanctification is completed. Now, the sanctification is not completed in water; but a certain sanctifying instrumental virtue, not permanent but transient, passes from the water, in which it is, into man who is the subject of true sanctification. Consequently the sacrament is not completed in the very water, but in applying the water to man, i.e. in the washing. Hence the Master (iv, 3) says that "Baptism is the outward washing of the body done together with the prescribed form of words."

   The Baptismal character is both reality and sacrament: because it is something real signified by the outward washing; and a sacramental sign of the inward justification: and this last is the reality only, in this sacrament---namely, the reality signified and not signifying.

2/ Whether Baptism was instituted after Christ's Passion?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1)), sacraments derive from their institution the power of conferring grace. Wherefore it seems that a sacrament is then instituted, when it receives the power of producing its effect. Now Baptism received this power when Christ was baptized. Consequently Baptism was truly instituted then, if we consider it as a sacrament. But the obligation of receiving this sacrament was proclaimed to mankind after the Passion and Resurrection. First, because Christ's Passion put an end to the figurative sacraments, which were supplanted by Baptism and the other sacraments of the New Law. Secondly, because by Baptism man is "made conformable" to Christ's Passion and Resurrection, in so far as he dies to sin and begins to live anew unto righteousness. Consequently it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise again, before proclaiming to man his obligation of conforming himself to Christ's Death and Resurrection.

3/ Whether water is the proper matter of Baptism?

  *I answer that,* By Divine institution water is the proper matter of Baptism; and with reason. First, by reason of the very nature of Baptism, which is a regeneration unto spiritual life. And this answers to the nature of water in a special degree; wherefore seeds, from which all living things, viz. plants and animals are generated, are moist and akin to water. For this reason certain philosophers held that water is the first principle of all things.

   Secondly, in regard to the effects of Baptism, to which the properties of water correspond. For by reason of its moistness it cleanses; and hence it fittingly signifies and causes the cleansing from sins. By reason of its coolness it tempers superfluous heat: wherefore it fittingly mitigates the concupiscence of the fomes. By reason of its transparency, it is susceptive of light; hence its adaptability to Baptism as the "sacrament of Faith."

   Thirdly, because it is suitable for the signification of the mysteries of Christ, by which we are justified. For, as Chrysostom says (Hom. xxv in Joan.) on Jn. 3:5, "Unless a man be born again," etc., "When we dip our heads under the water as in a kind of tomb our old man is buried, and being submerged is hidden below, and thence he rises again renewed."

   Fourthly, because by being so universal and abundant, it is a matter suitable to our need of this sacrament: for it can easily be obtained everywhere.

4/ Whether plain water is necessary for Baptism?

  *I answer that,* Water may cease to be pure or plain water in two ways: first, by being mixed with another body; secondly, by alteration. And each of these may happen in a twofold manner; artificially and naturally. Now art fails in the operation of nature: because nature gives the substantial form, which art cannot give; for whatever form is given by art is accidental; except perchance when art applies a proper agent to its proper matter, as fire to a combustible; in which manner animals are produced from certain things by way of putrefaction.

   Whatever artificial change, then, takes place in the water, whether by mixture or by alteration, the water's nature is not changed. Consequently such water can be used for Baptism: unless perhaps such a small quantity of water be mixed artificially with a body that the compound is something other than water; thus mud is earth rather than water, and diluted wine is wine rather than water.

   But if the change be natural, sometimes it destroys the nature of the water; and this is when by a natural process water enters into the substance of a mixed body: thus water changed into the juice of the grape is wine, wherefore it has not the nature of water. Sometimes, however, there may be a natural change of the water, without destruction of species: and this, both by alteration, as we may see in the case of water heated by the sun; and by mixture, as when the water of a river has become muddy by being mixed with particles of earth.

   We must therefore say that any water may be used for Baptism, no matter how much it may be changed, as long as the species of water is not destroyed; but if the species of water be destroyed, it cannot be used for Baptism.

5/ Whether this be a suitable form of Baptism: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"?

  *I answer that,* Baptism receives its consecration from its form, according to Eph. 5:26: "Cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life." And Augustine says (De Unico Baptismo iv) that "Baptism is consecrated by the words of the Gospel." Consequently the cause of Baptism needs to be expressed in the baptismal form. Now this cause is twofold; the principal cause from which it derives its virtue, and this is the Blessed Trinity; and the instrumental cause, viz. the minister who confers the sacrament outwardly. Wherefore both causes should be expressed in the form of Baptism. Now the minister is designated by the words, "I baptize thee"; and the principal cause in the words, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Therefore this is the suitable form of Baptism: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

6/ Whether Baptism can be conferred in the name of Christ?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [64]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A3THEP1)), the sacraments derive their efficacy from Christ's institution. Consequently, if any of those things be omitted which Christ instituted in regard to a sacrament, it is invalid; save by special dispensation of Him Who did not bind His power to the sacraments. Now Christ commanded the sacrament of Baptism to be given with the invocation of the Trinity. And consequently whatever is lacking to the full invocation of the Trinity, destroys the integrity of Baptism.

   Nor does it matter that in the name of one Person another is implied, as the name of the Son is implied in that of the Father, or that he who mentions the name of only one Person may believe aright in the Three; because just as a sacrament requires sensible matter, so does it require a sensible form. Hence, for the validity of the sacrament it is not enough to imply or to believe in the Trinity, unless the Trinity be expressed in sensible words. For this reason at Christ's Baptism, wherein was the source of the sanctification of our Baptism, the Trinity was present in sensible signs: viz. the Father in the voice, the Son in the human nature, the Holy Ghost in the dove.

7/ Whether immersion in water is necessary for Baptism?

  *I answer that,* In the sacrament of Baptism water is put to the use of a washing of the body, whereby to signify the inward washing away of sins. Now washing may be done with water not only by immersion, but also by sprinkling or pouring. And, therefore, although it is safer to baptize by immersion, because this is the more ordinary fashion, yet Baptism can be conferred by sprinkling or also by pouring, according to Ezech. 36:25: "I will pour upon you clean water," as also the Blessed Lawrence is related to have baptized. And this especially in cases of urgency: either because there is a great number to be baptized, as was clearly the case in Acts 2 and 4, where we read that on one day three thousand believed, and on another five thousand: or through there being but a small supply of water, or through feebleness of the minister, who cannot hold up the candidate for Baptism; or through feebleness of the candidate, whose life might be endangered by immersion. We must therefore conclude that immersion is not necessary for Baptism.

8/ Whether trine immersion is essential to Baptism?

  I answer that As stated above ([Article [7]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A7THEP1), ad 1), washing with water is of itself required for Baptism, being essential to the sacrament: whereas the mode of washing is accidental to the sacrament. Consequently, as Gregory in the words above quoted explains, both single and trine immersion are lawful considered in themselves; since one immersion signifies the oneness of Christ's death and of the Godhead; while trine immersion signifies the three days of Christ's burial, and also the Trinity of Persons.

   But for various reasons, according as the Church has ordained, one mode has been in practice, at one time, the other at another time. For since from the very earliest days of the Church some have had false notions concerning the Trinity, holding that Christ is a mere man, and that He is not called the "Son of God" or "God" except by reason of His merit, which was chiefly in His death; for this reason they did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, but in memory of Christ's death, and with one immersion. And this was condemned in the early Church. Wherefore in the Apostolic Canons (xlix) we read: "If any priest or bishop confer baptism not with the trine immersion in the one administration, but with one immersion, which baptism is said to be conferred by some in the death of the Lord, let him be deposed": for our Lord did not say, "Baptize ye in My death," but "In the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

   Later on, however, there arose the error of certain schismatics and heretics who rebaptized: as Augustine (Super. Joan., cf. De Haeres. lxix) relates of the Donatists. Wherefore, in detestation of their error, only one immersion was ordered to be made, by the (fourth) council of Toledo, in the acts of which we read: "In order to avoid the scandal of schism or the practice of heretical teaching let us hold to the single baptismal immersion."

   But now that this motive has ceased, trine immersion is universally observed in Baptism: and consequently anyone baptizing otherwise would sin gravely, through not following the ritual of the Church. It would, however, be valid Baptism.

9/ Whether Baptism may be reiterated?

  *I answer that,* Baptism cannot be reiterated.

   First, because Baptism is a spiritual regeneration; inasmuch as a man dies to the old life, and begins to lead the new life. Whence it is written ([Jn. 3:5](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++3:5)): "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, He cannot see [Vulg.: 'enter into'] the kingdom of God." Now one man can be begotten but once. Wherefore Baptism cannot be reiterated, just as neither can carnal generation. Hence Augustine says on Jn. 3:4: "'Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born again': So thou," says he, "must understand the birth of the Spirit, as Nicodemus understood the birth of the flesh . . . . As there is no return to the womb, so neither is there to Baptism."

   Secondly, because "we are baptized in Christ's death," by which we die unto sin and rise again unto "newness of life" (cf. Rm. 6:3,4). Now "Christ died" but "once" ([Rm. 6:10](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+6:10)). Wherefore neither should Baptism be reiterated. For this reason ([Heb. 6:6](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Heb++6:6)) is it said against some who wished to be baptized again: "Crucifying again to themselves the Son of God"; on which the gloss observes: "Christ's one death hallowed the one Baptism."

   Thirdly, because Baptism imprints a character, which is indelible, and is conferred with a certain consecration. Wherefore, just as other consecrations are not reiterated in the Church, so neither is Baptism. This is the view expressed by Augustine, who says (Contra Epist. Parmen. ii) that "the military character is not renewed": and that "the sacrament of Christ is not less enduring than this bodily mark, since we see that not even apostates are deprived of Baptism, since when they repent and return they are not baptized anew."

   Fourthly, because Baptism is conferred principally as a remedy against original sin. Wherefore, just as original sin is not renewed, so neither is Baptism reiterated, for as it is written ([Rm. 5:18](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+5:18)), "as by the offense of one, unto all men to condemnation, so also by the justice of one, unto all men to justification of life."

10/ Whether the Church observes a suitable rite in baptizing?

  *I answer that,* In the sacrament of Baptism something is done which is essential to the sacrament, and something which belongs to a certain solemnity of the sacrament. Essential indeed, to the sacrament are both the form which designates the principal cause of the sacrament; and the minister who is the instrumental cause; and the use of the matter, namely, washing with water, which designates the principal sacramental effect. But all the other things which the Church observes in the baptismal rite, belong rather to a certain solemnity of the sacrament.

   And these, indeed, are used in conjunction with the sacrament for three reasons. First, in order to arouse the devotion of the faithful, and their reverence for the sacrament. For if there were nothing done but a mere washing with water, without any solemnity, some might easily think it to be an ordinary washing.

   Secondly, for the instruction of the faithful. Because simple and unlettered folk need to be taught by some sensible signs, for instance, pictures and the like. And in this way by means of the sacramental ceremonies they are either instructed, or urged to seek the signification of such like sensible signs. And consequently, since, besides the principal sacramental effect, other things should be known about Baptism, it was fitting that these also should be represented by some outward signs.

   Thirdly, because the power of the devil is restrained, by prayers, blessings, and the like, from hindering the sacramental effect.

11/ Whether three kinds of Baptism are fittingly described---viz. Baptism of Water, of Blood, and of the Spirit?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A5THEP1)), Baptism of Water has its efficacy from Christ's Passion, to which a man is conformed by Baptism, and also from the Holy Ghost, as first cause. Now although the effect depends on the first cause, the cause far surpasses the effect, nor does it depend on it. Consequently, a man may, without Baptism of Water, receive the sacramental effect from Christ's Passion, in so far as he is conformed to Christ by suffering for Him. Hence it is written ([Apoc. 7:14](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rev+++7:14)): "These are they who are come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and have made them white in the blood of the Lamb." In like manner a man receives the effect of Baptism by the power of the Holy Ghost, not only without Baptism of Water, but also without Baptism of Blood: forasmuch as his heart is moved by the Holy Ghost to believe in and love God and to repent of his sins: wherefore this is also called Baptism of Repentance. Of this it is written ([Is. 4:4](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Is++4:4)): "If the Lord shall wash away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall wash away the blood of Jerusalem out of the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning." Thus, therefore, each of these other Baptisms is called Baptism, forasmuch as it takes the place of Baptism. Wherefore Augustine says (De Unico Baptismo Parvulorum iv): "The Blessed Cyprian argues with considerable reason from the thief to whom, though not baptized, it was said: 'Today shalt thou be with Me in Paradise' that suffering can take the place of Baptism. Having weighed this in my mind again and again, I perceive that not only can suffering for the name of Christ supply for what was lacking in Baptism, but even faith and conversion of heart, if perchance on account of the stress of the times the celebration of the mystery of Baptism is not practicable."

12/ Whether the Baptism of Blood is the most excellent of these?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [11]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A11THEP1)), the shedding of blood for Christ's sake, and the inward operation of the Holy Ghost, are called baptisms, in so far as they produce the effect of the Baptism of Water. Now the Baptism of Water derives its efficacy from Christ's Passion and from the Holy Ghost, as already stated ([Article [11]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A11THEP1)). These two causes act in each of these three Baptisms; most excellently, however, in the Baptism of Blood. For Christ's Passion acts in the Baptism of Water by way of a figurative representation; in the Baptism of the Spirit or of Repentance, by way of desire. but in the Baptism of Blood, by way of imitating the (Divine) act. In like manner, too, the power of the Holy Ghost acts in the Baptism of Water through a certain hidden power. in the Baptism of Repentance by moving the heart; but in the Baptism of Blood by the highest degree of fervor of dilection and love, according to Jn. 15:13: "Greater love than this no man hath that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Q. 67 OF THE MINISTERS BY WHOM THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM IS CONFERRED (EIGHT ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the ministers by whom the sacrament of Baptism is conferred. And concerning this there are eight points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A1THEP1) Whether it belongs to a deacon to baptize?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A2THEP1) Whether this belongs to a priest, or to a bishop only?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A3THEP1) Whether a layman can confer the sacrament of Baptism?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A4THEP1) Whether a woman can do this?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A5THEP1) Whether an unbaptized person can baptize?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A6THEP1) Whether several can at the same time baptize one and the same person?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A7THEP1) Whether it is essential that someone should raise the person baptized from the sacred font?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A8THEP1) Whether he who raises someone from the sacred font is bound to instruct him?

1/ Whether it is part of a deacon's duty to baptize?

  *I answer that,* Just as the properties and duties of the heavenly orders are gathered from their names, as Dionysius says (Coel. Hier. vi), so can we gather, from the names of the ecclesiastical orders, what belongs to each order. Now "deacons" are so called from being "ministers"; because, to wit, it is not in the deacon's province to be the chief and official celebrant in conferring a sacrament, but to minister to others, his elders, in the sacramental dispensations. And so it does not belong to a deacon to confer the sacrament of Baptism officially as it were; but to assist and serve his elders in the bestowal of this and other sacraments. Hence Isidore says (Epist. ad Ludifred.): "It is a deacon's duty to assist and serve the priests, in all the rites of Christ's sacraments, viz. those of Baptism, of the Chrism, of the Paten and Chalice."

2/ Whether to baptize is part of the priestly office, or proper to that of bishops?

  *I answer that,* Priests are consecrated for the purpose of celebrating the sacrament of Christ's Body, as stated above ([Question [65]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A3THEP1)). Now that is the sacrament of ecclesiastical unity, according to the Apostle (1 Cor. 10:17): "We, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread and one chalice." Moreover, by Baptism a man becomes a participator in ecclesiastical unity, wherefore also he receives the right to approach our Lord's Table. Consequently, just as it belongs to a priest to consecrate the Eucharist, which is the principal purpose of the priesthood, so it is the proper office of a priest to baptize: since it seems to belong to one and the same, to produce the whole and to dispose the part in the whole.

3/ Whether a layman can baptize?

  *I answer that,* It is due to the mercy of Him "Who will have all men to be saved" ([1 Tim. 2:4](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Tim++2:4)) that in those things which are necessary for salvation, man can easily find the remedy. Now the most necessary among all the sacraments is Baptism, which is man's regeneration unto spiritual life: since for children there is no substitute, while adults cannot otherwise than by Baptism receive a full remission both of guilt and of its punishment. Consequently, lest man should have to go without so necessary a remedy, it was ordained, both that the matter of Baptism should be something common that is easily obtainable by all, i.e. water; and that the minister of Baptism should be anyone, even not in orders, lest from lack of being baptized, man should suffer loss of his salvation.

4/ Whether a woman can baptize?

  *I answer that,* Christ is the chief Baptizer, according to Jn. 1:33: "He upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon Him, He it is that baptizeth." For it is written in Col. 3 (cf. Gal. 3:28), that in Christ there is neither male nor female. Consequently, just as a layman can baptize, as Christ's minister, so can a woman.

   But since "the head of the woman is the man," and "the head of . . . man, is Christ" ([1 Cor. 11:3](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++11:3)), a woman should not baptize if a man be available for the purpose; just as neither should a layman in the presence of a cleric, nor a cleric in the presence of a priest. The last, however, can baptize in the presence of a bishop, because it is part of the priestly office.

5/ Whether one that is not baptized can confer the sacrament of Baptism?

  *I answer that,* Augustine left this question without deciding it. For he says (Contra Ep. Parmen. ii): "This is indeed another question, whether even those can baptize who were never Christians; nor should anything be rashly asserted hereupon, without the authority of a sacred council such as suffices for so great a matter." But afterwards it was decided by the Church that the unbaptized, whether Jews or pagans, can confer the sacrament of Baptism, provided they baptize in the form of the Church. Wherefore Pope Nicolas I replies to the questions propounded by the Bulgars: "You say that many in your country have been baptized by someone, whether Christian or pagan you know not. If these were baptized in the name of the Trinity, they must not be rebaptized." But if the form of the Church be not observed, the sacrament of Baptism is not conferred. And thus is to be explained what Gregory II [\*Gregory III] writes to Bishop Boniface: "Those whom you assert to have been baptized by pagans," namely, with a form not recognized by the Church, "we command you to rebaptize in the name of the Trinity." And the reason of this is that, just as on the part of the matter, as far as the essentials of the sacrament are concerned, any water will suffice, so, on the part of the minister, any man is competent. Consequently, an unbaptized person can baptize in a case of urgency. So that two unbaptized persons may baptize one another, one baptizing the other and being afterwards baptized by him: and each would receive not only the sacrament but also the reality of the sacrament. But if this were done outside a case of urgency, each would sin grievously, both the baptizer and the baptized, and thus the baptismal effect would be frustrated, although the sacrament itself would not be invalidated.

6/ Whether several can baptize at the same time?

  *I answer that,* The Sacrament of Baptism derives its power principally from its form, which the Apostle calls "the word of life" ([Eph. 5:26](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Eph++5:26)). Consequently, if several were to baptize one at the same time, we must consider what form they would use. For were they to say: "We baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," some maintain that the sacrament of Baptism would not be conferred, because the form of the Church would not be observed, i.e. "I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." But this reasoning is disproved by the form observed in the Greek Church. For they might say: "The servant of God, N . . ., is baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," under which form the Greeks receive the sacrament of Baptism: and yet this form differs far more from the form that we use, than does this: "We baptize thee."

   The point to be observed, however, is this, that by this form, "We baptize thee," the intention expressed is that several concur in conferring one Baptism: and this seems contrary to the notion of a minister; for a man does not baptize save as a minister of Christ, and as standing in His place; wherefore just as there is one Christ, so should there be one minister to represent Christ. Hence the Apostle says pointedly ([Eph. 4:5](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Eph++4:5)): "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." Consequently, an intention which is in opposition to this seems to annul the sacrament of Baptism.

   On the other hand, if each were to say: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," each would signify his intention as though he were conferring Baptism independently of the other. This might occur in the case where both were striving to baptize someone; and then it is clear that whichever pronounced the words first would confer the sacrament of Baptism; while the other, however great his right to baptize, if he presume to utter the words, would be liable to be punished as a rebaptizer. If, however, they were to pronounce the words absolutely at the same time, and dipped or sprinkled the man together, they should be punished for baptizing in an improper manner, but not for rebaptizing: because each would intend to baptize an unbaptized person, and each, so far as he is concerned, would baptize. Nor would they confer several sacraments: but the one Christ baptizing inwardly would confer one sacrament by means of both together.

7/ Whether in Baptism it is necessary for someone to raise the baptized from the sacred font?

  *I answer that,* The spiritual regeneration, which takes place in Baptism, is in a certain manner likened to carnal generation: wherefore it is written ([1 Pt. 2:2](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Pt++2:2)): "As new-born babes, endowed with reason desire milk [Vulg.: 'desire reasonable milk'] without guile." Now, in carnal generation the new-born child needs nourishment and guidance: wherefore, in spiritual generation also, someone is needed to undertake the office of nurse and tutor by forming and instructing one who is yet a novice in the Faith, concerning things pertaining to Christian faith and mode of life, which the clergy have not the leisure to do through being busy with watching over the people generally: because little children and novices need more than ordinary care. Consequently someone is needed to receive the baptized from the sacred font as though for the purpose of instructing and guiding them. It is to this that Dionysius refers (Eccl. Hier. xi) saying: "It occurred to our heavenly guides," i.e. the Apostles, "and they decided, that infants should be taken charge of thus: that the parents of the child should hand it over to some instructor versed in holy things, who would thenceforth take charge of the child, and be to it a spiritual father and a guide in the road of salvation."

8/ Whether he who raises anyone from the sacred font is bound to instruct him?

  *I answer that,* Every man is bound to fulfil those duties which he has undertaken to perform. Now it has been stated above ([Article [7]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP067.html#TPQ67A7THEP1)) that godparents take upon themselves the duties of a tutor. Consequently they are bound to watch over their godchildren when there is need for them to do so: for instance when and where children are brought up among unbelievers. But if they are brought up among Catholic Christians, the godparents may well be excused from this responsibility, since it may be presumed that the children will be carefully instructed by their parents. If, however, they perceive in any way that the contrary is the case, they would be bound, as far as they are able, to see to the spiritual welfare of their godchildren.

Q. 68 OF THOSE WHO RECEIVE BAPTISM (TWELVE ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider those who receive Baptism; concerning which there are twelve points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A1THEP1) Whether all are bound to receive Baptism?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A2THEP1) Whether a man can be saved without Baptism?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A3THEP1) Whether Baptism should be deferred?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A4THEP1) Whether sinners should be baptized?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A5THEP1) Whether works of satisfaction should be enjoined on sinners that have been baptized?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A6THEP1) Whether Confession of sins is necessary?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A7THEP1) Whether an intention is required on the part of the one baptized?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A8THEP1) Whether faith is necessary?

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A9THEP1) Whether infants should be baptized?

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A10THEP1) Whether the children of Jews should be baptized against the will of their parents?

    [(11)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A11THEP1) Whether anyone should be baptized in the mother's womb?

    [(12)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A12THEP1) Whether madmen and imbeciles should be baptized?

1/ Whether all are bound to receive Baptism?

  *I answer that,* Men are bound to that without which they cannot obtain salvation. Now it is manifest that no one can obtain salvation but through Christ; wherefore the Apostle says ([Rm. 5:18](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+5:18)): "As by the offense of one unto all men unto condemnation; so also by the justice of one, unto all men unto justification of life." But for this end is Baptism conferred on a man, that being regenerated thereby, he may be incorporated in Christ, by becoming His member: wherefore it is written ([Gal. 3:27](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Gal++3:27)): "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ." Consequently it is manifest that all are bound to be baptized: and that without Baptism there is no salvation for men.

2/ Whether a man can be saved without Baptism?

  *I answer that,* The sacrament or Baptism may be wanting to someone in two ways. First, both in reality and in desire; as is the case with those who neither are baptized, nor wished to be baptized: which clearly indicates contempt of the sacrament, in regard to those who have the use of the free-will. Consequently those to whom Baptism is wanting thus, cannot obtain salvation: since neither sacramentally nor mentally are they incorporated in Christ, through Whom alone can salvation be obtained.

   Secondly, the sacrament of Baptism may be wanting to anyone in reality but not in desire: for instance, when a man wishes to be baptized, but by some ill-chance he is forestalled by death before receiving Baptism. And such a man can obtain salvation without being actually baptized, on account of his desire for Baptism, which desire is the outcome of "faith that worketh by charity," whereby God, Whose power is not tied to visible sacraments, sanctifies man inwardly. Hence Ambrose says of Valentinian, who died while yet a catechumen: "I lost him whom I was to regenerate: but he did not lose the grace he prayed for."

3/ Whether Baptism should be deferred?

  *I answer that,* In this matter we must make a distinction and see whether those who are to be baptized are children or adults. For if they be children, Baptism should not be deferred. First, because in them we do not look for better instruction or fuller conversion. Secondly, because of the danger of death, for no other remedy is available for them besides the sacrament of Baptism.

   On the other hand, adults have a remedy in the mere desire for Baptism, as stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A2THEP1)). And therefore Baptism should not be conferred on adults as soon as they are converted, but it should be deferred until some fixed time. First, as a safeguard to the Church, lest she be deceived through baptizing those who come to her under false pretenses, according to 1 Jn. 4:1: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, if they be of God." And those who approach Baptism are put to this test, when their faith and morals are subjected to proof for a space of time. Secondly, this is needful as being useful for those who are baptized; for they require a certain space of time in order to be fully instructed in the faith, and to be drilled in those things that pertain to the Christian mode of life. Thirdly, a certain reverence for the sacrament demands a delay whereby men are admitted to Baptism at the principal festivities, viz. of Easter and Pentecost, the result being that they receive the sacrament with greater devotion.

   There are, however, two reasons for forgoing this delay. First, when those who are to be baptized appear to be perfectly instructed in the faith and ready for Baptism; thus, Philip baptized the Eunuch at once ([Acts 8](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Acts+8)); and Peter, Cornelius and those who were with him ([Acts 10](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Acts+10)). Secondly, by reason of sickness or some kind of danger of death. Wherefore Pope Leo says (Epist. xvi): "Those who are threatened by death, sickness, siege, persecution, or shipwreck, should be baptized at any time." Yet if a man is forestalled by death, so as to have no time to receive the sacrament, while he awaits the season appointed by the Church, he is saved, yet "so as by fire," as stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A2THEP1), ad 2). Nevertheless he sins if he defer being baptized beyond the time appointed by the Church, except this be for an unavoidable cause and with the permission of the authorities of the Church. But even this sin, with his other sins, can be washed away by his subsequent contrition, which takes the place of Baptism, as stated above ([Question [66]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66OUTP1), [Article [11]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A11THEP1)).

4/ Whether sinners should be baptized?

  *I answer that,* A man may be said to be a sinner in two ways. First, on account of the stain and the debt of punishment incurred in the past: and on sinners in this sense the sacrament of Baptism should be conferred, since it is instituted specially for this purpose, that by it the uncleanness of sin may be washed away, according to Eph. 5:26: "Cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life."

   Secondly, a man may be called a sinner because he wills to sin and purposes to remain in sin: and on sinners in this sense the sacrament of Baptism should not be conferred. First, indeed, because by Baptism men are incorporated in Christ, according to Gal. 3:27: "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ." Now so long as a man wills to sin, he cannot be united to Christ, according to 2 Cor. 6:14: "What participation hath justice with injustice?" Wherefore Augustine says in his book on Penance (Serm. cccli) that "no man who has the use of free-will can begin the new life, except he repent of his former life." Secondly, because there should be nothing useless in the works of Christ and of the Church. Now that is useless which does not reach the end to which it is ordained; and, on the other hand, no one having the will to sin can, at the same time, be cleansed from sin, which is the purpose of Baptism; for this would be to combine two contradictory things. Thirdly, because there should be no falsehood in the sacramental signs. Now a sign is false if it does not correspond with the thing signified. But the very fact that a man presents himself to be cleansed by Baptism, signifies that he prepares himself for the inward cleansing: while this cannot be the case with one who purposes to remain in sin. Therefore it is manifest that on such a man the sacrament of Baptism is not to be conferred.

5/ Whether works of satisfaction should be enjoined on sinners that have been baptized?

  *I answer that,* As the Apostle says ([Rm. 6:3,4](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+6:3,4)), "all we who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in His death: for we are buried together with Him, by Baptism unto death"; which is to say that by Baptism man is incorporated in the very death of Christ. Now it is manifest from what has been said above ([Question [48]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48A2THEP1),4; [Question [49]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49A3THEP1)) that Christ's death satisfied sufficiently for sins, "not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world," according to 1 Jn. 2:2. Consequently no kind of satisfaction should be enjoined on one who is being baptized, for any sins whatever: and this would be to dishonor the Passion and death of Christ, as being insufficient for the plenary satisfaction for the sins of those who were to be baptized.

6/ Whether sinners who are going to be baptized are bound to confess their sins?

  *I answer that,* Confession of sins is twofold. One is made inwardly to God: and such confession of sins is required before Baptism: in other words, man should call his sins to mind and sorrow for them; since "he cannot begin the new life, except he repent of his former life," as Augustine says in his book on Penance (Serm. cccli). The other is the outward confession of sins, which is made to a priest; and such confession is not required before Baptism. First, because this confession, since it is directed to the person of the minister, belongs to the sacrament of Penance, which is not required before Baptism, which is the door of all the sacraments. Secondly, because the reason why a man makes outward confession to a priest, is that the priest may absolve him from his sins, and bind him to works of satisfaction, which should not be enjoined on the baptized, as stated above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A5THEP1)). Moreover those who are being baptized do not need to be released from their sins by the keys of the Church, since all are forgiven them in Baptism. Thirdly, because the very act of confession made to a man is penal, by reason of the shame it inflicts on the one confessing: whereas no exterior punishment is enjoined on a man who is being baptized.

   Therefore no special confession of sins is required of those who are being baptized; but that general confession suffices which they make when in accordance with the Church's ritual they "renounce Satan and all his works." And in this sense a gloss explains Mt. 3:6, saying that in John's Baptism "those who are going to be baptized learn that they should confess their sins and promise to amend their life."

   If, however, any persons about to be baptized, wish, out of devotion, to confess their sins, their confession should be heard; not for the purpose of enjoining them to do satisfaction, but in order to instruct them in the spiritual life as a remedy against their vicious habits.

7/ Whether the intention of receiving the sacrament of Baptism is required on the part of the one baptized?

  *I answer that,* By Baptism a man dies to the old life of sin, and begins a certain newness of life, according to Rm. 6:4: "We are buried together with" Christ "by Baptism into death; that, as Christ is risen from the dead . . . so we also may walk in newness of life." Consequently, just as, according to Augustine (Serm. cccli), he who has the use of free-will, must, in order to die to the old life, "will to repent of his former life"; so must he, of his own will, intend to lead a new life, the beginning of which is precisely the receiving of the sacrament. Therefore on the part of the one baptized, it is necessary for him to have the will or intention of receiving the sacrament.

8/ Whether faith is required on the part of the one baptized?

  *I answer that,* As appears from what has been said above ([Question [63]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A6THEP1); [Question [66]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66OUTP1), [Article [9]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A9THEP1)) Baptism produces a twofold effect in the soul, viz. the character and grace. Therefore in two ways may a thing be necessary for Baptism. First, as something without which grace, which is the ultimate effect of the sacrament, cannot be had. And thus right faith is necessary for Baptism, because, as it appears from Rm. 3:22, the justice of God is by faith of Jesus Christ.

   Secondly, something is required of necessity for Baptism, because without it the baptismal character cannot be imprinted And thus right faith is not necessary in the one baptized any more than in the one who baptizes: provided the other conditions are fulfilled which are essential to the sacrament. For the sacrament is not perfected by the righteousness of the minister or of the recipient of Baptism, but by the power of God.

9/ Whether children should be baptized?

  *I answer that,* As the Apostle says ([Rm. 5:17](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+5:17)), "if by one man's offense death reigned through one," namely Adam, "much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift, and of justice, shall reign in life through one, Jesus Christ." Now children contract original sin from the sin of Adam; which is made clear by the fact that they are under the ban of death, which "passed upon all" on account of the sin of the first man, as the Apostle says in the same passage ([Rm. 5:12](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+5:12)). Much more, therefore, can children receive grace through Christ, so as to reign in eternal life. But our Lord Himself said ([Jn. 3:5](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++3:5)): "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Consequently it became necessary to baptize children, that, as in birth they incurred damnation through Adam so in a second birth they might obtain salvation through Christ. Moreover it was fitting that children should receive Baptism, in order that being reared from childhood in things pertaining to the Christian mode of life, they may the more easily persevere therein; according to Prov. 22:5: "A young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it." This reason is also given by Dionysius (Eccl. Hier. iii).

10/ Whether children of Jews or other unbelievers be baptized against the will of their parents?

  *I answer that,* The children of unbelievers either have the use of reason or they have not. If they have, then they already begin to control their own actions, in things that are of Divine or natural law. And therefore of their own accord, and against the will of their parents, they can receive Baptism, just as they can contract marriage. Consequently such can lawfully be advised and persuaded to be baptized.

   If, however, they have not yet the use of free-will, according to the natural law they are under the care of their parents as long as they cannot look after themselves. For which reason we say that even the children of the ancients "were saved through the faith of their parents." Wherefore it would be contrary to natural justice if such children were baptized against their parents' will; just as it would be if one having the use of reason were baptized against his will. Moreover under the circumstances it would be dangerous to baptize the children of unbelievers; for they would be liable to lapse into unbelief, by reason of their natural affection for their parents. Therefore it is not the custom of the Church to baptize the children of unbelievers against their parents' will.

11/ Whether a child can be baptized while yet in its mother's womb?

  *I answer that,* It is essential to Baptism that some part of the body of the person baptized be in some way washed with water, since Baptism is a kind of washing, as stated above ([Question [66]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A1THEP1)). But an infant's body, before being born from the womb, can nowise be washed with water; unless perchance it be said that the baptismal water, with which the mother's body is washed, reaches the child while yet in its mother's womb. But this is impossible: both because the child's soul, to the sanctification of which Baptism is ordained, is distinct from the soul of the mother; and because the body of the animated infant is already formed, and consequently distinct from the body of the mother. Therefore the Baptism which the mother receives does not overflow on to the child which is in her womb. Hence Augustine says (Cont. Julian. vi): "If what is conceived within a mother belonged to her body, so as to be considered a part thereof, we should not baptize an infant whose mother, through danger of death, was baptized while she bore it in her womb. Since, then, it," i.e. the infant, "is baptized, it certainly did not belong to the mother's body while it was in the womb." It follows, therefore, that a child can nowise be baptized while in its mother's womb.

12/ Whether madmen and imbeciles should be baptized?

  *I answer that,* In the matter of madmen and imbeciles a distinction is to be made. For some are so from birth, and have no lucid intervals, and show no signs of the use of reason. And with regard to these it seems that we should come to the same decision as with regard to children who are baptized in the Faith of the Church, as stated above ([Article [9]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A9THEP1), ad 2).

   But there are others who have fallen from a state of sanity into a state of insanity. And with regard to these we must be guided by their wishes as expressed by them when sane: so that, if then they manifested a desire to receive Baptism, it should be given to them when in a state of madness or imbecility, even though then they refuse. If, on the other hand, while sane they showed no desire to receive Baptism, they must not be baptized.

   Again, there are some who, though mad or imbecile from birth, have, nevertheless, lucid intervals, in which they can make right use of reason. Wherefore, if then they express a desire for Baptism, they can be baptized though they be actually in a state of madness. And in this case the sacrament should be bestowed on them if there be fear of danger otherwise it is better to wait until the time when they are sane, so that they may receive the sacrament more devoutly. But if during the interval of lucidity they manifest no desire to receive Baptism, they should not be baptized while in a state of insanity.

   Lastly there are others who, though not altogether sane, yet can use their reason so far as to think about their salvation, and understand the power of the sacrament. And these are to be treated the same as those who are sane, and who are baptized if they be willing, but not against their will.

Q. 69 OF THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM (TEN ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the effects of Baptism, concerning which there are ten points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A1THEP1) Whether all sins are taken away by Baptism?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A2THEP1) Whether man is freed from all punishment by Baptism?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A3THEP1) Whether Baptism takes away the penalties of sin that belong to this life?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A4THEP1) Whether grace and virtues are bestowed on man by Baptism?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A5THEP1) Of the effects of virtue which are conferred by Baptism?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A6THEP1) Whether even children receive grace and virtues in Baptism?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A7THEP1) Whether Baptism opens the gates of the heavenly kingdom to those who are baptized?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A8THEP1) Whether Baptism produces an equal effect in all who are baptized?

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A9THEP1) Whether insincerity hinders the effect of Baptism?

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A10THEP1) Whether Baptism takes effect when the insincerity ceases?

1/ Whether all sins are taken away by Baptism?

  *I answer that,* As the Apostle says ([Rm. 6:3](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+6:3)), "all we, who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in His death." And further on he concludes ([Rm. 6:11](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+6:11)): "So do you also reckon that you are dead to sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus our Lord." Hence it is clear that by Baptism man dies unto the oldness of sin, and begins to live unto the newness of grace. But every sin belongs to the primitive oldness. Consequently every sin is taken away by Baptism.

2/ Whether man is freed by Baptism from all debt of punishment due to sin?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [49]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP049.html#TPQ49A3THEP1), ad 2; [Question [68]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A1THEP1),4,5) by Baptism a man is incorporated in the Passion and death of Christ, according to Rm. 6:8: "If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall live also together with Christ." Hence it is clear that the Passion of Christ is communicated to every baptized person, so that he is healed just as if he himself had suffered and died. Now Christ's Passion, as stated above ([Question [68]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A5THEP1)), is a sufficient satisfaction for all the sins of all men. Consequently he who is baptized, is freed from the debt of all punishment due to him for his sins, just as if he himself had offered sufficient satisfaction for all his sins.

3/ Whether Baptism should take away the penalties of sin that belong to this life?

  *I answer that,* Baptism has the power to take away the penalties of the present life yet it does not take them away during the present life, but by its power they will be taken away from the just in the resurrection when "this mortal hath put on immortality" ([1 Cor. 15:54](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++15:54)). And this is reasonable. First, because, by Baptism, man is incorporated in Christ, and is made His member, as stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A3THEP1); [Question [68]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A5THEP1)). Consequently it is fitting that what takes place in the Head should take place also in the member incorporated. Now, from the very beginning of His conception Christ was "full of grace and truth," yet He had a passible body, which through His Passion and death was raised up to a life of glory. Wherefore a Christian receives grace in Baptism, as to his soul; but he retains a passible body, so that he may suffer for Christ therein: yet at length he will be raised up to a life of impassibility. Hence the Apostle says ([Rm. 8:11](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+8:11)): "He that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall quicken also our [Vulg.: 'your'] mortal bodies, because of His Spirit that dwelleth in us [Vulg.: 'you']": and further on in the same chapter ([Rm. 8:17](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+8:17)): "Heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs with Christ: yet so, if we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him."

   Secondly, this is suitable for our spiritual training: namely, in order that, by fighting against concupiscence and other defects to which he is subject, man may receive the crown of victory. Wherefore on Rm. 6:6, "that the body of sin may be destroyed," a gloss says: "If a man after Baptism live in the flesh, he has concupiscence to fight against, and to conquer by God's help." In sign of which it is written (Judges 3:1,2): "These are the nations which the Lord left, that by them He might instruct Israel . . . that afterwards their children might learn to fight with their enemies, and to be trained up to war."

   Thirdly, this was suitable, lest men might seek to be baptized for the sake of impassibility in the present life, and not for the sake of the glory of life eternal. Wherefore the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 15:19](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++15:19)): "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

4/ Whether grace and virtues are bestowed on man by Baptism?

  *I answer that,* As Augustine says in the book on Infant Baptism (De Pecc. Merit. et Remiss. i) "the effect of Baptism is that the baptized are incorporated in Christ as His members." Now the fulness of grace and virtues flows from Christ the Head to all His members, according to Jn. 1:16: "Of His fulness we all have received." Hence it is clear that man receives grace and virtues in Baptism.

5/ Whether certain acts of the virtues are fittingly set down as effects of Baptism, to wit---incorporation in Christ, enlightenment, and fruitfulness?

  *I answer that,* By Baptism man is born again unto the spiritual life, which is proper to the faithful of Christ, as the Apostle says ([Gal. 2:20](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Gal++2:20)): "And that I live now in the flesh; I live in the faith of the Son of God." Now life is only in those members that are united to the head, from which they derive sense and movement. And therefore it follows of necessity that by Baptism man is incorporated in Christ, as one of His members. Again, just as the members derive sense and movement from the material head, so from their spiritual Head, i.e. Christ, do His members derive spiritual sense consisting in the knowledge Of truth, and spiritual movement which results from the instinct of grace. Hence it is written ([Jn. 1:14,16](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++1:14,16)): "We have seen Him . . . full of grace and truth; and of His fulness we all have received." And it follows from this that the baptized are enlightened by Christ as to the knowledge of truth, and made fruitful by Him with the fruitfulness of good works by the infusion of grace.

6/ Whether children receive grace and virtue in Baptism?

  *I answer that,* Some of the early writers held that children do not receive grace and virtues in Baptism, but that they receive the imprint of the character of Christ, by the power of which they receive grace and virtue when they arrive at the perfect age. But this is evidently false, for two reasons. First, because children, like adults, are made members of Christ in Baptism; hence they must, of necessity, receive an influx of grace and virtues from the Head. Secondly, because, if this were true, children that die after Baptism, would not come to eternal life; since according to Rm. 6:23, "the grace of God is life everlasting." And consequently Baptism would not have profited them unto salvation.

   Now the source of their error was that they did not recognize the distinction between habit and act. And so, seeing children to be incapable of acts of virtue, they thought that they had no virtues at all after Baptism. But this inability of children to act is not due to the absence of habits, but to an impediment on the part of the body: thus also when a man is asleep, though he may have the habits of virtue, yet is he hindered from virtuous acts through being asleep.

7/ Whether the effect of Baptism is to open the gates of the heavenly kingdom?

  *I answer that,* To open the gates of the heavenly kingdom is to remove the obstacle that prevents one from entering therein. Now this obstacle is guilt and the debt of punishment. But it has been shown above ([Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP069.html#TPQ69A1THEP1),2) that all guilt and also all debt of punishment are taken away by Baptism. It follows, therefore, that the effect of Baptism is to open the gates of the heavenly kingdom.

8/ Whether Baptism has an equal effect in all?

  *I answer that,* The effect of Baptism is twofold, the essential effect, and the accidental. The essential effect of Baptism is that for which Baptism was instituted, namely, the begetting of men unto spiritual life. Therefore, since all children are equally disposed to Baptism, because they are baptized not in their own faith, but in that of the Church, they all receive an equal effect in Baptism. Whereas adults, who approach Baptism in their own faith, are not equally disposed to Baptism; for some approach thereto with greater, some with less, devotion. And therefore some receive a greater, some a smaller share of the grace of newness; just as from the same fire, he receives more heat who approaches nearest to it, although the fire, as far as it is concerned, sends forth its heat equally to all.

   But the accidental effect of Baptism, is that to which Baptism is not ordained, but which the Divine power produces miraculously in Baptism: thus on Rm. 6:6, "that we may serve sin no longer," a gloss says: "this is not bestowed in Baptism, save by an ineffable miracle of the Creator, so that the law of sin, which is in our members, be absolutely destroyed." And such like effects are not equally received by all the baptized, even if they approach with equal devotion: but they are bestowed according to the ordering of Divine providence.

9/ Whether insincerity hinders the effect of Baptism?

  *I answer that,* As Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii), "God does not compel man to be righteous." Consequently in order that a man be justified by Baptism, his will must needs embrace both Baptism and the baptismal effect. Now, a man is said to be insincere by reason of his will being in contradiction with either Baptism or its effect. For, according to Augustine (De Bapt. cont. Donat. vii), a man is said to be insincere, in four ways: first, because he does not believe, whereas Baptism is the sacrament of Faith; secondly, through scorning the sacrament itself; thirdly, through observing a rite which differs from that prescribed by the Church in conferring the sacrament; fourthly, through approaching the sacrament without devotion. Wherefore it is manifest that insincerity hinders the effect of Baptism.

10/ Whether Baptism produces its effect when the insincerity ceases?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [66]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66OUTP1), [Article [9]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP066.html#TPQ66A9THEP1)), Baptism is a spiritual regeneration. Now when a thing is generated, it receives together with the form, the form's effect, unless there be an obstacle; and when this is removed, the form of the thing generated produces its effect: thus at the same time as a weighty body is generated, it has a downward movement, unless something prevent this; and when the obstacle is removed, it begins forthwith to move downwards. In like manner when a man is baptized, he receives the character, which is like a form; and he receives in consequence its proper effect, which is grace whereby all his sins are remitted. But this effect is sometimes hindered by insincerity. Wherefore, when this obstacle is removed by Penance, Baptism forthwith produces its effect.

Q. 70 OF CIRCUMCISION (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider things that are preparatory to Baptism: and (1) that which preceded Baptism, viz. Circumcision, (2) those which accompany Baptism, viz. Catechism and Exorcism.

   Concerning the first there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70A1THEP1) Whether circumcision was a preparation for, and a figure of, Baptism?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70A2THEP1) Its institution;

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70A3THEP1) Its rite;

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70A4THEP1) Its effect.

1/ Whether circumcision was a preparation for, and a figure of Baptism?

  *I answer that,* Baptism is called the Sacrament of Faith; in so far, to wit, as in Baptism man makes a profession of faith, and by Baptism is aggregated to the congregation of the faithful. Now our faith is the same as that of the Fathers of old, according to the Apostle ([2 Cor. 4:13](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?2+Cor++4:13)): "Having the same spirit of faith . . . we . . . believe." But circumcision was a protestation of faith; wherefore by circumcision also men of old were aggregated to the body of the faithful. Consequently, it is manifest that circumcision was a preparation for Baptism and a figure thereof, forasmuch as "all things happened" to the Fathers of old "in figure" ([1 Cor. 10:11](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++10:11)); just as their faith regarded things to come.

2/ Whether circumcision was instituted in a fitting manner?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70A1THEP1)) circumcision was a preparation for Baptism, inasmuch as it was a profession of faith in Christ, which we also profess in Baptism. Now among the Fathers of old, Abraham was the first to receive the promise of the future birth of Christ, when it was said to him: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" ([Gn. 22:18](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Gn++22:18)). Moreover, he was the first to cut himself off from the society of unbelievers, in accordance with the commandment of the Lord, Who said to him ([Gn. 13:1](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Gn++13:1)): "Go forth out of thy country and from thy kindred." Therefore circumcision was fittingly instituted in the person of Abraham.

3/ Whether the rite of circumcision was fitting?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70A2THEP1)), circumcision was established, as a sign of faith, by God "of" Whose "wisdom there is no number" ([Ps. 146:5](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Ps++146:5)). Now to determine suitable signs is a work of wisdom. Consequently, it must be allowed that the rite of circumcision was fitting.

4/ Whether circumcision bestowed sanctifying grace?

  *I answer that,* All are agreed in saying that original sin was remitted in circumcision. But some said that no grace was conferred, and that the only effect was to remit sin. The Master holds this opinion (Sent. iv, D, 1), and in a gloss on Rm. 4:11. But this is impossible, since guilt is not remitted except by grace, according to Rm. 3:2: "Being justified freely by His grace," etc.

   Wherefore others said that grace was bestowed by circumcision, as to that effect which is the remission of guilt, but not as to its positive effects; lest they should be compelled to say that the grace bestowed in circumcision sufficed for the fulfilling of the precepts of the Law, and that, consequently, the coming of Christ was unnecessary. But neither can this opinion stand. First, because by circumcision children. received the power of obtaining glory at the allotted time, which is the last positive effect of grace. Secondly, because, in the order of the formal cause, positive effects naturally precede those that denote privation, although it is the reverse in the order of the material cause: since a form does not remove a privation save by informing the subject.

   Consequently, others said that grace was conferred in circumcision, also as a particular positive effect consisting in being made worthy of eternal life; but not as to all its effects, for it did not suffice for the repression of the concupiscence of the fomes, nor again for the fulfilment of the precepts of the Law. And this was my opinion at one time (Sent. iv, D, 1; [Question [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP002.html#TPQ2OUTP1), [Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP002.html#TPQ2A4THEP1)). But if one consider the matter carefully, it is clear that this is not true. Because the least grace can resist any degree of concupiscence, and avoid every mortal sin, that is committed in transgressing the precepts of the Law; for the smallest degree of charity loves God more than cupidity loves "thousands of gold and silver" ([Ps. 118:72](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Ps++118:72)).

   We must say, therefore, that grace was bestowed in circumcision as to all the effects of grace, but not as in Baptism. Because in Baptism grace is bestowed by the very power of Baptism itself, which power Baptism has as the instrument of Christ's Passion already consummated. Whereas circumcision bestowed grace, inasmuch as it was a sign of faith in Christ's future Passion: so that the man who was circumcised, professed to embrace that faith; whether, being an adult, he made profession for himself, or, being a child, someone else made profession for him. Hence, too, the Apostle says ([Rm. 4:11](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+4:11)), that Abraham "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the justice of the faith": because, to wit, justice was of faith signified: not of circumcision signifying. And since Baptism operates instrumentally by the power of Christ's Passion, whereas circumcision does not, therefore Baptism imprints a character that incorporates man in Christ, and bestows grace more copiously than does circumcision; since greater is the effect of a thing already present, than of the hope thereof.

Q. 71 OF THE PREPARATIONS THAT ACCOMPANY BAPTISM (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the preparations that accompany Baptism: concerning which there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP071.html#TPQ71A1THEP1) Whether catechism should precede Baptism?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP071.html#TPQ71A2THEP1) Whether exorcism should precede Baptism?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP071.html#TPQ71A3THEP1) Whether what is done in catechizing and exorcizing, effects anything, or is a mere sign?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP071.html#TPQ71A4THEP1) Whether those who are to be baptized should be catechized or exorcized by priests?

1/ Whether catechism should precede Baptism?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [70]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP070.html#TPQ70A1THEP1)), Baptism is the Sacrament of Faith: since it is a profession of the Christian faith. Now in order that a man receive the faith, he must be instructed therein, according to Rm. 10:14: "How shall they believe Him, of Whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" And therefore it is fitting that catechism should precede Baptism. Hence when our Lord bade His disciples to baptize, He made teaching to precede Baptism, saying: "Go ye . . . and teach all nations, baptizing them," etc.

2/ Whether exorcism should precede Baptism?

  *I answer that,* Whoever purposes to do a work wisely, first removes the obstacles to his work; hence it is written ([Jer. 4:3](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jer++4:3)): "Break up anew your fallow ground and sow not upon thorns." Now the devil is the enemy of man's salvation, which man acquires by Baptism; and he has a certain power over man from the very fact that the latter is subject to original, or even actual, sin. Consequently it is fitting that before Baptism the demons should be cast out by exorcisms, lest they impede man's salvation. Which expulsion is signified by the (priest) breathing (upon the person to be baptized); while the blessing, with the imposition of hands, bars the way against the return of him who was cast out. Then the salt which is put in the mouth, and the anointing of the nose and ears with spittle, signify the receiving of doctrine, as to the ears; consent thereto as to the nose; and confession thereof, as to the mouth. And the anointing with oil signifies man's ability to fight against the demons.

3/ Whether what is done in the exorcism effects anything, or is a mere sign?

  *I answer that,* Some say that the things done in the exorcism have no effect, but are mere signs. But this is clearly false; since in exorcizing, the Church uses words of command to cast out the devil's power, for instance, when she says: "Therefore, accursed devil, go out from him," etc.

   Therefore we must say that they have some effect, but, other than that of Baptism. For Baptism gives man grace unto the full remission of sins. But those things that are done in the exorcism remove the twofold impediment against the reception of saving grace. Of these, one is the outward impediment, so far as the demons strive to hinder man's salvation. And this impediment is removed by the breathings, whereby the demon's power is cast out, as appears from the passage quoted from Augustine, i.e. as to the devil not placing obstacles against the reception of the sacrament. Nevertheless, the demon's power over man remains as to the stain of sin, and the debt of punishment, until sin be washed away by Baptism. And in this sense Cyprian says (Epist. lxxvi): "Know that the devil's evil power remains until the pouring of the saving water: but in Baptism he loses it all."

   The other impediment is within, forasmuch as, from having contracted original sin, man's sense is closed to the perception of the mysteries of salvation. Hence Rabanus says (De Instit. Cleric. i) that "by means of the typifying spittle and the touch of the priest, the Divine wisdom and power brings salvation to the catechumen, that his nostrils being opened he may perceive the odor of the knowledge of God, that his ears be opened to hear the commandments of God, that his senses be opened in his inmost heart to respond."

4/ Whether it belongs to a priest to catechize and exorcize the person to be baptized?

  *I answer that,* The minister compared to the priest, is as a secondary and instrumental agent to the principal agent: as is implied in the very word "minister." Now the secondary agent does nothing without the principal agent in operating. And the more mighty the operation, so much the mightier instruments does the principal agent require. But the operation of the priest in conferring the sacrament itself is mightier than in those things that are preparatory to the sacrament. And so the highest ministers who are called deacons co-operate with the priest in bestowing the sacraments themselves: for Isidore says (Epist. ad Ludifred.) that "it belongs to the deacons to assist the priests in all things that are done in Christ's sacraments, in Baptism, to wit, in the Chrism, in the Paten and Chalice"; while the inferior ministers assist the priest in those things which are preparatory to the sacraments: the readers, for instance, in catechizing; the exorcists in exorcizing.

CONFIRMATION (Question [72])
Q. 72 OF THE SACRAMENT OF CONFIRMATION (TWELVE ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the Sacrament of Confirmation. Concerning this there are twelve points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1) Whether Confirmation is a sacrament?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A2THEP1) Its matter;

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A3THEP1) Whether it is essential to the sacrament that the chrism should have been previously consecrated by a bishop?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A4THEP1) Its form;

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A5THEP1) Whether it imprints a character?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A6THEP1) Whether the character of Confirmation presupposes the character of Baptism?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A7THEP1) Whether it bestows grace?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A8THEP1) Who is competent to receive this sacrament?

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A9THEP1) In what part of the body?

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A10THEP1) Whether someone is required to stand for the person to be confirmed?

    [(11)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A11THEP1) Whether this sacrament is given by bishops only?

    [(12)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A12THEP1) Of its rite.

1/ Whether confirmation is a sacrament?

  *I answer that,* The sacraments of the New Law are ordained unto special effects of grace: and therefore where there is a special effect of grace, there we find a special sacrament ordained for the purpose. But since sensible and material things bear a likeness to things spiritual and intelligible, from what occurs in the life of the body, we can perceive that which is special to the spiritual life. Now it is evident that in the life of the body a certain special perfection consists in man's attaining to the perfect age, and being able to perform the perfect actions of a man: hence the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 13:11](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++13:11)): "When I became a man, I put away the things of a child." And thence it is that besides the movement of generation whereby man receives life of the body, there is the movement of growth, whereby man is brought to the perfect age. So therefore does man receive spiritual life in Baptism, which is a spiritual regeneration: while in Confirmation man arrives at the perfect age, as it were, of the spiritual life. Hence Pope Melchiades says: "The Holy Ghost, Who comes down on the waters of Baptism bearing salvation in His flight, bestows at the font, the fulness of innocence; but in Confirmation He confers an increase of grace. In Baptism we are born again unto life; after Baptism we are strengthened." And therefore it is evident that Confirmation is a special sacrament.

2/ Whether chrism is a fitting matter for this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Chrism is the fitting matter of this sacrament. For, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1)), in this sacrament the fulness of the Holy Ghost is given for the spiritual strength which belongs to the perfect age. Now when man comes to perfect age he begins at once to have intercourse with others; whereas until then he lives an individual life, as it were, confined to himself. Now the grace of the Holy Ghost is signified by oil; hence Christ is said to be "anointed with the oil of gladness" ([Ps. 44:8](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Ps++44:8)), by reason of His being gifted with the fulness of the Holy Ghost. Consequently oil is a suitable matter of this sacrament. And balm is mixed with the oil, by reason of its fragrant odor, which spreads about: hence the Apostle says ([2 Cor. 2:15](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?2+Cor++2:15)): "We are the good odor of Christ," etc. And though many other things be fragrant, yet preference is given to balm, because it has a special odor of its own, and because it confers incorruptibility: hence it is written (Ecclus. 24:21): "My odor is as the purest balm."

3/ Whether it is essential to this sacrament that the chrism which is its matter be previously consecrated by a bishop?

  *I answer that,* The entire sanctification of the sacraments is derived from Christ, as stated above ([Question [64]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP064.html#TPQ64A3THEP1)). But it must be observed that Christ did use certain sacraments having a corporeal matter, viz. Baptism, and also the Eucharist. And consequently, from Christ's very act in using them, the matter of these sacraments received a certain aptitude to the perfection of the sacrament. Hence Chrysostom (Chromatius, In Matth. 3:15) says that "the waters of Baptism could never wash away the sins of believers, had they not been sanctified by contact with our Lord's body." And again, our Lord Himself "taking bread . . . blessed . . . and in like manner the chalice" ([Mt. 26:26,27; Lk. 22:19, 20](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++26:26,27;+Lk++22:19,+20)). For this reason there is no need for the matter of these sacraments to be blessed previously, since Christ's blessing is enough. And if any blessing be used, it belongs to the solemnity of the sacrament, not to its essence. But Christ did not make use of visible anointings, so as not to slight the invisible unction whereby He was "anointed above" His "fellows" ([Ps. 44:8](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Ps++44:8)). And hence both chrism, and the holy oil, and the oil of the sick are blessed before being put to sacramental use. This suffices for the reply to the First Objection.

4/ Whether the proper form of this sacrament is: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross," etc.?

  *I answer that,* The above form is appropriate to this sacrament. For just as the form of a natural thing gives it its species, so a sacramental form should contain whatever belongs to the species of the sacrament. Now as is evident from what has been already said ([Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1),2), in this sacrament the Holy Ghost is given for strength in the spiritual combat. Wherefore in this sacrament three things are necessary; and they are contained in the above form. The first of these is the cause conferring fulness of spiritual strength which cause is the Blessed Trinity: and this is expressed in the words, "In the name of the Father," etc. The second is the spiritual strength itself bestowed on man unto salvation by the sacrament of visible matter; and this is referred to in the words, "I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation." The third is the sign which is given to the combatant, as in a bodily combat: thus are soldiers marked with the sign of their leaders. And to this refer the words, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross," in which sign, to wit, our King triumphed (cf. Col. 2:15).

5/ Whether the sacrament of Confirmation imprints a character?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [63]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A2THEP1)), a character is a spiritual power ordained to certain sacred actions. Now it has been said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1); [Question [65]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A1THEP1)) that, just as Baptism is a spiritual regeneration unto Christian life, so also is Confirmation a certain spiritual growth bringing man to perfect spiritual age. But it is evident, from a comparison with the life of the body, that the action which is proper to man immediately after birth, is different from the action which is proper to him when he has come to perfect age. And therefore by the sacrament of Confirmation man is given a spiritual power in respect of sacred actions other than those in respect of which he receives power in Baptism. For in Baptism he receives power to do those things which pertain to his own salvation, forasmuch as he lives to himself: whereas in Confirmation he receives power to do those things which pertain to the spiritual combat with the enemies of the Faith. This is evident from the example of the apostles, who, before they received the fulness of the Holy Ghost, were in the "upper room . . . persevering . . . in prayer" ([Acts 1:13,14](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Acts+1:13,14)); whereas afterwards they went out and feared not to confess their faith in public, even in the face of the enemies of the Christian Faith. And therefore it is evident that a character is imprinted in the sacrament of Confirmation.

6/ Whether the character of Confirmation presupposes of necessity, the baptismal character?

  *I answer that,* The character of Confirmation, of necessity supposes the baptismal character: so that, in effect, if one who is not baptized were to be confirmed, he would receive nothing, but would have to be confirmed again after receiving Baptism. The reason of this is that, Confirmation is to Baptism as growth to birth, as is evident from what has been said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1); [Question [65]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A1THEP1)). Now it is clear that no one can be brought to perfect age unless he be first born: and in like manner, unless a man be first baptized, he cannot receive the sacrament of Confirmation.

7/ Whether sanctifying grace is bestowed in this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* In this sacrament, as stated above ([Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1),4), the Holy Ghost is given to the baptized for strength: just as He was given to the apostles on the day of Pentecost, as we read in Acts 2; and just as He was given to the baptized by the imposition of the apostles' hands, as related in Acts 8:17. Now it has been proved in the FP, Question [43], Article [3] that the Holy Ghost is not sent or given except with sanctifying grace. Consequently it is evident that sanctifying grace is bestowed in this sacrament.

8/ Whether this sacrament should be given to all?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1)), man is spiritually advanced by this sacrament to perfect age. Now the intention of nature is that everyone born corporally, should come to perfect age: yet this is sometimes hindered by reason of the corruptibility of the body, which is forestalled by death. But much more is it God's intention to bring all things to perfection, since nature shares in this intention inasmuch as it reflects Him: hence it is written ([Dt. 32:4](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Dt++32:4)): "The works of God are perfect." Now the soul, to which spiritual birth and perfect spiritual age belong, is immortal; and just as it can in old age attain to spiritual birth, so can it attain to perfect (spiritual) age in youth or childhood; because the various ages of the body do not affect the soul. Therefore this sacrament should be given to all.

9/ Whether this sacrament should be given to man on the forehead?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1),4), in this sacrament man receives the Holy Ghost for strength in the spiritual combat, that he may bravely confess the Faith of Christ even in face of the enemies of that Faith. Wherefore he is fittingly signed with the sign of the cross on the forehead, with chrism, for two reasons. First, because he is signed with the sign of the cross, as a soldier with the sign of his leader, which should be evident and manifest. Now, the forehead, which is hardly ever covered, is the most conspicuous part of the human body. Wherefore the confirmed is anointed with chrism on the forehead, that he may show publicly that he is a Christian: thus too the apostles after receiving the Holy Ghost showed themselves in public, whereas before they remained hidden in the upper room.

   Secondly, because man is hindered from freely confessing Christ's name, by two things---by fear and by shame. Now both these things betray themselves principally on the forehead on account of the proximity of the imagination, and because the (vital) spirits mount directly from the heart to the forehead: hence "those who are ashamed, blush, and those who are afraid, pale" (Ethic. iv). And therefore man is signed with chrism, that neither fear nor shame may hinder him from confessing the name of Christ.

10/ Whether he who is confirmed needs one to stand\* for him? [\*Literally, "to hold him"]

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A1THEP1),4,9), this sacrament is given to man for strength in the spiritual combat. Now, just as one newly born requires someone to teach him things pertaining to ordinary conduct, according to Heb. 12:9: "We have had fathers of our flesh, for instructors, and we obeyed [Vulg.: 'reverenced']" them; so they who are chosen for the fight need instructors by whom they are informed of things concerning the conduct of the battle, and hence in earthly wars, generals and captains are appointed to the command of the others. For this reason he also who receives this sacrament, has someone to stand for him, who, as it were, has to instruct him concerning the fight.

   Likewise, since this sacrament bestows on man the perfection of spiritual age, as stated above ([Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP072.html#TPQ72A2THEP1),5), therefore he who approaches this sacrament is upheld by another, as being spiritually a weakling and a child.

11/ Whether only a bishop can confer this sacrament?

    *I answer that,* In every work the final completion is reserved to the supreme act or power; thus the preparation of the matter belongs to the lower craftsmen, the higher gives the form, but the highest of all is he to whom pertains the use, which is the end of things made by art; thus also the letter which is written by the clerk, is signed by his employer. Now the faithful of Christ are a Divine work, according to 1 Cor. 3:9: "You are God's building"; and they are also "an epistle," as it were, "written with the Spirit of God," according to 2 Cor. 3:2,3. And this sacrament of Confirmation is, as it were, the final completion of the sacrament of Baptism; in the sense that by Baptism man is built up into a spiritual dwelling, and is written like a spiritual letter; whereas by the sacrament of Confirmation, like a house already built, he is consecrated as a temple of the Holy Ghost, and as a letter already written, is signed with the sign of the cross. Therefore the conferring of this sacrament is reserved to bishops, who possess supreme power in the Church: just as in the primitive Church, the fulness of the Holy Ghost was given by the apostles, in whose place the bishops stand ([Acts 8](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Acts+8)). Hence Pope Urban I says: "All the faithful should. after Baptism, receive the Holy Ghost by the imposition of the bishop's hand, that they may become perfect Christians."

12/ Whether the rite of this sacrament is appropriate?

  *I answer that,* Our Lord promised His faithful ([Mt. 18:20](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++18:20)) saying: "Where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." And therefore we must hold firmly that the Church's ordinations are directed by the wisdom of Christ. And for this reason we must look upon it as certain that the rite observed by the Church, in this and the other sacraments, is appropriate.

EUCHARIST (Questions [73]-83)

Q. 73 OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST (SIX ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the sacrament of the Eucharist; and first of all we treat of the sacrament itself; secondly, of its matter; thirdly, of its form; fourthly, of its effects; fifthly, of the recipients of this sacrament; sixthly, of the minister; seventhly, of the rite.

   Under the first heading there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A1THEP1) Whether the Eucharist is a sacrament?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A2THEP1) Whether it is one or several sacraments?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A3THEP1) Whether it is necessary for salvation?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A4THEP1) Its names;

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A5THEP1) Its institution;

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A6THEP1) Its figures.

1/ Whether the Eucharist is a sacrament?

  *I answer that,* The Church's sacraments are ordained for helping man in the spiritual life. But the spiritual life is analogous to the corporeal, since corporeal things bear a resemblance to spiritual. Now it is clear that just as generation is required for corporeal life, since thereby man receives life; and growth, whereby man is brought to maturity: so likewise food is required for the preservation of life. Consequently, just as for the spiritual life there had to be Baptism, which is spiritual generation; and Confirmation, which is spiritual growth: so there needed to be the sacrament of the Eucharist, which is spiritual food.

2/ Whether the Eucharist is one sacrament or several?

  *I answer that,* As stated in Metaph. v, a thing is said to be one, not only from being indivisible, or continuous, but also when it is complete; thus we speak of one house, and one man. A thing is one in perfection, when it is complete through the presence of all that is needed for its end; as a man is complete by having all the members required for the operation of his soul, and a house by having all the parts needful for dwelling therein. And so this sacrament is said to be one. Because it is ordained for spiritual refreshment, which is conformed to corporeal refreshment. Now there are two things required for corporeal refreshment, namely, food, which is dry sustenance, and drink, which is wet sustenance. Consequently, two things concur for the integrity of this sacrament, to wit, spiritual food and spiritual drink, according to John: "My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed." Therefore, this sacrament is materially many, but formally and perfectively one.

3/ Whether the Eucharist is necessary for salvation?

  *I answer that,* Two things have to be considered in this sacrament, namely, the sacrament itself, and what is contained in it. Now it was stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A1THEP1), Objection [2]) that the reality of the sacrament is the unity of the mystical body, without which there can be no salvation; for there is no entering into salvation outside the Church, just as in the time of the deluge there was none outside the Ark, which denotes the Church, according to 1 Pt. 3:20,21. And it has been said above ([Question [68]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A2THEP1)), that before receiving a sacrament, the reality of the sacrament can be had through the very desire of receiving the sacrament. Accordingly, before actual reception of this sacrament, a man can obtain salvation through the desire of receiving it, just as he can before Baptism through the desire of Baptism, as stated above ([Question [68]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP068.html#TPQ68A2THEP1)). Yet there is a difference in two respects. First of all, because Baptism is the beginning of the spiritual life, and the door of the sacraments; whereas the Eucharist is, as it were, the consummation of the spiritual life, and the end of all the sacraments, as was observed above ([Question [63]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63OUTP1),[Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A6THEP1)): for by the hallowings of all the sacraments preparation is made for receiving or consecrating the Eucharist. Consequently, the reception of Baptism is necessary for starting the spiritual life, while the receiving of the Eucharist is requisite for its consummation; by partaking not indeed actually, but in desire, as an end is possessed in desire and intention. Another difference is because by Baptism a man is ordained to the Eucharist, and therefore from the fact of children being baptized, they are destined by the Church to the Eucharist; and just as they believe through the Church's faith, so they desire the Eucharist through the Church's intention, and, as a result, receive its reality. But they are not disposed for Baptism by any previous sacrament, and consequently before receiving Baptism, in no way have they Baptism in desire; but adults alone have: consequently, they cannot have the reality of the sacrament without receiving the sacrament itself. Therefore this sacrament is not necessary for salvation in the same way as Baptism is.

4/ Whether this sacrament is suitably called by various names?

  *I answer that,* This sacrament has a threefold significance. one with regard to the past, inasmuch as it is commemorative of our Lord's Passion, which was a true sacrifice, as stated above ([Question [48]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48A3THEP1)), and in this respect it is called a "Sacrifice."

   With regard to the present it has another meaning, namely, that of Ecclesiastical unity, in which men are aggregated through this Sacrament; and in this respect it is called "Communion" or {Synaxis}. For Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iv) that "it is called Communion because we communicate with Christ through it, both because we partake of His flesh and Godhead, and because we communicate with and are united to one another through it."

   With regard to the future it has a third meaning, inasmuch as this sacrament foreshadows the Divine fruition, which shall come to pass in heaven; and according to this it is called "Viaticum," because it supplies the way of winning thither. And in this respect it is also called the "Eucharist," that is, "good grace," because "the grace of God is life everlasting" ([Rm. 6:23](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+6:23)); or because it really contains Christ, Who is "full of grace."

   In Greek, moreover, it is called {Metalepsis}, i.e. "Assumption," because, as Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iv), "we thereby assume the Godhead of the Son."

5/ Whether the institution of this sacrament was appropriate?

  *I answer that,* This sacrament was appropriately instituted at the supper, when Christ conversed with His disciples for the last time. First of all, because of what is contained in the sacrament: for Christ is Himself contained in the Eucharist sacramentally. Consequently, when Christ was going to leave His disciples in His proper species, He left Himself with them under the sacramental species; as the Emperor's image is set up to be reverenced in his absence. Hence Eusebius says: "Since He was going to withdraw His assumed body from their eyes, and bear it away to the stars, it was needful that on the day of the supper He should consecrate the sacrament of His body and blood for our sakes, in order that what was once offered up for our ransom should be fittingly worshiped in a mystery."

   Secondly, because without faith in the Passion there could never be any salvation, according to Rm. 3:25: "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood." It was necessary accordingly that there should be at all times among men something to show forth our Lord's Passion; the chief sacrament of which in the old Law was the Paschal Lamb. Hence the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 5:7](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++5:7)): "Christ our Pasch is sacrificed." But its successor under the New Testament is the sacrament of the Eucharist, which is a remembrance of the Passion now past, just as the other was figurative of the Passion to come. And so it was fitting that when the hour of the Passion was come, Christ should institute a new Sacrament after celebrating the old, as Pope Leo I says (Serm. lviii).

   Thirdly, because last words, chiefly such as are spoken by departing friends, are committed most deeply to memory; since then especially affection for friends is more enkindled, and the things which affect us most are impressed the deepest in the soul. Consequently, since, as Pope Alexander I says, "among sacrifices there can be none greater than the body and blood of Christ, nor any more powerful oblation"; our Lord instituted this sacrament at His last parting with His disciples, in order that it might be held in the greater veneration. And this is what Augustine says (Respons. ad Januar. i): "In order to commend more earnestly the death of this mystery, our Saviour willed this last act to be fixed in the hearts and memories of the disciples whom He was about to quit for the Passion."

6/ Whether the Paschal Lamb was the chief figure of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* We can consider three things in this sacrament: namely, that which is sacrament only, and this is the bread and wine; that which is both reality and sacrament, to wit, Christ's true body; and lastly that which is reality only, namely, the effect of this sacrament. Consequently, in relation to what is sacrament only, the chief figure of this sacrament was the oblation of Melchisedech, who offered up bread and wine. In relation to Christ crucified, Who is contained in this sacrament, its figures were all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, especially the sacrifice of expiation, which was the most solemn of all. While with regard to its effect, the chief figure was the Manna, "having in it the sweetness of every taste" (Wis. 16:20), just as the grace of this sacrament refreshes the soul in all respects.

   The Paschal Lamb foreshadowed this sacrament in these three ways. First of all, because it was eaten with unleavened loaves, according to Ex. 12:8: "They shall eat flesh . . . and unleavened bread." As to the second because it was immolated by the entire multitude of the children of Israel on the fourteenth day of the moon; and this was a figure of the Passion of Christ, Who is called the Lamb on account of His innocence. As to the effect, because by the blood of the Paschal Lamb the children of Israel were preserved from the destroying Angel, and brought from the Egyptian captivity; and in this respect the Paschal Lamb is the chief figure of this sacrament, because it represents it in every respect.

Q. 74 OF THE MATTER OF THIS SACRAMENT (EIGHT ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the matter of this sacrament: and first of all as to its species; secondly, the change of the bread and wine into the body of Christ; thirdly, the manner in which Christ's body exists in this sacrament; fourthly, the accidents of bread and wine which continue in this sacrament.

   Under the first heading there are eight points for inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A1THEP1) Whether bread and wine are the matter of this sacrament?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A2THEP1) Whether a determinate quantity of the same is required for the matter of this sacrament?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A3THEP1) Whether the matter of this sacrament is wheaten bread?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A4THEP1) Whether it is unleavened or fermented bread?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A5THEP1) Whether the matter of this sacrament is wine from the grape?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A6THEP1) Whether water should be mixed with it?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A7THEP1) Whether water is of necessity for this sacrament?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A8THEP1) Of the quantity of the water added.

1/ Whether the matter of this sacrament is bread and wine?

  *I answer that,* Some have fallen into various errors about the matter of this sacrament. Some, known as the Artotyrytae, as Augustine says (De Haeres. xxviii), "offer bread and cheese in this sacrament, contending that oblations were celebrated by men in the first ages, from fruits of the earth and sheep." Others, called Cataphrygae and Pepuziani, "are reputed to have made their Eucharistic bread with infants' blood drawn from tiny punctures over the entire body, and mixed with flour." Others, styled Aquarii, under guise of sobriety, offer nothing but water in this sacrament.

   Now all these and similar errors are excluded by the fact that Christ instituted this sacrament under the species of bread and wine, as is evident from Mt. 26. Consequently, bread and wine are the proper matter of this sacrament. And the reasonableness of this is seen first, in the use of this sacrament, which is eating: for, as water is used in the sacrament of Baptism for the purpose of spiritual cleansing, since bodily cleansing is commonly done with water; so bread and wine, wherewith men are commonly fed, are employed in this sacrament for the use of spiritual eating.

   Secondly, in relation to Christ's Passion, in which the blood was separated from the body. And therefore in this sacrament, which is the memorial of our Lord's Passion, the bread is received apart as the sacrament of the body, and the wine as the sacrament of the blood.

   Thirdly, as to the effect, considered in each of the partakers. For, as Ambrose (Mag. Sent. iv, D, xi) says on 1 Cor. 11:20, this sacrament "avails for the defense of soul and body"; and therefore "Christ's body is offered" under the species of bread "for the health of the body, and the blood" under the species of wine "for the health of the soul," according to Lev. 17:14: "The life of the animal [Vulg.: 'of all flesh'] is in the blood."

   Fourthly, as to the effect with regard to the whole Church, which is made up of many believers, just "as bread is composed of many grains, and wine flows from many grapes," as the gloss observes on 1 Cor. 10:17: "We being many are . . . one body," etc.

2/ Whether a determinate quantity of bread and wine is required for the matter of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Some have maintained that the priest could not consecrate an immense quantity of bread and wine, for instance, all the bread in the market or all the wine in a cask. But this does not appear to be true, because in all things containing matter, the reason for the determination of the matter is drawn from its disposition to an end, just as the matter of a saw is iron, so as to adapt it for cutting. But the end of this sacrament is the use of the faithful. Consequently, the quantity of the matter of this sacrament must be determined by comparison with the use of the faithful. But this cannot be determined by comparison with the use of the faithful who are actually present; otherwise the parish priest having few parishioners could not consecrate many hosts. It remains, then, for the matter of this sacrament to be determined in reference to the number of the faithful absolutely. But the number of the faithful is not a determinate one. Hence it cannot be said that the quantity of the matter of this sacrament is restricted.

3/ Whether wheaten bread is required for the matter of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A1THEP1)), for the use of the sacraments such matter is adopted as is commonly made use of among men. Now among other breads wheaten bread is more commonly used by men; since other breads seem to be employed when this fails. And consequently Christ is believed to have instituted this sacrament under this species of bread. Moreover this bread strengthens man, and so it denotes more suitably the effect of this sacrament. Consequently, the proper matter for this sacrament is wheaten bread.

4/ Whether this sacrament ought to be made of unleavened bread?

  *I answer that,* Two things may be considered touching the matter of this sacrament namely, what is necessary, and what is suitable. It is necessary that the bread be wheaten, without which the sacrament is not valid, as stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A3THEP1)). It is not, however, necessary for the sacrament that the bread be unleavened or leavened, since it can be celebrated in either.

   But it is suitable that every priest observe the rite of his Church in the celebration of the sacrament. Now in this matter there are various customs of the Churches: for, Gregory says: "The Roman Church offers unleavened bread, because our Lord took flesh without union of sexes: but the Greek Churches offer leavened bread, because the Word of the Father was clothed with flesh; as leaven is mixed with the flour." Hence, as a priest sins by celebrating with fermented bread in the Latin Church, so a Greek priest celebrating with unfermented bread in a church of the Greeks would also sin, as perverting the rite of his Church. Nevertheless the custom of celebrating with unleavened bread is more reasonable. First, on account of Christ's institution: for He instituted this sacrament "on the first day of the Azymes" ([Mt. 26:17; Mk. 14:12; Lk. 22:7](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++26:17;+Mk++14:12;+Lk++22:7)), on which day there ought to be nothing fermented in the houses of the Jews, as is stated in Ex. 12:15,19. Secondly, because bread is properly the sacrament of Christ's body, which was conceived without corruption, rather than of His Godhead, as will be seen later ([Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1), ad 1). Thirdly, because this is more in keeping with the sincerity of the faithful, which is required in the use of this sacrament, according to 1 Cor. 5:7: "Christ our Pasch is sacrificed: therefore let us feast . . . with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

   However, this custom of the Greeks is not unreasonable both on account of its signification, to which Gregory refers, and in detestation of the heresy of the Nazarenes, who mixed up legal observances with the Gospel.

5/ Whether wine of the grape is the proper matter of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* This sacrament can only be performed with wine from the grape. First of all on account of Christ's institution, since He instituted this sacrament in wine from the grape, as is evident from His own words, in instituting this sacrament ([Mt. 26:29](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++26:29)): "I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine." Secondly, because, as stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A3THEP1)), that is adopted as the matter of the sacraments which is properly and universally considered as such. Now that is properly called wine, which is drawn from the grape, whereas other liquors are called wine from resemblance to the wine of the grape. Thirdly, because the wine from the grape is more in keeping with the effect of this sacrament, which is spiritual; because it is written ([Ps. 103:15](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Ps++103:15)): "That wine may cheer the heart of man."

6/ Whether water should be mixed with the wine?

  *I answer that,* Water ought to be mingled with the wine which is offered in this sacrament. First of all on account of its institution: for it is believed with probability that our Lord instituted this sacrament in wine tempered with water according to the custom of that country: hence it is written ([Prov. 9:5](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Prov++9:5)): "Drink the wine which I have mixed for you." Secondly, because it harmonizes with the representation of our Lord's Passion: hence Pope Alexander I says (Ep. 1 ad omnes orth.): "In the Lord's chalice neither wine only nor water only ought to be offered, but both mixed because we read that both flowed from His side in the Passion." Thirdly, because this is adapted for signifying the effect of this sacrament, since as Pope Julius says (Concil. Bracarens iii, Can. 1): "We see that the people are signified by the water, but Christ's blood by the wine. Therefore when water is mixed with the wine in the chalice, the people is made one with Christ." Fourthly, because this is appropriate to the fourth effect of this sacrament, which is the entering into everlasting life: hence Ambrose says (De Sacram. v): "The water flows into the chalice, and springs forth unto everlasting life."

7/ Whether the mixing with water is essential to this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Judgment concerning a sign is to be drawn from the thing signified. Now the adding of water to the wine is for the purpose of signifying the sharing of this sacrament by the faithful, in this respect that by the mixing of the water with the wine is signified the union of the people with Christ, as stated ([Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A6THEP1)). Moreover, the flowing of water from the side of Christ hanging on the cross refers to the same, because by the water is denoted the cleansing from sins, which was the effect of Christ's Passion. Now it was observed above ([Question [73]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A1THEP1), ad 3), that this sacrament is completed in the consecration of the matter: while the usage of the faithful is not essential to the sacrament, but only a consequence thereof. Consequently, then, the adding of water is not essential to the sacrament.

8/ Whether water should be added in great quantity?

  *I answer that,* There is a threefold opinion regarding the water added to the wine, as Pope Innocent III says in a certain Decretal. For some say that the water remains by itself when the wine is changed into blood: but such an opinion cannot stand, because in the sacrament of the altar after the consecration there is nothing else save the body and the blood of Christ. Because, as Ambrose says in De Officiis (De Mysteriis ix): "Before the blessing it is another species that is named, after the blessing the Body is signified; otherwise it would not be adored with adoration of latria." And therefore others have said that as the wine is changed into blood, so the water is changed into the water which flowed from Christ's side. But this cannot be maintained reasonably, because according to this the water would be consecrated apart from the wine, as the wine is from the bread.

   And therefore as he (Innocent III, Decretals, Extra, De Celeb. Miss.) says, the more probable opinion is that which holds that the water is changed into wine, and the wine into blood. Now, this could not be done unless so little water was used that it would be changed into wine. Consequently, it is always safer to add little water, especially if the wine be weak, because the sacrament could not be celebrated if there were such addition of water as to destroy the species of the wine. Hence Pope Julius I reprehends some who "keep throughout the year a linen cloth steeped in must, and at the time of sacrifice wash a part of it with water, and so make the offering."

Q. 75 OF THE CHANGE OF BREAD AND WINE INTO THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST (EIGHT ARTICLES)

   We have to consider the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; under which head there are eight points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A1THEP1) Whether the substance of bread and wine remain in this sacrament after the consecration?\*

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1) Whether it is annihilated?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A3THEP1) Whether it is changed into the body and blood of Christ?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A4THEP1) Whether the accidents remain after the change?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A5THEP1) Whether the substantial form remains there?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A6THEP1) Whether this change is instantaneous?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A7THEP1) Whether it is more miraculous than any other change?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A8THEP1) By what words it may be suitably expressed? [\*The titles of the Articles here given were taken by St. Thomas from his Commentary on the Sentences (Sent. iv, D, 90). However, in writing the Articles he introduced a new point of inquiry, that of the First Article; and substituted another division of the matter under discussion, as may be seen by referring to the titles of the various Articles. Most editions have ignored St. Thomas's original division, and give the one to which he subsequently adhered.]

1/ Whether the body of Christ be in this sacrament in very truth, or merely as in a figure or sign?

  *I answer that,* The presence of Christ's true body and blood in this sacrament cannot be detected by sense, nor understanding, but by faith alone, which rests upon Divine authority. Hence, on Lk. 22:19: "This is My body which shall be delivered up for you," Cyril says: "Doubt not whether this be true; but take rather the Saviour's words with faith; for since He is the Truth, He lieth not."

   Now this is suitable, first for the perfection of the New Law. For, the sacrifices of the Old Law contained only in figure that true sacrifice of Christ's Passion, according to Heb. 10:1: "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things." And therefore it was necessary that the sacrifice of the New Law instituted by Christ should have something more, namely, that it should contain Christ Himself crucified, not merely in signification or figure, but also in very truth. And therefore this sacrament which contains Christ Himself, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii), is perfective of all the other sacraments, in which Christ's virtue is participated.

   Secondly, this belongs to Christ's love, out of which for our salvation He assumed a true body of our nature. And because it is the special feature of friendship to live together with friends, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix), He promises us His bodily presence as a reward, saying ([Mt. 24:28](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++24:28)): "Where the body is, there shall the eagles be gathered together." Yet meanwhile in our pilgrimage He does not deprive us of His bodily presence; but unites us with Himself in this sacrament through the truth of His body and blood. Hence ([Jn. 6:57](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++6:57)) he says: "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, abideth in Me, and I in him." Hence this sacrament is the sign of supreme charity, and the uplifter of our hope, from such familiar union of Christ with us.

   Thirdly, it belongs to the perfection of faith, which concerns His humanity just as it does His Godhead, according to Jn. 14:1: "You believe in God, believe also in Me." And since faith is of things unseen, as Christ shows us His Godhead invisibly, so also in this sacrament He shows us His flesh in an invisible manner.

   Some men accordingly, not paying heed to these things, have contended that Christ's body and blood are not in this sacrament except as in a sign, a thing to be rejected as heretical, since it is contrary to Christ's words. Hence Berengarius, who had been the first deviser of this heresy, was afterwards forced to withdraw his error, and to acknowledge the truth of the faith.

2/ Whether in this sacrament the substance of the bread and wine remains after the consecration?

  *I answer that,* Some have held that the substance of the bread and wine remains in this sacrament after the consecration. But this opinion cannot stand: first of all, because by such an opinion the truth of this sacrament is destroyed, to which it belongs that Christ's true body exists in this sacrament; which indeed was not there before the consecration. Now a thing cannot be in any place, where it was not previously, except by change of place, or by the conversion of another thing into itself; just as fire begins anew to be in some house, either because it is carried thither, or because it is generated there. Now it is evident that Christ's body does not begin to be present in this sacrament by local motion. First of all, because it would follow that it would cease to be in heaven: for what is moved locally does not come anew to some place unless it quit the former one. Secondly, because every body moved locally passes through all intermediary spaces, which cannot be said here. Thirdly, because it is not possible for one movement of the same body moved locally to be terminated in different places at the one time, whereas the body of Christ under this sacrament begins at the one time to be in several places. And consequently it remains that Christ's body cannot begin to be anew in this sacrament except by change of the substance of bread into itself. But what is changed into another thing, no longer remains after such change. Hence the conclusion is that, saving the truth of this sacrament, the substance of the bread cannot remain after the consecration.

   Secondly, because this position is contrary to the form of this sacrament, in which it is said: "This is My body," which would not be true if the substance of the bread were to remain there; for the substance of bread never is the body of Christ. Rather should one say in that case: "Here is My body."

   Thirdly, because it would be opposed to the veneration of this sacrament, if any substance were there, which could not be adored with adoration of latria.

   Fourthly, because it is contrary to the rite of the Church, according to which it is not lawful to take the body of Christ after bodily food, while it is nevertheless lawful to take one consecrated host after another. Hence this opinion is to be avoided as heretical.

3/ Whether the substance of the bread or wine is annihilated after the consecration of this sacrament, or dissolved into their original matter?

  *I answer that,* Because the substance of the bread and wine does not remain in this sacrament, some, deeming that it is impossible for the substance of the bread and wine to be changed into Christ's flesh and blood, have maintained that by the consecration, the substance of the bread and wine is either dissolved into the original matter, or that it is annihilated.

   Now the original matter into which mixed bodies can be dissolved is the four elements. For dissolution cannot be made into primary matter, so that a subject can exist without a form, since matter cannot exist without a form. But since after the consecration nothing remains under the sacramental species except the body and the blood of Christ, it will be necessary to say that the elements into which the substance of the bread and wine is dissolved, depart from thence by local motion, which would be perceived by the senses. In like manner also the substance of the bread or wine remains until the last instant of the consecration; but in the last instant of the consecration there is already present there the substance of the body or blood of Christ, just as the form is already present in the last instant of generation. Hence no instant can be assigned in which the original matter can be there. For it cannot be said that the substance of the bread or wine is dissolved gradually into the original matter, or that it successively quits the species, for if this began to be done in the last instant of its consecration, then at the one time under part of the host there would be the body of Christ together with the substance of bread, which is contrary to what has been said above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1)). But if this begin to come to pass before the consecration, there will then be a time in which under one part of the host there will be neither the substance of bread nor the body of Christ, which is not fitting. They seem indeed to have taken this into careful consideration, wherefore they formulated their proposition with an alternative viz. that (the substance) may be annihilated. But even this cannot stand, because no way can be assigned whereby Christ's true body can begin to be in this sacrament, except by the change of the substance of bread into it, which change is excluded the moment we admit either annihilation of the substance of the bread, or dissolution into the original matter. Likewise no cause can be assigned for such dissolution or annihilation, since the effect of the sacrament is signified by the form: "This is My body." Hence it is clear that the aforesaid opinion is false.

4/ Whether bread can be converted into the body of Christ?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1)), since Christ's true body is in this sacrament, and since it does not begin to be there by local motion, nor is it contained therein as in a place, as is evident from what was stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A1THEP1), ad 2), it must be said then that it begins to be there by conversion of the substance of bread into itself.

   Yet this change is not like natural changes, but is entirely supernatural, and effected by God's power alone. Hence Ambrose says [(De Sacram. iv): "See how Christ's word changes nature's laws, as He wills: a man is not wont to be born save of man and woman: see therefore that against the established law and order a man is born of a Virgin": and] [\*The passage in the brackets is not in the Leonine edition] (De Myster. iv): "It is clear that a Virgin begot beyond the order of nature: and what we make is the body from the Virgin. Why, then, do you look for nature's order in Christ's body, since the Lord Jesus was Himself brought forth of a Virgin beyond nature?" Chrysostom likewise (Hom. xlvii), commenting on Jn. 6:64: "The words which I have spoken to you," namely, of this sacrament, "are spirit and life," says: i.e. "spiritual, having nothing carnal, nor natural consequence; but they are rent from all such necessity which exists upon earth, and from the laws here established."

   For it is evident that every agent acts according as it is in act. But every created agent is limited in its act, as being of a determinate genus and species: and consequently the action of every created agent bears upon some determinate act. Now the determination of every thing in actual existence comes from its form. Consequently, no natural or created agent can act except by changing the form in something; and on this account every change made according to nature's laws is a formal change. But God is infinite act, as stated in the FP, Question [7], Article [1]; Question [26], Article [2]; hence His action extends to the whole nature of being. Therefore He can work not only formal conversion, so that diverse forms succeed each other in the same subject; but also the change of all being, so that, to wit, the whole substance of one thing be changed into the whole substance of another. And this is done by Divine power in this sacrament; for the whole substance of the bread is changed into the whole substance of Christ's body, and the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of Christ's blood. Hence this is not a formal, but a substantial conversion; nor is it a kind of natural movement: but, with a name of its own, it can be called "transubstantiation."

5/ Whether the accidents of the bread and wine remain in this sacrament after the change?

  *I answer that,* It is evident to sense that all the accidents of the bread and wine remain after the consecration. And this is reasonably done by Divine providence. First of all, because it is not customary, but horrible, for men to eat human flesh, and to drink blood. And therefore Christ's flesh and blood are set before us to be partaken of under the species of those things which are the more commonly used by men, namely, bread and wine. Secondly, lest this sacrament might be derided by unbelievers, if we were to eat our Lord under His own species. Thirdly, that while we receive our Lord's body and blood invisibly, this may redound to the merit of faith.

6/ Whether the substantial form of the bread remains in this sacrament after the consecration?

  *I answer that,* Some have contended that after the consecration not only do the accidents of the bread remain, but also its substantial form. But this cannot be. First of all, because if the substantial form of the bread were to remain, nothing of the bread would be changed into the body of Christ, excepting the matter; and so it would follow that it would be changed, not into the whole body of Christ, but into its matter, which is repugnant to the form of the sacrament, wherein it is said: "This is My body."

   Secondly, because if the substantial form of the bread were to remain, it would remain either in matter, or separated from matter. The first cannot be, for if it were to remain in the matter of the bread, then the whole substance of the bread would remain, which is against what was said above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1)). Nor could it remain in any other matter, because the proper form exists only in its proper matter. But if it were to remain separate from matter, it would then be an actually intelligible form, and also an intelligence; for all forms separated from matter are such.

   Thirdly, it would be unbefitting this sacrament: because the accidents of the bread remain in this sacrament, in order that the body of Christ may be seen under them, and not under its proper species, as stated above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A5THEP1)).

   And therefore it must be said that the substantial form of the bread does not remain.

7/ Whether this change is wrought instantaneously?

  *I answer that,* A change may be instantaneous from a threefold reason. First on the part of the form, which is the terminus of the change. For, if it be a form that receives more and less, it is acquired by its subject successively, such as health; and therefore because a substantial form does not receive more and less, it follows that its introduction into matter is instantaneous.

   Secondly on the part of the subject, which sometimes is prepared successively for receiving the form; thus water is heated successively. When, however, the subject itself is in the ultimate disposition for receiving the form, it receives it suddenly, as a transparent body is illuminated suddenly. Thirdly on the part of the agent, which possesses infinite power: wherefore it can instantly dispose the matter for the form. Thus it is written (Mk. 7:34) that when Christ had said, "'Ephpheta,' which is 'Be thou opened,' immediately his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed."

   For these three reasons this conversion is instantaneous. First, because the substance of Christ's body which is the term of this conversion, does not receive more or less. Secondly, because in this conversion there is no subject to be disposed successively. Thirdly, because it is effected by God's infinite power.

8/ Whether this proposition is false: "The body of Christ is made out of bread"?

  *I answer that,* This conversion of bread into the body of Christ has something in common with creation, and with natural transmutation, and in some respect differs from both. For the order of the terms is common to these three; that is, that after one thing there is another (for, in creation there is being after non-being; in this sacrament, Christ's body after the substance of bread; in natural transmutation white after black, or fire after air); and that the aforesaid terms are not coexistent.

   Now the conversion, of which we are speaking, has this in common with creation, that in neither of them is there any common subject belonging to either of the extremes; the contrary of which appears in every natural transmutation.

   Again, this conversion has something in common with natural transmutation in two respects, although not in the same fashion. First of all because in both, one of the extremes passes into the other, as bread into Christ's body, and air into fire; whereas non-being is not converted into being. But this comes to pass differently on the one side and on the other; for in this sacrament the whole substance of the bread passes into the whole body of Christ; whereas in natural transmutation the matter of the one receives the form of the other, the previous form being laid aside. Secondly, they have this in common, that on both sides something remains the same; whereas this does not happen in creation: yet differently; for the same matter or subject remains in natural transmutation; whereas in this sacrament the same accidents remain.

   From these observations we can gather the various ways of speaking in such matters. For, because in no one of the aforesaid three things are the extremes coexistent, therefore in none of them can one extreme be predicated of the other by the substantive verb of the present tense: for we do not say, "Non-being is being" or, "Bread is the body of Christ," or, "Air is fire," or, "White is black." Yet because of the relationship of the extremes in all of them we can use the preposition "ex" [out of], which denotes order; for we can truly and properly say that "being is made out of non-being," and "out of bread, the body of Christ," and "out of air, fire," and "out of white, black." But because in creation one of the extremes does not pass into the other, we cannot use the word "conversion" in creation, so as to say that "non-being is converted into being": we can, however, use the word in this sacrament, just as in natural transmutation. But since in this sacrament the whole substance is converted into the whole substance, on that account this conversion is properly termed transubstantiation.

   Again, since there is no subject of this conversion, the things which are true in natural conversion by reason of the subject, are not to be granted in this conversion. And in the first place indeed it is evident that potentiality to the opposite follows a subject, by reason whereof we say that "a white thing can be black," or that "air can be fire"; although the latter is not so proper as the former: for the subject of whiteness, in which there is potentiality to blackness, is the whole substance of the white thing; since whiteness is not a part thereof; whereas the subject of the form of air is part thereof: hence when it is said, "Air can be fire," it is verified by synecdoche by reason of the part. But in this conversion, and similarly in creation, because there is no subject, it is not said that one extreme can be the other, as that "non-being can be being," or that "bread can be the body of Christ": and for the same reason it cannot be properly said that "being is made of [de] non-being," or that "the body of Christ is made of bread," because this preposition "of" [de] denotes a consubstantial cause, which consubstantiality of the extremes in natural transmutations is considered according to something common in the subject. And for the same reason it is not granted that "bread will be the body of Christ," or that it "may become the body of Christ," just as it is not granted in creation that "non-being will be being," or that "non-being may become being," because this manner of speaking is verified in natural transmutations by reason of the subject: for instance, when we say that "a white thing becomes black," or "a white thing will be black."

Q. 76 OF THE WAY IN WHICH CHRIST IS IN THIS SACRAMENT (EIGHT ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the manner in which Christ exists in this sacrament; and under this head there are eight points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1) Whether the whole Christ is under this sacrament?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A2THEP1) Whether the entire Christ is under each species of the sacrament?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A3THEP1) Whether the entire Christ is under every part of the species?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A4THEP1) Whether all the dimensions of Christ's body are in this sacrament?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A5THEP1) Whether the body of Christ is in this sacrament locally?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A6THEP1) Whether after the consecration, the body of Christ is moved when the host or chalice is moved?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A7THEP1) Whether Christ's body, as it is in this sacrament, can be seen by the eye?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A8THEP1) Whether the true body of Christ remains in this sacrament when He is seen under the appearance of a child or of flesh?

1/ Whether the whole Christ is contained under this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* It is absolutely necessary to confess according to Catholic faith that the entire Christ is in this sacrament. Yet we must know that there is something of Christ in this sacrament in a twofold manner: first, as it were, by the power of the sacrament; secondly, from natural concomitance. By the power of the sacrament, there is under the species of this sacrament that into which the pre-existing substance of the bread and wine is changed, as expressed by the words of the form, which are effective in this as in the other sacraments; for instance, by the words: "This is My body," or, "This is My blood." But from natural concomitance there is also in this sacrament that which is really united with that thing wherein the aforesaid conversion is terminated. For if any two things be really united, then wherever the one is really, there must the other also be: since things really united together are only distinguished by an operation of the mind.

2/ Whether the whole Christ is contained under each species of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* After what we have said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1)), it must be held most certainly that the whole Christ is under each sacramental species yet not alike in each. For the body of Christ is indeed present under the species of bread by the power of the sacrament, while the blood is there from real concomitance, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1), ad 1) in regard to the soul and Godhead of Christ; and under the species of wine the blood is present by the power of the sacrament, and His body by real concomitance, as is also His soul and Godhead: because now Christ's blood is not separated from His body, as it was at the time of His Passion and death. Hence if this sacrament had been celebrated then, the body of Christ would have been under the species of the bread, but without the blood; and, under the species of the wine, the blood would have been present without the body, as it was then, in fact.

3/ Whether Christ is entire under every part of the species of the bread and wine?

  *I answer that,* As was observed above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1), ad 3), because the substance of Christ's body is in this sacrament by the power of the sacrament, while dimensive quantity is there by reason of real concomitance, consequently Christ's body is in this sacrament substantively, that is, in the way in which substance is under dimensions, but not after the manner of dimensions, which means, not in the way in which the dimensive quantity of a body is under the dimensive quantity of place.

   Now it is evident that the whole nature of a substance is under every part of the dimensions under which it is contained; just as the entire nature of air is under every part of air, and the entire nature of bread under every part of bread; and this indifferently, whether the dimensions be actually divided (as when the air is divided or the bread cut), or whether they be actually undivided, but potentially divisible. And therefore it is manifest that the entire Christ is under every part of the species of the bread, even while the host remains entire, and not merely when it is broken, as some say, giving the example of an image which appears in a mirror, which appears as one in the unbroken mirror, whereas when the mirror is broken, there is an image in each part of the broken mirror: for the comparison is not perfect, because the multiplying of such images results in the broken mirror on account of the various reflections in the various parts of the mirror; but here there is only one consecration, whereby Christ's body is in this sacrament.

4/ Whether the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body is in this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1)), any part of Christ is in this sacrament in two ways: in one way, by the power of the sacrament; in another, from real concomitance. By the power of the sacrament the dimensive quantity of Christ's body is not in this sacrament; for, by the power of the sacrament that is present in this sacrament, whereat the conversion is terminated. But the conversion which takes place in this sacrament is terminated directly at the substance of Christ's body, and not at its dimensions; which is evident from the fact that the dimensive quantity of the bread remains after the consecration, while only the substance of the bread passes away.

   Nevertheless, since the substance of Christ's body is not really deprived of its dimensive quantity and its other accidents, hence it comes that by reason of real concomitance the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body and all its other accidents are in this sacrament.

5/ Whether Christ's body is in this sacrament as in a place?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1), ad 3; [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1A3THEP1)), Christ's body is in this sacrament not after the proper manner of dimensive quantity, but rather after the manner of substance. But every body occupying a place is in the place according to the manner of dimensive quantity, namely, inasmuch as it is commensurate with the place according to its dimensive quantity. Hence it remains that Christ's body is not in this sacrament as in a place, but after the manner of substance, that is to say, in that way in which substance is contained by dimensions; because the substance of Christ's body succeeds the substance of bread in this sacrament: hence as the substance of bread was not locally under its dimensions, but after the manner of substance, so neither is the substance of Christ's body. Nevertheless the substance of Christ's body is not the subject of those dimensions, as was the substance of the bread: and therefore the substance of the bread was there locally by reason of its dimensions, because it was compared with that place through the medium of its own dimensions; but the substance of Christ's body is compared with that place through the medium of foreign dimensions, so that, on the contrary, the proper dimensions of Christ's body are compared with that place through the medium of substance; which is contrary to the notion of a located body.

   Hence in no way is Christ's body locally in this sacrament.

6/ Whether Christ's body is in this sacrament movably?

  *I answer that,* When any thing is one, as to subject, and manifold in being, there is nothing to hinder it from being moved in one respect, and yet to remain at rest in another just as it is one thing for a body to be white, and another thing, to be large; hence it can be moved as to its whiteness, and yet continue unmoved as to its magnitude. But in Christ, being in Himself and being under the sacrament are not the same thing, because when we say that He is under this sacrament, we express a kind of relationship to this sacrament. According to this being, then, Christ is not moved locally of Himself, but only accidentally, because Christ is not in this sacrament as in a place, as stated above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A5THEP1)). But what is not in a place, is not moved of itself locally, but only according to the motion of the subject in which it is.

   In the same way neither is it moved of itself according to the being which it has in this sacrament, by any other change whatever, as for instance, that it ceases to be under this sacrament: because whatever possesses unfailing existence of itself, cannot be the principle of failing; but when something else fails, then it ceases to be in it; just as God, Whose existence is unfailing and immortal, ceases to be in some corruptible creature because such corruptible creature ceases to exist. And in this way, since Christ has unfailing and incorruptible being, He ceases to be under this sacrament, not because He ceases to be, nor yet by local movement of His own, as is clear from what has been said, but only by the fact that the sacramental species cease to exist.

   Hence it is clear that Christ, strictly speaking is immovably in this sacrament.

7/ Whether the body of Christ, as it is in this sacrament, can be seen by any eye, at least by a glorified one?

  *I answer that,* The eye is of two kinds, namely, the bodily eye properly so-called, and the intellectual eye, so-called by similitude. But Christ's body as it is in this sacrament cannot be seen by any bodily eye. First of all, because a body which is visible brings about an alteration in the medium, through its accidents. Now the accidents of Christ's body are in this sacrament by means of the substance; so that the accidents of Christ's body have no immediate relationship either to this sacrament or to adjacent bodies; consequently they do not act on the medium so as to be seen by any corporeal eye. Secondly, because, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1), ad 3; [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1A3THEP1)), Christ's body is substantially present in this sacrament. But substance, as such, is not visible to the bodily eye, nor does it come under any one of the senses, nor under the imagination, but solely under the intellect, whose object is "what a thing is" (De Anima iii). And therefore, properly speaking, Christ's body, according to the mode of being which it has in this sacrament, is perceptible neither by the sense nor by the imagination, but only by the intellect, which is called the spiritual eye.

   Moreover it is perceived differently by different intellects. For since the way in which Christ is in this sacrament is entirely supernatural, it is visible in itself to a supernatural, i.e. the Divine, intellect, and consequently to a beatified intellect, of angel or of man, which, through the participated glory of the Divine intellect, sees all supernatural things in the vision of the Divine Essence. But it can be seen by a wayfarer through faith alone, like other supernatural things. And not even the angelic intellect of its own natural power is capable of beholding it; consequently the devils cannot by their intellect perceive Christ in this sacrament, except through faith, to which they do not pay willing assent; yet they are convinced of it from the evidence of signs, according to James 2:19: "The devils believe, and tremble."

8/ Whether Christ's body is truly there when flesh or a child appears miraculously in this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Such apparition comes about in two ways, when occasionally in this sacrament flesh, or blood, or a child, is seen. Sometimes it happens on the part of the beholders, whose eyes are so affected as if they outwardly saw flesh, or blood, or a child, while no change takes place in the sacrament. And this seems to happen when to one person it is seen under the species of flesh or of a child, while to others it is seen as before under the species of bread; or when to the same individual it appears for an hour under the appearance of flesh or a child, and afterwards under the appearance of bread. Nor is there any deception there, as occurs in the feats of magicians, because such species is divinely formed in the eye in order to represent some truth, namely, for the purpose of showing that Christ's body is truly under this sacrament; just as Christ without deception appeared to the disciples who were going to Emmaus. For Augustine says (De Qq. Evang. ii) that "when our pretense is referred to some significance, it is not a lie, but a figure of the truth." And since in this way no change is made in the sacrament, it is manifest that, when such apparition occurs, Christ does not cease to be under this sacrament.

   But it sometimes happens that such apparition comes about not merely by a change wrought in the beholders, but by an appearance which really exists outwardly. And this indeed is seen to happen when it is beheld by everyone under such an appearance, and it remains so not for an hour, but for a considerable time; and, in this case some think that it is the proper species of Christ's body. Nor does it matter that sometimes Christ's entire body is not seen there, but part of His flesh, or else that it is not seen in youthful guise. but in the semblance of a child, because it lies within the power of a glorified body for it to be seen by a non-glorified eye either entirely or in part, and under its own semblance or in strange guise, as will be said later ([XP](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/XP.html), [Question [85]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/XP/XP085.html#XPQ85OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/XP/XP085.html#XPQ85A2THEP1),3).

   But this seems unlikely. First of all, because Christ's body under its proper species can be seen only in one place, wherein it is definitively contained. Hence since it is seen in its proper species, and is adored in heaven, it is not seen under its proper species in this sacrament. Secondly, because a glorified body, which appears at will, disappears when it wills after the apparition; thus it is related ([Lk. 24:31](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++24:31)) that our Lord "vanished out of sight" of the disciples. But that which appears under the likeness of flesh in this sacrament, continues for a long time; indeed, one reads of its being sometimes enclosed, and, by order of many bishops, preserved in a pyx, which it would be wicked to think of Christ under His proper semblance.

   Consequently, it remains to be said, that, while the dimensions remain the same as before, there is a miraculous change wrought in the other accidents, such as shape, color, and the rest, so that flesh, or blood, or a child, is seen. And, as was said already, this is not deception, because it is done "to represent the truth," namely, to show by this miraculous apparition that Christ's body and blood are truly in this sacrament. And thus it is clear that as the dimensions remain, which are the foundation of the other accidents, as we shall see later on ([Question [77]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A2THEP1)), the body of Christ truly remains in this sacrament.

### Q. 77 OF THE ACCIDENTS WHICH REMAIN IN THIS SACRAMENT (EIGHT ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the accidents which remain in this sacrament; under which head there are eight points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A1THEP1) Whether the accidents which remain are without a subject?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A2THEP1) Whether dimensive quantity is the subject of the other accidents?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A3THEP1) Whether such accidents can affect an extrinsic body?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A4THEP1) Whether they can be corrupted?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A5THEP1) Whether anything can be generated from them?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A6THEP1) Whether they can nourish?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A7THEP1) Of the breaking of the consecrated bread?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A8THEP1) Whether anything can be mixed with the consecrated wine?

1/ Whether the accidents remain in this sacrament without a subject?

  *I answer that,* The species of the bread and wine, which are perceived by our senses to remain in this sacrament after consecration, are not subjected in the substance of the bread and wine, for that does not remain, as stated above ([Question [75]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1)); nor in the substantial form, for that does not remain ([Question [75]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A6THEP1)), and if it did remain, "it could not be a subject," as Boethius declares (De Trin. i). Furthermore it is manifest that these accidents are not subjected in the substance of Christ's body and blood, because the substance of the human body cannot in any way be affected by such accidents; nor is it possible for Christ's glorious and impassible body to be altered so as to receive these qualities.

   Now there are some who say that they are in the surrounding atmosphere as in a subject. But even this cannot be: in the first place, because atmosphere is not susceptive of such accidents. Secondly, because these accidents are not where the atmosphere is, nay more, the atmosphere is displaced by the motion of these species. Thirdly, because accidents do not pass from subject to subject, so that the same identical accident which was first in one subject be afterwards in another; because an accident is individuated by the subject; hence it cannot come to pass for an accident remaining identically the same to be at one time in one subject, and at another time in another. Fourthly, since the atmosphere is not deprived of its own accidents, it would have at the one time its own accidents and others foreign to it. Nor can it be maintained that this is done miraculously in virtue of the consecration, because the words of consecration do not signify this, and they effect only what they signify.

   Therefore it follows that the accidents continue in this sacrament without a subject. This can be done by Divine power: for since an effect depends more upon the first cause than on the second, God Who is the first cause both of substance and accident, can by His unlimited power preserve an accident in existence when the substance is withdrawn whereby it was preserved in existence as by its proper cause, just as without natural causes He can produce other effects of natural causes, even as He formed a human body in the Virgin's womb, "without the seed of man" (Hymn for Christmas, First Vespers).

2/ Whether in this sacrament the dimensive quantity of the bread or wine is the subject of the other accidents?

  *I answer that,* It is necessary to say that the other accidents which remain in this sacrament are subjected in the dimensive quantity of the bread and wine that remains: first of all, because something having quantity and color and affected by other accidents is perceived by the senses; nor is sense deceived in such. Secondly, because the first disposition of matter is dimensive quantity, hence Plato also assigned "great" and "small" as the first differences of matter (Aristotle, Metaph. iv). And because the first subject is matter, the consequence is that all other accidents are related to their subject through the medium of dimensive quantity; just as the first subject of color is said to be the surface, on which account some have maintained that dimensions are the substances of bodies, as is said in Metaph. iii. And since, when the subject is withdrawn, the accidents remain according to the being which they had before, it follows that all accidents remain founded upon dimensive quantity.

   Thirdly, because, since the subject is the principle of individuation of the accidents, it is necessary for what is admitted as the subject of some accidents to be somehow the principle of individuation: for it is of the very notion of an individual that it cannot be in several; and this happens in two ways. First, because it is not natural to it to be in any one; and in this way immaterial separated forms, subsisting of themselves, are also individuals of themselves. Secondly, because a form, be it substantial or accidental, is naturally in someone indeed, not in several, as this whiteness, which is in this body. As to the first, matter is the principle of individuation of all inherent forms, because, since these forms, considered in themselves, are naturally in something as in a subject, from the very fact that one of them is received in matter, which is not in another, it follows that neither can the form itself thus existing be in another. As to the second, it must be maintained that the principle of individuation is dimensive quantity. For that something is naturally in another one solely, is due to the fact that that other is undivided in itself, and distinct from all others. But it is on account of quantity that substance can be divided, as is said in Phys. i. And therefore dimensive quantity itself is a particular principle of individuation in forms of this kind, namely, inasmuch as forms numerically distinct are in different parts of the matter. Hence also dimensive quantity has of itself a kind of individuation, so that we can imagine several lines of the same species, differing in position, which is included in the notion of this quantity; for it belongs to dimension for it to be "quantity having position" (Aristotle, Categor. iv), and therefore dimensive quantity can be the subject of the other accidents, rather than the other way about.

3/ Whether the species remaining in this sacrament can change external objects?

  *I answer that,* Because everything acts in so far as it is an actual being, the consequence is that everything stands in the same relation to action as it does to being. Therefore, because, according to what was said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A1THEP1)), it is an effect of the Divine power that the sacramental species continue in the being which they had when the substance of the bread and wine was present, it follows that they continue in their action. Consequently they retain every action which they had while the substance of the bread and wine remained, now that the substance of the bread and wine has passed into the body and blood of Christ. Hence there is no doubt but that they can change external bodies.

4/ Whether the sacramental species can be corrupted?

  *I answer that,* Corruption is "movement from being into non-being" (Aristotle, Phys. v). Now it has been stated ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A3THEP1)) that the sacramental species retain the same being as they had before when the substance of the bread was present. Consequently, as the being of those accidents could be corrupted while the substance of the bread and wine was present, so likewise they can be corrupted now that the substance has passed away.

   But such accidents could have been previously corrupted in two ways: in one way, of themselves; in another way, accidentally. They could be corrupted of themselves, as by alteration of the qualities, and increase or decrease of the quantity, not in the way in which increase or decrease is found only in animated bodies, such as the substances of the bread and wine are not, but by addition or division; for, as is said in Metaph. iii, one dimension is dissolved by division, and two dimensions result; while on the contrary, by addition, two dimensions become one. And in this way such accidents can be corrupted manifestly after consecration, because the dimensive quantity which remains can receive division and addition; and since it is the subject of sensible qualities, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A1THEP1)), it can likewise be the subject of their alteration, for instance, if the color or the savor of the bread or wine be altered.

   An accident can be corrupted in another way, through the corruption of its subject, and in this way also they can be corrupted after consecration; for although the subject does not remain, still the being which they had in the subject does remain, which being is proper, and suited to the subject. And therefore such being can be corrupted by a contrary agent, as the substance of the bread or wine was subject to corruption, and, moreover, was not corrupted except by a preceding alteration regarding the accidents.

   Nevertheless, a distinction must be made between each of the aforesaid corruptions; because, when the body and the blood of Christ succeed in this sacrament to the substance of the bread and wine, if there be such change on the part of the accidents as would not have sufficed for the corruption of the bread and wine, then the body and blood of Christ do not cease to be under this sacrament on account of such change, whether the change be on the part of the quality, as for instance, when the color or the savor of the bread or wine is slightly modified; or on the part of the quantity, as when the bread or the wine is divided into such parts as to keep in them the nature of bread or of wine. But if the change be so great that the substance of the bread or wine would have been corrupted, then Christ's body and blood do not remain under this sacrament; and this either on the part of the qualities, as when the color, savor, and other qualities of the bread and wine are so altered as to be incompatible with the nature of bread or of wine; or else on the part of the quantity, as, for instance, if the bread be reduced to fine particles, or the wine divided into such tiny drops that the species of bread or wine no longer remain.

5/ Whether anything can be generated from the sacramental species?

  *I answer that,* Since "the corruption of one thing is the generation of another" (De Gener. i), something must be generated necessarily from the sacramental species if they be corrupted, as stated above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A4THEP1)); for they are not corrupted in such a way that they disappear altogether, as if reduced to nothing; on the contrary, something sensible manifestly succeeds to them.

   Nevertheless, it is difficult to see how anything can be generated from them. For it is quite evident that nothing is generated out of the body and blood of Christ which are truly there, because these are incorruptible. But if the substance, or even the matter, of the bread and wine were to remain in this sacrament, then, as some have maintained, it would be easy to account for this sensible object which succeeds to them. But that supposition is false, as was stated above ([Question [75]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1),4,8).

   Hence it is that others have said that the things generated have not sprung from the sacramental species, but from the surrounding atmosphere. But this can be shown in many ways to be impossible. In the first place, because when a thing is generated from another, the latter at first appears changed and corrupted; whereas no alteration or corruption appeared previously in the adjacent atmosphere; hence the worms or ashes are not generated therefrom. Secondly, because the nature of the atmosphere is not such as to permit of such things being generated by such alterations. Thirdly, because it is possible for many consecrated hosts to be burned or putrefied; nor would it be possible for an earthen body, large enough to be generated from the atmosphere, unless a great and, in fact, exceedingly sensible condensation of the atmosphere took place. Fourthly, because the same thing can happen to the solid bodies surrounding them, such as iron or stone, which remain entire after the generation of the aforesaid things. Hence this opinion cannot stand, because it is opposed to what is manifest to our senses.

   And therefore others have said that the substance of the bread and wine returns during the corruption of the species, and so from the returning substance of the bread and wine, ashes or worms or something of the kind are generated. But this explanation seems an impossible one. First of all, because if the substance of the bread and wine be converted into the body and blood of Christ, as was shown above ([Question [75]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1),4), the substance of the bread and wine cannot return, except the body and blood of Christ be again changed back into the substance of bread and wine, which is impossible: thus if air be turned into fire, the air cannot return without the fire being again changed into air. But if the substance of bread or wine be annihilated, it cannot return again, because what lapses into nothing does not return numerically the same. Unless perchance it be said that the said substance returns, because God creates anew another new substance to replace the first. Secondly, this seems to be impossible, because no time can be assigned when the substance of the bread returns. For, from what was said above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A4THEP1); [Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A6THEP1), ad 3), it is evident that while the species of the bread and wine remain, there remain also the body and blood of Christ, which are not present together with the substance of the bread and wine in this sacrament, according to what was stated above ([Question [75]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A2THEP1)). Hence the substance of the bread and wine cannot return while the sacramental species remain; nor, again, when these species pass away; because then the substance of the bread and wine would be without their proper accidents, which is impossible. Unless perchance it be said that in the last instant of the corruption of the species there returns (not, indeed, the substance of bread and wine, because it is in that very instant that they have the being of the substance generated from the species, but) the matter of the bread and wine; which, matter, properly speaking, would be more correctly described as created anew, than as returning. And in this sense the aforesaid position might be held.

   However, since it does not seem reasonable to say that anything takes place miraculously in this sacrament, except in virtue of the consecration itself, which does not imply either creation or return of matter, it seems better to say that in the actual consecration it is miraculously bestowed on the dimensive quantity of the bread and wine to be the subject of subsequent forms. Now this is proper to matter; and therefore as a consequence everything which goes with matter is bestowed on dimensive quantity; and therefore everything which could be generated from the matter of bread or wine, if it were present, can be generated from the aforesaid dimensive quantity of the bread or wine, not, indeed, by a new miracle, but by virtue of the miracle which has already taken place.

6/ Whether the sacramental species can nourish?

  *I answer that,* This question presents no difficulty, now that we have solved the preceding question. Because, as stated in De Anima ii, food nourishes by being converted into the substance of the individual nourished. Now it has been stated ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A5THEP1)) that the sacramental species can be converted into a substance generated from them. And they can be converted into the human body for the same reason as they can into ashes or worms. Consequently, it is evident that they nourish.

   But the senses witness to the untruth of what some maintain; viz. that the species do not nourish as though they were changed into the human body, but merely refresh and hearten by acting upon the senses (as a man is heartened by the odor of meat, and intoxicated by the fumes of wine). Because such refreshment does not suffice long for a man, whose body needs repair owing to constant waste: and yet a man could be supported for long if he were to take hosts and consecrated wine in great quantity.

   In like manner the statement advanced by others cannot stand, who hold that the sacramental species nourish owing to the remaining substantial form of the bread and wine: both because the form does not remain, as stated above ([Question [75]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A6THEP1)): and because to nourish is the act not of a form but rather of matter, which takes the form of the one nourished, while the form of the nourishment passes away: hence it is said in De Anima ii that nourishment is at first unlike, but at the end is like.

7/ Whether the sacramental species are broken in this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Many opinions prevailed of old on this matter. Some held that in this sacrament there was no breaking at all in reality, but merely in the eyes of the beholders. But this contention cannot stand, because in this sacrament of truth the sense is not deceived with regard to its proper object of judgment, and one of these objects is breaking, whereby from one thing arise many: and these are common sensibles, as is stated in De Anima ii.

   Others accordingly have said that there was indeed a genuine breaking, but without any subject. But this again contradicts our senses; because a quantitative body is seen in this sacrament, which formerly was one, and is now divided into many, and this must be the subject of the breaking.

   But it cannot be said that Christ's true body is broken. First of all, because it is incorruptible and impassible: secondly, because it is entire under every part, as was shown above ([Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A3THEP1)), which is contrary to the nature of a thing broken.

   It remains, then, that the breaking is in the dimensive quantity of the bread, as in a subject, just as the other accidents. And as the sacramental species are the sacrament of Christ's true body, so is the breaking of these species the sacrament of our Lord's Passion, which was in Christ's true body.

8/ Whether any liquid can be mingled with the consecrated wine?

  *I answer that,* The truth of this question is evident from what has been said already. For it was said above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A3THEP1); [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A3A5THEP1), ad 2) that the species remaining in this sacrament, as they acquire the manner of being of substance in virtue of the consecration, so likewise do they obtain the mode of acting and of being acted upon, so that they can do or receive whatever their substance could do or receive, were it there present. But it is evident that if the substance of wine were there present, then some other liquid could be mingled with it.

   Nevertheless there would be a different effect of such mixing both according to the form and according to the quantity of the liquid. For if sufficient liquid were mixed so as to spread itself all through the wine, then the whole would be a mixed substance. Now what is made up of things mixed is neither of them, but each passes into a third resulting from both: hence it would result that the former wine would remain no longer. But if the liquid added were of another species, for instance, if water were mixed, the species of the wine would be dissolved, and there would be a liquid of another species. But if liquid of the same species were added, of instance, wine with wine, the same species would remain, but the wine would not be the same numerically, as the diversity of the accidents shows: for instance, if one wine were white and the other red.

   But if the liquid added were of such minute quantity that it could not permeate the whole, the entire wine would not be mixed, but only part of it, which would not remain the same numerically owing to the blending of extraneous matter: still it would remain the same specifically, not only if a little liquid of the same species were mixed with it, but even if it were of another species, since a drop of water blended with much wine passes into the species of wine (De Gener. i).

   Now it is evident that the body and blood of Christ abide in this sacrament so long as the species remain numerically the same, as stated above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A4THEP1); [Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A6THEP1), ad 3); because it is this bread and this wine which is consecrated. Hence, if the liquid of any kind whatsoever added be so much in quantity as to permeate the whole of the consecrated wine, and be mixed with it throughout, the result would be something numerically distinct, and the blood of Christ will remain there no longer. But if the quantity of the liquid added be so slight as not to permeate throughout, but to reach only a part of the species, Christ's blood will cease to be under that part of the consecrated wine, yet will remain under the rest.

Q. 78 OF THE FORM OF THIS SACRAMENT (SIX ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the form of this sacrament; concerning which there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A1THEP1) What is the form of this sacrament?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A2THEP1) Whether the form for the consecration of the bread is appropriate?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A3THEP1) Whether the form for the consecration of the blood is appropriate?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A4THEP1) Of the power of each form?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A5THEP1) Of the truth of the expression?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A6THEP1) Of the comparison of the one form with the other?

1/ Whether this is the form of this sacrament: "This is My body," and "This is the chalice of My blood"?

  *I answer that,* This sacrament differs from the other sacraments in two respects. First of all, in this, that this sacrament is accomplished by the consecration of the matter, while the rest are perfected in the use of the consecrated matter. Secondly, because in the other sacraments the consecration of the matter consists only in a blessing, from which the matter consecrated derives instrumentally a spiritual power, which through the priest who is an animated instrument, can pass on to inanimate instruments. But in this sacrament the consecration of the matter consists in the miraculous change of the substance, which can only be done by God; hence the minister in performing this sacrament has no other act save the pronouncing of the words. And because the form should suit the thing, therefore the form of this sacrament differs from the forms of the other sacraments in two respects. First, because the form of the other sacraments implies the use of the matter, as for instance, baptizing, or signing; but the form of this sacrament implies merely the consecration of the matter, which consists in transubstantiation, as when it is said, "This is My body," or, "This is the chalice of My blood." Secondly, because the forms of the other sacraments are pronounced in the person of the minister, whether by way of exercising an act, as when it is said, "I baptize thee," or "I confirm thee," etc.; or by way of command, as when it is said in the sacrament of order, "Take the power," etc.; or by way of entreaty, as when in the sacrament of Extreme Unction it is said, "By this anointing and our intercession," etc. But the form of this sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this sacrament, except to pronounce the words of Christ.

2/ Whether this is the proper form for the consecration of the bread: "This is My body"?

  *I answer that,* This is the proper form for the consecration of the bread. For it was said ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A1THEP1)) that this consecration consists in changing the substance of bread into the body of Christ. Now the form of a sacrament ought to denote what is done in the sacrament. Consequently the form for the consecration of the bread ought to signify the actual conversion of the bread into the body of Christ. And herein are three things to be considered: namely, the actual conversion, the term "whence," and the term "whereunto."

   Now the conversion can be considered in two ways: first, in "becoming," secondly, in "being." But the conversion ought not to be signified in this form as in "becoming," but as in "being." First, because such conversion is not successive, as was said above ([Question [75]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75OUTP1), [Article [7]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP075.html#TPQ75A7THEP1)), but instantaneous; and in such changes the "becoming" is nothing else than the "being." Secondly, because the sacramental forms bear the same relation to the signification of the sacramental effect as artificial forms to the representation of the effect of art. Now an artificial form is the likeness of the ultimate effect, on which the artist's intention is fixed ;. just as the art-form in the builder's mind is principally the form of the house constructed, and secondarily of the constructing. Accordingly, in this form also the conversion ought to be expressed as in "being," to which the intention is referred.

   And since the conversion is expressed in this form as in "being," it is necessary for the extremes of the conversion to be signified as they exist in the fact of conversion. But then the term "whereunto" has the proper nature of its own substance; whereas the term "whence" does not remain in its own substance, but only as to the accidents whereby it comes under the senses, and can be determined in relation to the senses. Hence the term "whence" of the conversion is conveniently expressed by the demonstrative pronoun, relative to the sensible accidents which continue; but the term "whereunto" is expressed by the noun signifying the nature of the thing which terminates the conversion, and this is Christ's entire body, and not merely His flesh; as was said above ([Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1), ad 2). Hence this form is most appropriate: "This is My body."

3/ Whether this is the proper form for the consecration of the wine: "This is the chalice of My blood," etc.?

  *I answer that,* There is a twofold opinion regarding this form. Some have maintained that the words "This is the chalice of My blood" alone belong to the substance of this form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood. consequently they belong to the integrity of the expression.

   And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to the words, "As often as ye shall do this," which belong to the use of this sacrament, and consequently do not belong to the substance of the form. Hence it is that the priest pronounces all these words, under the same rite and manner, namely, holding the chalice in his hands. Moreover, in Lk. 22:20, the words that follow are interposed with the preceding words: "This is the chalice, the new testament in My blood."

   Consequently it must be said that all the aforesaid words belong to the substance of the form; but that by the first words, "This is the chalice of My blood," the change of the wine into blood is denoted, as explained above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A2THEP1)) in the form for the consecration of the bread; but by the words which come after is shown the power of the blood shed in the Passion, which power works in this sacrament, and is ordained for three purposes. First and principally for securing our eternal heritage, according to Heb. 10:19: "Having confidence in the entering into the holies by the blood of Christ"; and in order to denote this, we say, "of the New and Eternal Testament." Secondly, for justifying by grace, which is by faith according to Rm. 3:25,26: "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood . . . that He Himself may be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ": and on this account we add, "The Mystery of Faith." Thirdly, for removing sins which are the impediments to both of these things, according to Heb. 9:14: "The blood of Christ . . . shall cleanse our conscience from dead works," that is, from sins; and on this account, we say, "which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins."

4/ Whether in the aforesaid words of the forms there be any created power which causes the consecration?

  *I answer that,* Some have maintained that neither in the above words is there any created power for causing the transubstantiation, nor in the other forms of the sacraments, or even in the sacraments themselves, for producing the sacramental effects. This, as was shown above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1)), is both contrary to the teachings of the saints, and detracts from the dignity of the sacraments of the New Law. Hence, since this sacrament is of greater worth than the others, as stated above ([Question [65]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP065.html#TPQ65A3THEP1)), the result is that there is in the words of the form of this sacrament a created power which causes the change to be wrought in it: instrumental, however, as in the other sacraments, as stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Articles [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A3THEP1),4). For since these words are uttered in the person of Christ, it is from His command that they receive their instrumental power from Him, just as His other deeds and sayings derive their salutary power instrumentally, as was observed above ([Question [48]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP048.html#TPQ48A6THEP1); [Question [56]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP056.html#TPQ56OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP056.html#TPQ56A1THEP1), ad 3).

5/ Whether the aforesaid expressions are true?

  *I answer that,* There have been many opinions on this point. Some have said that in this expression, "This is My body," the word "this" implies demonstration as conceived, and not as exercised, because the whole phrase is taken materially, since it is uttered by a way of narration: for the priest relates that Christ said: "This is My body."

   But such a view cannot hold good, because then these words would not be applied to the corporeal matter present, and consequently the sacrament would not be valid: for Augustine says (Tract. lxxx in Joan.): "The word is added to the element, and this becomes a sacrament." Moreover this solution ignores entirely the difficulty which this question presents: for there is still the objection in regard to the first uttering of these words by Christ; since it is evident that then they were employed, not materially, but significatively. And therefore it must be said that even when spoken by the priest they are taken significatively, and not merely materially. Nor does it matter that the priest pronounces them by way of recital, as though they were spoken by Christ, because owing to Christ's infinite power, just as through contact with His flesh the regenerative power entered not only into the waters which came into contact with Christ, but into all waters throughout the whole world and during all future ages, so likewise from Christ's uttering these words they derived their consecrating power, by whatever priest they be uttered, as if Christ present were saying them.

   And therefore others have said that in this phrase the word "this" appeals, not to the senses, but to the intellect; so that the meaning is, "This is My body"---i.e. "The thing signified by 'this' is My body." But neither can this stand, because, since in the sacraments the effect is that which is signified, from such a form it would not result that Christ's body was in very truth in this sacrament, but merely as in a sign, which is heretical, as stated above ([Question [85]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85OUTP1),[Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A1THEP1)).

   Consequently, others have said that the word "this" appeals to the senses; not at the precise instant of its being uttered, but merely at the last instant thereof; as when a man says, "Now I am silent," this adverb "now" points to the instant immediately following the speech: because the sense is: "Directly these words are spoken I am silent." But neither can this hold good, because in that case the meaning of the sentence would be: "My body is My body," which the above phrase does not effect, because this was so even before the utterance of the words: hence neither does the aforesaid sentence mean this.

   Consequently, then, it remains to be said, as stated above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A4THEP1)), that this sentence possesses the power of effecting the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ. And therefore it is compared to other sentences, which have power only of signifying and not of producing, as the concept of the practical intellect, which is productive of the thing, is compared to the concept of our speculative intellect which is drawn from things. because "words are signs of concepts," as the Philosopher says (Peri Herm. i). And therefore as the concept of the practical intellect does not presuppose the thing understood, but makes it, so the truth of this expression does not presuppose the thing signified, but makes it; for such is the relation of God's word to the things made by the Word. Now this change takes place not successively, but in an instant, as stated above ([Question [77]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77OUTP1), [Article [7]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A7THEP1)). Consequently one must understand the aforesaid expression with reference to the last instant of the words being spoken, yet not so that the subject may be understood to have stood for that which is the term of the conversion; viz. that the body of Christ is the body of Christ; nor again that the subject be understood to stand for that which it was before the conversion, namely, the bread. but for that which is commonly related to both, i.e. that which is contained in general under those species. For these words do not make the body of Christ to be the body of Christ, nor do they make the bread to be the body of Christ; but what was contained under those species, and was formerly bread, they make to be the body of Christ. And therefore expressly our Lord did not say: "This bread is My body," which would be the meaning of the second opinion; nor "This My body is My body," which would be the meaning of the third opinion: but in general: "This is My body," assigning no noun on the part of the subject, but only a pronoun, which signifies substance in common, without quality, that is, without a determinate form.

6/ Whether the form of the consecration of the bread accomplishes its effect before the form of the consecration of the wine be completed?

  *I answer that,* Some of the earlier doctors said that these two forms, namely, for consecrating the bread and the wine, await each other's action, so that the first does not produce its effect until the second be uttered.

   But this cannot stand, because, as stated above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A5THEP1), ad 3), for the truth of this phrase, "This is My body," wherein the verb is in the present tense, it is required for the thing signified to be present simultaneously in time with the signification of the expression used; otherwise, if the thing signified had to be awaited for afterwards, a verb of the future tense would be employed, and not one of the present tense, so that we should not say, "This is My body," but "This will be My body." But the signification of this speech is complete directly those words are spoken. And therefore the thing signified must be present instantaneously, and such is the effect of this sacrament; otherwise it would not be a true speech. Moreover, this opinion is against the rite of the Church, which forthwith adores the body of Christ after the words are uttered.

   Hence it must be said that the first form does not await the second in its action, but has its effect on the instant.

Q. 79 OF THE EFFECTS OF THIS SACRAMENT (EIGHT ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the effects of this sacrament, and under this head there are eight points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A1THEP1) Whether this sacrament bestows grace?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A2THEP1) Whether the attaining of glory is an effect of this sacrament?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A3THEP1) Whether the forgiveness of mortal sin is an effect of this sacrament?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A4THEP1) Whether venial sin is forgiven by this sacrament?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A5THEP1) Whether the entire punishment due for sin is forgiven by this sacrament?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A6THEP1) Whether this sacrament preserves man from future sins?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A7THEP1) Whether this sacrament benefits others besides the recipients?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A8THEP1) Of the obstacles to the effect of this sacrament.

1/ Whether grace is bestowed through this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* The effect of this sacrament ought to be considered, first of all and principally, from what is contained in this sacrament, which is Christ; Who, just as by coming into the world, He visibly bestowed the life of grace upon the world, according to Jn. 1:17: "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," so also, by coming sacramentally into man causes the life of grace, according to Jn. 6:58: "He that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me." Hence Cyril says on Lk. 22:19: "God's life-giving Word by uniting Himself with His own flesh, made it to be productive of life. For it was becoming that He should be united somehow with bodies through His sacred flesh and precious blood, which we receive in a life-giving blessing in the bread and wine."

   Secondly, it is considered on the part of what is represented by this sacrament, which is Christ's Passion, as stated above ([Question [74]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP074.html#TPQ74A1THEP1); [Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A2THEP1), ad 1). And therefore this sacrament works in man the effect which Christ's Passion wrought in the world. Hence, Chrysostom says on the words, "Immediately there came out blood and water" ([Jn. 19:34](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++19:34)): "Since the sacred mysteries derive their origin from thence, when you draw nigh to the awe-inspiring chalice, so approach as if you were going to drink from Christ's own side." Hence our Lord Himself says ([Mt. 26:28](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++26:28)): "This is My blood . . . which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins."

   Thirdly, the effect of this sacrament is considered from the way in which this sacrament is given; for it is given by way of food and drink. And therefore this sacrament does for the spiritual life all that material food does for the bodily life, namely, by sustaining, giving increase, restoring, and giving delight. Accordingly, Ambrose says (De Sacram. v): "This is the bread of everlasting life, which supports the substance of our soul." And Chrysostom says (Hom. xlvi in Joan.): "When we desire it, He lets us feel Him, and eat Him, and embrace Him." And hence our Lord says ([Jn. 6:56](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++6:56)): "My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed."

   Fourthly, the effect of this sacrament is considered from the species under which it is given. Hence Augustine says (Tract. xxvi in Joan.): "Our Lord betokened His body and blood in things which out of many units are made into some one whole: for out of many grains is one thing made," viz. bread; "and many grapes flow into one thing," viz. wine. And therefore he observes elsewhere (Tract. xxvi in Joan.): "O sacrament of piety, O sign of unity, O bond of charity!"

   And since Christ and His Passion are the cause of grace. and since spiritual refreshment, and charity cannot be without grace, it is clear from all that has been set forth that this sacrament bestows grace.

2/ Whether the attaining of glory is an effect of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* In this sacrament we may consider both that from which it derives its effect, namely, Christ contained in it, as also His Passion represented by it; and that through which it works its effect, namely, the use of the sacrament, and its species.

   Now as to both of these it belongs to this sacrament to cause the attaining of eternal life. Because it was by His Passion that Christ opened to us the approach to eternal life, according to Heb. 9:15: "He is the Mediator of the New Testament; that by means of His death . . . they that are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Accordingly in the form of this sacrament it is said: "This is the chalice of My blood, of the New and Eternal Testament."

   In like manner the refreshment of spiritual food and the unity denoted by the species of the bread and wine are to be had in the present life, although imperfectly. but perfectly in the state of glory. Hence Augustine says on the words, "My flesh is meat indeed" ([Jn. 6:56](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Jn++6:56)): "Seeing that in meat and drink, men aim at this, that they hunger not nor thirst, this verily nought doth afford save only this meat and drink which maketh them who partake thereof to be immortal and incorruptible, in the fellowship of the saints, where shall be peace, and unity, full and perfect."

3/ Whether the forgiveness of mortal sin is an effect of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* The power of this sacrament can be considered in two ways. First of all, in itself: and thus this sacrament has from Christ's Passion the power of forgiving all sins, since the Passion is the fount and cause of the forgiveness of sins.

   Secondly, it can be considered in comparison with the recipient of the sacrament, in so far as there is, or is not, found in him an obstacle to receiving the fruit of this sacrament. Now whoever is conscious of mortal sin, has within him an obstacle to receiving the effect of this sacrament; since he is not a proper recipient of this sacrament, both because he is not alive spiritually, and so he ought not to eat the spiritual nourishment, since nourishment is confined to the living; and because he cannot be united with Christ, which is the effect of this sacrament, as long as he retains an attachment towards mortal sin. Consequently, as is said in the book De Eccles. Dogm.: "If the soul leans towards sin, it is burdened rather than purified from partaking of the Eucharist." Hence, in him who is conscious of mortal sin, this sacrament does not cause the forgiveness of sin.

   Nevertheless this sacrament can effect the forgiveness of sin in two ways. First of all, by being received, not actually, but in desire; as when a man is first justified from sin. Secondly, when received by one in mortal sin of which he is not conscious, and for which he has no attachment; since possibly he was not sufficiently contrite at first, but by approaching this sacrament devoutly and reverently he obtains the grace of charity, which will perfect his contrition and bring forgiveness of sin.

4/ Whether venial sins are forgiven through this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Two things may be considered in this sacrament, to wit, the sacrament itself, and the reality of the sacrament: and it appears from both that this sacrament has the power of forgiving venial sins. For this sacrament is received under the form of nourishing food. Now nourishment from food is requisite for the body to make good the daily waste caused by the action of natural heat. But something is also lost daily of our spirituality from the heat of concupiscence through venial sins, which lessen the fervor of charity, as was shown in the SS, Question [24], Article [10]. And therefore it belongs to this sacrament to forgive venial sins. Hence Ambrose says (De Sacram. v) that this daily bread is taken "as a remedy against daily infirmity."

   The reality of this sacrament is charity, not only as to its habit, but also as to its act, which is kindled in this sacrament; and by this means venial sins are forgiven. Consequently, it is manifest that venial sins are forgiven by the power of this sacrament.

5/ Whether the entire punishment due to sin is forgiven through this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* This sacrament is both a sacrifice and a sacrament. it has the nature of a sacrifice inasmuch as it is offered up; and it has the nature of a sacrament inasmuch as it is received. And therefore it has the effect of a sacrament in the recipient, and the effect of a sacrifice in the offerer, or in them for whom it is offered.

   If, then, it be considered as a sacrament, it produces its effect in two ways: first of all directly through the power of the sacrament; secondly as by a kind of concomitance, as was said above regarding what is contained in the sacrament ([Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A1THEP1),2). Through the power of the sacrament it produces directly that effect for which it was instituted. Now it was instituted not for satisfaction, but for nourishing spiritually through union between Christ and His members, as nourishment is united with the person nourished. But because this union is the effect of charity, from the fervor of which man obtains forgiveness, not only of guilt but also of punishment, hence it is that as a consequence, and by concomitance with the chief effect, man obtains forgiveness of the punishment, not indeed of the entire punishment, but according to the measure of his devotion and fervor.

   But in so far as it is a sacrifice, it has a satisfactory power. Yet in satisfaction, the affection of the offerer is weighed rather than the quantity of the offering. Hence our Lord says (Mk. 12:43: cf. Lk. 21:4) of the widow who offered "two mites" that she "cast in more than all." Therefore, although this offering suffices of its own quantity to satisfy for all punishment, yet it becomes satisfactory for them for whom it is offered, or even for the offerers, according to the measure of their devotion, and not for the whole punishment.

6/ Whether man is preserved by this sacrament from future sins?

  *I answer that,* Sin is the spiritual death of the soul. Hence man is preserved from future sin in the same way as the body is preserved from future death of the body: and this happens in two ways. First of all, in so far as man's nature is strengthened inwardly against inner decay, and so by means of food and medicine he is preserved from death. Secondly, by being guarded against outward assaults; and thus he is protected by means of arms by which he defends his body.

   Now this sacrament preserves man from sin in both of these ways. For, first of all, by uniting man with Christ through grace, it strengthens his spiritual life, as spiritual food and spiritual medicine, according to Ps. 103:5: "(That) bread strengthens [Vulg.: 'may strengthen'] man's heart." Augustine likewise says (Tract. xxvi in Joan.): "Approach without fear; it is bread, not poison." Secondly, inasmuch as it is a sign of Christ's Passion, whereby the devils are conquered, it repels all the assaults of demons. Hence Chrysostom says (Hom. xlvi in Joan.): "Like lions breathing forth fire, thus do we depart from that table, being made terrible to the devil."

7/ Whether this sacrament benefit others besides the recipients?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A3THEP1)), this sacrament is not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice. For, it has the nature of a sacrifice inasmuch as in this sacrament Christ's Passion is represented, whereby Christ "offered Himself a Victim to God" ([Eph. 5:2](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Eph++5:2)), and it has the nature of a sacrament inasmuch as invisible grace is bestowed in this sacrament under a visible species. So, then, this sacrament benefits recipients by way both of sacrament and of sacrifice, because it is offered for all who partake of it. For it is said in the Canon of the Mass: "May as many of us as, by participation at this Altar, shall receive the most sacred body and blood of Thy Son, be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace."

   But to others who do not receive it, it is beneficial by way of sacrifice, inasmuch as it is offered for their salvation. Hence it is said in the Canon of the Mass: "Be mindful, O Lord, of Thy servants, men and women . . . for whom we offer, or who offer up to Thee, this sacrifice of praise for themselves and for all their own, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their safety and salvation." And our Lord expressed both ways, saying ([Mt. 26:28, with Lk. 22:20](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++26:28,+with+Lk++22:20)): "Which for you," i.e. who receive it, "and for many," i.e. others, "shall be shed unto remission of sins."

8/ Whether the effect of this sacrament is hindered by venial sin?

  *I answer that,* Venial sins can be taken in two ways: first of all as past, secondly as in the act of being committed. Venial sins taken in the first way do not in any way hinder the effect of this sacrament. For it can come to pass that after many venial sins a man may approach devoutly to this sacrament and fully secure its effect. Considered in the second way venial sins do not utterly hinder the effect of this sacrament, but merely in part. For, it has been stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A1THEP1)), that the effect of this sacrament is not only the obtaining of habitual grace or charity, but also a certain actual refreshment of spiritual sweetness: which is indeed hindered if anyone approach to this sacrament with mind distracted through venial sins; but the increase of habitual grace or of charity is not taken away.

Q. 80 OF THE USE OR RECEIVING OF THIS SACRAMENT IN GENERAL (TWELVE ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the use or receiving of this sacrament, first of all in general; secondly, how Christ used this sacrament.

   Under the first heading there are twelve points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A1THEP1) Whether there are two ways of eating this sacrament, namely, sacramentally and spiritually?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A2THEP1) Whether it belongs to man alone to eat this sacrament spiritually?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A3THEP1) Whether it belongs to the just man only to eat it sacramentally?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A4THEP1) Whether the sinner sins in eating it sacramentally?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A5THEP1) Of the degree of this sin;

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A6THEP1) Whether this sacrament should be refused to the sinner that approaches it?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A7THEP1) Whether nocturnal pollution prevents man from receiving this sacrament?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A8THEP1) Whether it is to be received only when one is fasting?

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A9THEP1) Whether it is to be given to them who lack the use of reason?

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A10THEP1) Whether it is to be received daily?

    [(11)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A11THEP1) Whether it is lawful to refrain from it altogether?

    [(12)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A12THEP1) Whether it is lawful to receive the body without the blood?

1/ Whether there are two ways to be distinguished of eating Christ's body?

  *I answer that,* There are two things to be considered in the receiving of this sacrament, namely, the sacrament itself, and its fruits, and we have already spoken of both ([Questions [73]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73OUTP1),79). The perfect way, then, of receiving this sacrament is when one takes it so as to partake of its effect. Now, as was stated above ([Question [79]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79OUTP1), [Articles [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A3THEP1),8), it sometimes happens that a man is hindered from receiving the effect of this sacrament; and such receiving of this sacrament is an imperfect one. Therefore, as the perfect is divided against the imperfect, so sacramental eating, whereby the sacrament only is received without its effect, is divided against spiritual eating, by which one receives the effect of this sacrament, whereby a man is spiritually united with Christ through faith and charity.

2/ Whether it belongs to man alone to eat this sacrament spiritually?

  *I answer that,* Christ Himself is contained in this sacrament, not under His proper species, but under the sacramental species. Consequently there are two ways of eating spiritually. First, as Christ Himself exists under His proper species, and in this way the angels eat Christ spiritually inasmuch as they are united with Him in the enjoyment of perfect charity, and in clear vision (and this is the bread we hope for in heaven), and not by faith, as we are united with Him here.

   In another way one may eat Christ spiritually, as He is under the sacramental species, inasmuch as a man believes in Christ, while desiring to receive this sacrament; and this is not merely to eat Christ spiritually, but likewise to eat this sacrament; which does not fall to the lot of the angels. And therefore although the angels feed on Christ spiritually, yet it does not belong to them to eat this sacrament spiritually.

3/ Whether the just man alone may eat Christ sacramentally?

  *I answer that,* In the past, some have erred upon this point, saying that Christ's body is not received sacramentally by sinners; but that directly the body is touched by the lips of sinners, it ceases to be under the sacramental species.

   But this is erroneous; because it detracts from the truth of this sacrament, to which truth it belongs that so long as the species last, Christ's body does not cease to be under them, as stated above ([Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A6THEP1), ad 3;[Question [77]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77OUTP1), [Article [8]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A8THEP1)). But the species last so long as the substance of the bread would remain, if it were there, as was stated above ([Question [77]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77OUTP1), [Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP077.html#TPQ77A4THEP1)). Now it is clear that the substance of bread taken by a sinner does not at once cease to be, but it continues until digested by natural heat: hence Christ's body remains just as long under the sacramental species when taken by sinners. Hence it must be said that the sinner, and not merely the just, can eat Christ's body.

4/ Whether the sinner sins in receiving Christ's body sacramentally?

  *I answer that,* In this sacrament, as in the others, that which is a sacrament is a sign of the reality of the sacrament. Now there is a twofold reality of this sacrament, as stated above ([Question [73]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A6THEP1)): one which is signified and contained, namely, Christ Himself; while the other is signified but not contained, namely, Christ's mystical body, which is the fellowship of the saints. Therefore, whoever receives this sacrament, expresses thereby that he is made one with Christ, and incorporated in His members; and this is done by living faith, which no one has who is in mortal sin. And therefore it is manifest that whoever receives this sacrament while in mortal sin, is guilty of lying to this sacrament, and consequently of sacrilege, because he profanes the sacrament: and therefore he sins mortally.

5/ Whether to approach this sacrament with consciousness of sin is the gravest of all sins?

  *I answer that,* As stated in the FS, Question [73], Articles [3],6; SS, Question [73], Article [3], one sin can be said to be graver than another in two ways: first of all essentially, secondly accidentally. Essentially, in regard to its species, which is taken from its object: and so a sin is greater according as that against which it is committed is greater. And since Christ's Godhead is greater than His humanity, and His humanity greater than the sacraments of His humanity, hence it is that those are the gravest sins which are committed against the Godhead, such as unbelief and blasphemy. The second degree of gravity is held by those sins which are committed against His humanity: hence it is written ([Mt. 12:32](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++12:32)): "Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come." In the third place come sins committed against the sacraments, which belong to Christ's humanity; and after these are the other sins committed against mere creatures.

   Accidentally, one sin can be graver than another on the sinner's part. for example, the sin which is the result of ignorance or of weakness is lighter than one arising from contempt, or from sure knowledge; and the same reason holds good of other circumstances. And according to this, the above sin can be graver in some, as happens in them who from actual contempt and with consciousness of sin approach this sacrament: but in others it is less grave; for instance, in those who from fear of their sin being discovered, approach this sacrament with consciousness of sin.

   So, then, it is evident that this sin is specifically graver than many others, yet it is not the greatest of all.

6/ Whether the priest ought to deny the body of Christ to the sinner seeking it?

  *I answer that,* A distinction must be made among sinners: some are secret; others are notorious, either from evidence of the fact, as public usurers, or public robbers, or from being denounced as evil men by some ecclesiastical or civil tribunal. Therefore Holy Communion ought not to be given to open sinners when they ask for it. Hence Cyprian writes to someone (Ep. lxi): "You were so kind as to consider that I ought to be consulted regarding actors, end that magician who continues to practice his disgraceful arts among you; as to whether I thought that Holy Communion ought to be given to such with the other Christians. I think that it is beseeming neither the Divine majesty, nor Christian discipline, for the Church's modesty and honor to be defiled by such shameful and infamous contagion."

   But if they be not open sinners, but occult, the Holy Communion should not be denied them if they ask for it. For since every Christian, from the fact that he is baptized, is admitted to the Lord's table, he may not be robbed of his right, except from some open cause. Hence on 1 Cor. 5:11, "If he who is called a brother among you," etc., Augustine's gloss remarks: "We cannot inhibit any person from Communion, except he has openly confessed, or has been named and convicted by some ecclesiastical or lay tribunal." Nevertheless a priest who has knowledge of the crime can privately warn the secret sinner, or warn all openly in public, from approaching the Lord's table, until they have repented of their sins and have been reconciled to the Church; because after repentance and reconciliation, Communion must not be refused even to public sinners, especially in the hour of death. Hence in the (3rd) Council of Carthage (Can. xxxv) we read: "Reconciliation is not to be denied to stage-players or actors, or others of the sort, or to apostates, after their conversion to God."

7/ Whether the seminal loss that occurs during sleep hinders anyone from receiving this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* There are two things to be weighed regarding the aforesaid movements: one on account of which they necessarily prevent a man from receiving this sacrament; the other, on account of which they do so, not of necessity, but from a sense of propriety.

   Mortal sin alone necessarily prevents anyone from partaking of this sacrament: and although these movements during sleep, considered in themselves, cannot be a mortal sin, nevertheless, owing to their cause, they have mortal sin connected with them; which cause, therefore, must be investigated. Sometimes they are due to an external spiritual cause, viz. the deception of the demons, who can stir up phantasms, as was stated in the FP, Question [111], Article [3], through the apparition of which, these movements occasionally follow. Sometimes they are due to an internal spiritual cause, such as previous thoughts. At other times they arise from some internal corporeal cause, as from abundance or weakness of nature, or even from surfeit of meat or drink. Now every one of these three causes can be without sin at all, or else with venial sin, or with mortal sin. If it be without sin, or with venial sin, it does not necessarily prevent the receiving of this sacrament, so as to make a man guilty of the body and blood of the Lord: but should it be with mortal sin, it prevents it of necessity.

   For such illusions on the part of demons sometimes come from one's not striving to receive fervently; and this can be either a mortal or a venial sin. At other times it is due to malice alone on the part of the demons who wish to keep men from receiving this sacrament. So we read in the Conferences of the Fathers (Cassian, Collat. xxii) that when a certain one always suffered thus on those feast-days on which he had to receive Communion, his superiors, discovering that there was no fault on his part, ruled that he was not to refrain from communicating on that account, and the demoniacal illusion ceased.

   In like fashion previous evil thoughts can sometimes be without any sin whatever, as when one has to think of such things on account of lecturing or debating; and if it be done without concupiscence and delectation, the thoughts will not be unclean but honest; and yet defilement can come of such thoughts, as is clear from the authority of Augustine (Objection [1]). At other times such thoughts come of concupiscence and delectation, and should there be consent, it will be a mortal sin: otherwise it will be a venial sin.

   In the same way too the corporeal cause can be without sin, as when it arises from bodily debility, and hence some individuals suffer seminal loss without sin even in their wakeful hours; or it can come from the abundance of nature: for, just as blood can flow without sin, so also can the semen which is superfluity of the blood, according to the Philosopher (De Gener. Animal. i). But occasionally it is with sin, as when it is due to excess of food or drink. And this also can be either venial or mortal sin; although more frequently the sin is mortal in the case of evil thoughts on account of the proneness to consent, rather than in the case of consumption of food and drink. Hence Gregory, writing to Augustine, Bishop of the English (Regist. xi), says that one ought to refrain from Communion when this arises from evil thoughts, but not when it arises from excess of food or drink, especially if necessity call for Communion. So, then, one must judge from its cause whether such bodily defilement of necessity hinders the receiving of this sacrament.

   At the same time a sense of decency forbids Communion on two accounts. The first of these is always verified, viz. the bodily defilement, with which, out of reverence for the sacrament, it is unbecoming to approach the altar (and hence those who wish to touch any sacred object, wash their hands): except perchance such uncleanness be perpetual or of long standing, such as leprosy or issue of blood, or anything else of the kind. The other reason is the mental distraction which follows after the aforesaid movements, especially when they take place with unclean imaginings. Now this obstacle, which arises from a sense of decency, can be set aside owing to any necessity, as Gregory says (Regist. xi): "As when perchance either a festival day calls for it, or necessity compels one to exercise the ministry because there is no other priest at hand."

8/ Whether food or drink taken beforehand hinders the receiving of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* A thing may prevent the receiving of this sacrament in two ways: first of all in itself, like mortal sin, which is repugnant to what is signified by this sacrament, as stated above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A4THEP1)): secondly, on account of the Church's prohibition; and thus a man is prevented from taking this sacrament after receiving food or drink, for three reasons. First, as Augustine says (Resp. ad Januar., Ep. liv), "out of respect for this sacrament," so that it may enter into a mouth not yet contaminated by any food or drink. Secondly, because of its signification. i.e. to give us to understand that Christ, Who is the reality of this sacrament, and His charity, ought to be first of all established in our hearts, according to Mt. 6:33: "Seek first the kingdom of God." Thirdly, on account of the danger of vomiting and intemperance, which sometimes arise from over-indulging in food, as the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 11:21](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++11:21)): "One, indeed, is hungry, and another is drunk."

   Nevertheless the sick are exempted from this general rule, for they should be given Communion at once, even after food, should there be any doubt as to their danger, lest they die without Communion, because necessity has no law. Hence it is said in the Canon de Consecratione: "Let the priest at once take Communion to the sick person, lest he die without Communion."

9/ Whether those who have not the use of reason ought to receive this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Men are said to be devoid of reason in two ways. First, when they are feeble-minded, as a man who sees dimly is said not to see: and since such persons can conceive some devotion towards this sacrament, it is not to be denied them.

   In another way men are said not to possess fully the use of reason. Either, then, they never had the use of reason, and have remained so from birth; and in that case this sacrament is not to be given to them, because in no way has there been any preceding devotion towards the sacrament: or else, they were not always devoid of reason, and then, if when they formerly had their wits they showed devotion towards this sacrament, it ought to be given to them in the hour of death; unless danger be feared of vomiting or spitting it out. Hence we read in the acts of the Fourth Council of Carthage (Canon 76). and the same is to be found in the Decretals (xxvi, 6): "If a sick man ask to receive the sacrament of Penance; and if, when the priest who has been sent for comes to him, he be so weak as to be unable to speak, or becomes delirious, let them, who heard him ask, bear witness, and let him receive the sacrament of Penance. then if it be thought that he is going to die shortly, let him be reconciled by imposition of hands, and let the Eucharist be placed in his mouth."

10/ Whether it is lawful to receive this sacrament daily?

  *I answer that,* There are two things to be considered regarding the use of this sacrament. The first is on the part of the sacrament itself, the virtue of which gives health to men; and consequently it is profitable to receive it daily so as to receive its fruits daily. Hence Ambrose says (De Sacram. iv): "If, whenever Christ's blood is shed, it is shed for the forgiveness of sins, I who sin often, should receive it often: I need a frequent remedy." The second thing to be considered is on the part of the recipient, who is required to approach this sacrament with great reverence and devotion. Consequently, if anyone finds that he has these dispositions every day, he will do well to receive it daily. Hence, Augustine after saying, "Receive daily, that it may profit thee daily," adds: "So live, as to deserve to receive it daily." But because many persons are lacking in this devotion, on account of the many drawbacks both spiritual and corporal from which they suffer, it is not expedient for all to approach this sacrament every day; but they should do so as often as they find themselves properly disposed. Hence it is said in De Eccles. Dogmat. liii: "I neither praise nor blame daily reception of the Eucharist."

11/ Whether it is lawful to abstain altogether from communion?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A1THEP1)), there are two ways of receiving this sacrament namely, spiritually and sacramentally. Now it is clear that all are bound to eat it at least spiritually, because this is to be incorporated in Christ, as was said above ([Question [73]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A3THEP1), ad 1). Now spiritual eating comprises the desire or yearning for receiving this sacrament, as was said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A1THEP1), ad 3, [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP080.html#TPQ80A1A2THEP1)). Therefore, a man cannot be saved without desiring to receive this sacrament.

   Now a desire would be vain except it were fulfilled when opportunity presented itself. Consequently, it is evident that a man is bound to receive this sacrament, not only by virtue of the Church's precept, but also by virtue of the Lord's command ([Lk. 22:19](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++22:19)): "Do this in memory of Me." But by the precept of the Church there are fixed times for fulfilling Christ's command.

12/ Whether it is lawful to receive the body of Christ without the blood?

  *I answer that,* Two points should be observed regarding the use of this sacrament, one on the part of the sacrament, the other on the part of the recipients; on the part of the sacrament it is proper for both the body and the blood to be received, since the perfection of the sacrament lies in both, and consequently, since it is the priest's duty both to consecrate and finish the sacrament, he ought on no account to receive Christ's body without the blood.

   But on the part of the recipient the greatest reverence and caution are called for, lest anything happen which is unworthy of so great a mystery. Now this could especially happen in receiving the blood, for, if incautiously handled, it might easily be spilt. And because the multitude of the Christian people increased, in which there are old, young, and children, some of whom have not enough discretion to observe due caution in using this sacrament, on that account it is a prudent custom in some churches for the blood not to be offered to the reception of the people, but to be received by the priest alone.

Q. 81 OF THE USE WHICH CHRIST MADE OF THIS SACRAMENT AT ITS INSTITUTION (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the use which Christ made of this sacrament at its institution; under which heading there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP081.html#TPQ81A1THEP1) Whether Christ received His own body and blood?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP081.html#TPQ81A2THEP1) Whether He gave it to Judas?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP081.html#TPQ81A3THEP1) What kind of body did He receive or give, namely, was it passible or impassible?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP081.html#TPQ81A4THEP1) What would have been the condition of Christ's body under this sacrament, if it had been reserved or consecrated during the three days He lay dead?

1/ Whether Christ received His own body and blood?

  *I answer that,* Some have said that Christ during the supper gave His body and blood to His disciples, but did not partake of it Himself. But this seems improbable. Because Christ Himself was the first to fulfill what He required others to observe: hence He willed first to be baptized when imposing Baptism upon others: as we read in Acts 1:1: "Jesus began to do and to teach." Hence He first of all took His own body and blood, and afterwards gave it to be taken by the disciples. And hence the gloss upon Ruth 3:7, "When he had eaten and drunk, says: Christ ate and drank at the supper, when He gave to the disciples the sacrament of His body and blood. Hence, 'because the children partook [\*Vulg.: 'are partakers' ([Heb. 2:14](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Heb++2:14))] of His flesh and blood, He also hath been partaker in the same.'"

2/ Whether Christ gave His body to Judas?

  *I answer that,* Hilary, in commenting on Mt. 26:17, held that Christ did not give His body and blood to Judas. And this would have been quite proper, if the malice of Judas be considered. But since Christ was to serve us as a pattern of justice, it was not in keeping with His teaching authority to sever Judas, a hidden sinner, from Communion with the others without an accuser and evident proof. lest the Church's prelates might have an example for doing the like, and lest Judas himself being exasperated might take occasion of sinning. Therefore, it remains to be said that Judas received our Lord's body and blood with the other disciples, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii), and Augustine (Tract. lxii in Joan.).

3/ Whether Christ received and gave to the disciples His impassible body?

  *I answer that,* Hugh of Saint Victor (Innocent III, De Sacr. Alt. Myst. iv), maintained, that before the Passion, Christ assumed at various times the four properties of a glorified body ---namely, subtlety in His birth, when He came forth from the closed womb of the Virgin; agility, when He walked dryshod upon the sea; clarity, in the Transfiguration; and impassibility at the Last Supper, when He gave His body to the disciples to be eaten. And according to this He gave His body in an impassible and immortal condition to His disciples.

   But whatever may be the case touching the other qualities, concerning which we have already stated what should be held ([Question [28]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP028.html#TPQ28OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP028.html#TPQ28A2THEP1), ad 3; [Question [45]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP045.html#TPQ45OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP045.html#TPQ45A2THEP1)), nevertheless the above opinion regarding impassibility is inadmissible. For it is manifest that the same body of Christ which was then seen by the disciples in its own species, was received by them under the sacramental species. But as seen in its own species it was not impassible; nay more, it was ready for the Passion. Therefore, neither was Christ's body impassible when given under the sacramental species.

   Yet there was present in the sacrament, in an impassible manner, that which was passible of itself; just as that was there invisibly which of itself was visible. For as sight requires that the body seen be in contact with the adjacent medium of sight, so does passion require contact of the suffering body with the active agents. But Christ's body, according as it is under the sacrament, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP081.html#TPQ81A1THEP1), ad 2; [Question [76]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP076.html#TPQ76A5THEP1)), is not compared with its surroundings through the intermediary of its own dimensions, whereby bodies touch each other, but through the dimensions of the bread and wine; consequently, it is those species which are acted upon and are seen, but not Christ's own body.

4/ Whether, if this sacrament had been reserved in a pyx, or consecrated at the moment of Christ's death by one of the apostles, Christ Himself would have died there?

  *I answer that,* Christ's body is substantially the same in this sacrament, as in its proper species, but not after the same fashion; because in its proper species it comes in contact with surrounding bodies by its own dimensions: but it does not do so as it is in this sacrament, as stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP081.html#TPQ81A3THEP1)). And therefore, all that belongs to Christ, as He is in Himself, can be attributed to Him both in His proper species, and as He exists in the sacrament; such as to live, to die, to grieve, to be animate or inanimate, and the like; while all that belongs to Him in relation to outward bodies, can be attributed to Him as He exists in His proper species, but not as He is in this sacrament; such as to be mocked, to be spat upon, to be crucified, to be scourged, and the rest. Hence some have composed this verse:

   "Our Lord can grieve beneath the sacramental veils But cannot feel the piercing of the thorns and nails."

Q. 82 OF THE MINISTER OF THIS SACRAMENT (TEN ARTICLES)

   We now proceed to consider the minister of this sacrament: under which head there are ten points for our inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A1THEP1) Whether it belongs to a priest alone to consecrate this sacrament?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A2THEP1) Whether several priests can at the same time consecrate the same host?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A3THEP1) Whether it belongs to the priest alone to dispense this sacrament?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A4THEP1) Whether it is lawful for the priest consecrating to refrain from communicating?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A5THEP1) Whether a priest in sin can perform this sacrament?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A6THEP1) Whether the Mass of a wicked priest is of less value than that of a good one?

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A7THEP1) Whether those who are heretics, schismatics, or excommunicated, can perform this sacrament?

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A8THEP1) Whether degraded priests can do so?

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A9THEP1) Whether communicants receiving at their hands are guilty of sinning?

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A10THEP1) Whether a priest may lawfully refrain altogether from celebrating? [\*This is the order observed by St. Thomas in writing the Articles; but in writing this prologue, he placed Article 10 immediately after Article 4 (Cf. Leonine edition).]

1/ Whether the consecration of this sacrament belongs to a priest alone?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [78]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78OUTP1), [Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A1THEP1),4), such is the dignity of this sacrament that it is performed only as in the person of Christ. Now whoever performs any act in another's stead, must do so by the power bestowed by such a one. But as the power of receiving this sacrament is conceded by Christ to the baptized person, so likewise the power of consecrating this sacrament on Christ's behalf is bestowed upon the priest at his ordination: for thereby he is put upon a level with them to whom the Lord said ([Lk. 22:19](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++22:19)): "Do this for a commemoration of Me." Therefore, it must be said that it belongs to priests to accomplish this sacrament.

2/ Whether several priests can consecrate one and the same host?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A1THEP1)), when a priest is ordained he is placed on a level with those who received consecrating power from our Lord at the Supper. And therefore, according to the custom of some Churches, as the apostles supped when Christ supped, so the newly ordained co-celebrate with the ordaining bishop. Nor is the consecration, on that account, repeated over the same host, because as Innocent III says (De Sacr. Alt. Myst. iv), the intention of all should be directed to the same instant of the consecration.

3/ Whether dispensing of this sacrament belongs to a priest alone?

  *I answer that,* The dispensing of Christ's body belongs to the priest for three reasons. First, because, as was said above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A1THEP1)), he consecrates as in the person of Christ. But as Christ consecrated His body at the supper, so also He gave it to others to be partaken of by them. Accordingly, as the consecration of Christ's body belongs to the priest, so likewise does the dispensing belong to him. Secondly, because the priest is the appointed intermediary between God and the people; hence as it belongs to him to offer the people's gifts to God, so it belongs to him to deliver consecrated gifts to the people. Thirdly, because out of reverence towards this sacrament, nothing touches it, but what is consecrated; hence the corporal and the chalice are consecrated, and likewise the priest's hands, for touching this sacrament. Hence it is not lawful for anyone else to touch it except from necessity, for instance, if it were to fall upon the ground, or else in some other case of urgency.

4/ Whether the priest who consecrates is bound to receive this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [79]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79OUTP1), [Articles [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A5THEP1),7), the Eucharist is not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice. Now whoever offers sacrifice must be a sharer in the sacrifice, because the outward sacrifice he offers is a sign of the inner sacrifice whereby he offers himself to God, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x). Hence by partaking of the sacrifice he shows that the inner one is likewise his. In the same way also, by dispensing the sacrifice to the people he shows that he is the dispenser of Divine gifts, of which he ought himself to be the first to partake, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii). Consequently, he ought to receive before dispensing it to the people. Accordingly we read in the chapter mentioned above (Twelfth Council of Toledo, Can. v): "What kind of sacrifice is that wherein not even the sacrificer is known to have a share?" But it is by partaking of the sacrifice that he has a share in it, as the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 10:18](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++10:18)): "Are not they that eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?" Therefore it is necessary for the priest, as often as he consecrates, to receive this sacrament in its integrity.

5/ Whether a wicked priest can consecrate the Eucharist?

  *I answer that,* As was said above ([Articles [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A1THEP1),3), the priest consecrates this sacrament not by his own power, but as the minister of Christ, in Whose person he consecrates this sacrament. But from the fact of being wicked he does not cease to be Christ's minister; because our Lord has good and wicked ministers or servants. Hence ([Mt. 24:45](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++24:45)) our Lord says: "Who, thinkest thou, is a faithful and wise servant?" and afterwards He adds: "But if that evil servant shall say in his heart," etc. And the Apostle ([1 Cor. 4:1](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Cor++4:1)) says: "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ"; and afterwards he adds: "I am not conscious to myself of anything; yet am I not hereby justified." He was therefore certain that he was Christ's minister; yet he was not certain that he was a just man. Consequently, a man can be Christ's minister even though he be not one of the just. And this belongs to Christ's excellence, Whom, as the true God, things both good and evil serve, since they are ordained by His providence for His glory. Hence it is evident that priests, even though they be not godly, but sinners, can consecrate the Eucharist.

6/ Whether the mass of a sinful priest is of less worth than the mass of a good priest?

  *I answer that,* There are two things to be considered in the mass. namely, the sacrament itself, which is the chief thing; and the prayers which are offered up in the mass for the quick and the dead. So far as the mass itself is concerned, the mass of a wicked priest is not of less value than that of a good priest, because the same sacrifice is offered by both.

   Again, the prayer put up in the mass can be considered in two respects: first of all, in so far as it has its efficacy from the devotion of the priest interceding, and in this respect there is no doubt but that the mass of the better priest is the more fruitful. In another respect, inasmuch as the prayer is said by the priest in the mass in the place of the entire Church, of which the priest is the minister; and this ministry remains even in sinful men, as was said above ([Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A5THEP1)) in regard to Christ's ministry. Hence, in this respect the prayer even of the sinful priest is fruitful, not only that which he utters in the mass, but likewise all those he recites in the ecclesiastical offices, wherein he takes the place of the Church. on the other hand, his private prayers are not fruitful, according to Prov. 28:9: "He that turneth away his ears from hearing the law, his prayer shall be an abomination."

7/ Whether heretics, schismatics, and excommunicated persons can consecrate?

  *I answer that,* Some have contended that heretics, schismatics, and the excommunicate, who are outside the pale of the Church, cannot perform this sacrament. But herein they are deceived, because, as Augustine says (Contra Parmen. ii), "it is one thing to lack something utterly, and another to have it improperly"; and in like fashion, "it is one thing not to bestow, and quite another to bestow, but not rightly." Accordingly, such as, being within the Church, received the power of consecrating the Eucharist through being ordained to the priesthood, have such power rightly indeed; but they use it improperly if afterwards they be separated from the Church by heresy, schism, or excommunication. But such as are ordained while separated from the Church, have neither the power rightly, nor do they use it rightly. But that in both cases they have the power, is clear from what Augustine says (Contra Parmen. ii), that when they return to the unity of the Church, they are not re-ordained, but are received in their orders. And since the consecration of the Eucharist is an act which follows the power of order, such persons as are separated from the Church by heresy, schism, or excommunication, can indeed consecrate the Eucharist, which on being consecrated by them contains Christ's true body and blood; but they act wrongly, and sin by doing so; and in consequence they do not receive the fruit of the sacrifice, which is a spiritual sacrifice.

8/ Whether a degraded priest can consecrate this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* The power of consecrating the Eucharist belongs to the character of the priestly order. But every character is indelible, because it is given with a kind of consecration, as was said above ([Question [63]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63OUTP1), [Article [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP063.html#TPQ63A5THEP1)), just as the consecrations of all other things are perpetual, and cannot be lost or repeated. Hence it is clear that the power of consecrating is not lost by degradation. For, again, Augustine says (Contra Parmen. ii): "Both are sacraments," namely Baptism and order, "and both are given to a man with a kind of consecration; the former, when he is baptized; the latter when he is ordained; and therefore it is not lawful for Catholics to repeat either of them." And thus it is evident that the degraded priest can perform this sacrament.

9/ Whether it is permissible to receive communion from heretical, excommunicate, or sinful priests, and to hear mass said by them?

  *I answer that,* As was said above ([Articles [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A5THEP1),7), heretical, schismatical, excommunicate, or even sinful priests, although they have the power to consecrate the Eucharist, yet they do not make a proper use of it; on the contrary, they sin by using it. But whoever communicates with another who is in sin, becomes a sharer in his sin. Hence we read in John's Second Canonical Epistle (11) that "He that saith unto him, God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works." Consequently, it is not lawful to receive Communion from them, or to assist at their mass.

   Still there is a difference among the above, because heretics, schismatics, and excommunicates, have been forbidden, by the Church's sentence, to perform the Eucharistic rite. And therefore whoever hears their mass or receives the sacraments from them, commits sin. But not all who are sinners are debarred by the Church's sentence from using this power: and so, although suspended by the Divine sentence, yet they are not suspended in regard to others by any ecclesiastical sentence: consequently, until the Church's sentence is pronounced, it is lawful to receive Communion at their hands, and to hear their mass. Hence on 1 Cor. 5:11, "with such a one not so much as to eat," Augustine's gloss runs thus: "In saying this he was unwilling for a man to be judged by his fellow man on arbitrary suspicion, or even by usurped extraordinary judgment, but rather by God's law, according to the Church's ordering, whether he confess of his own accord, or whether he be accused and convicted."

10/ Whether it is lawful for a priest to refrain entirely from consecrating the Eucharist?

  *I answer that,* Some have said that a priest may lawfully refrain altogether from consecrating, except he be bound to do so, and to give the sacraments to the people, by reason of his being entrusted with the care of souls.

   But this is said quite unreasonably, because everyone is bound to use the grace entrusted to him, when opportunity serves, according to 2 Cor. 6:1: "We exhort you that you receive not the grace of God in vain." But the opportunity of offering sacrifice is considered not merely in relation to the faithful of Christ to whom the sacraments must be administered, but chiefly with regard to God to Whom the sacrifice of this sacrament is offered by consecrating. Hence, it is not lawful for the priest, even though he has not the care of souls, to refrain altogether from celebrating; and he seems to be bound to celebrate at least on the chief festivals, and especially on those days on which the faithful usually communicate. And hence it is that (2 Macc. 4:14) it is said against some priests that they "were not now occupied about the offices of the altar . . . despising the temple and neglecting the sacrifices."

Q. 83 OF THE RITE OF THIS SACRAMENT (SIX ARTICLES)

   We have now to consider the Rite of this sacrament, under which head there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP083.html#TPQ83A1THEP1) Whether Christ is sacrificed in the celebration of this mystery?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP083.html#TPQ83A2THEP1) Of the time of celebrating;

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP083.html#TPQ83A3THEP1) Of the place and other matters relating to the equipment for this celebration;

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP083.html#TPQ83A4THEP1) Of the words uttered in celebrating this mystery;

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP083.html#TPQ83A5THEP1) Of the actions performed in celebrating this mystery.

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP083.html#TPQ83A6THEP1) Of the defects which occur in the celebration of this sacrament.

1/ Whether Christ is sacrificed in this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* The celebration of this sacrament is called a sacrifice for two reasons. First, because, as Augustine says (Ad Simplician. ii), "the images of things are called by the names of the things whereof they are the images; as when we look upon a picture or a fresco, we say, 'This is Cicero and that is Sallust.'" But, as was said above ([Question [79]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A1THEP1)), the celebration of this sacrament is an image representing Christ's Passion, which is His true sacrifice. Accordingly the celebration of this sacrament is called Christ's sacrifice. Hence it is that Ambrose, in commenting on Heb. 10:1, says: "In Christ was offered up a sacrifice capable of giving eternal salvation; what then do we do? Do we not offer it up every day in memory of His death?" Secondly it is called a sacrifice, in respect of the effect of His Passion: because, to wit, by this sacrament, we are made partakers of the fruit of our Lord's Passion. Hence in one of the Sunday Secrets (Ninth Sunday after Pentecost) we say: "Whenever the commemoration of this sacrifice is celebrated, the work of our redemption is enacted." Consequently, according to the first reason, it is true to say that Christ was sacrificed, even in the figures of the Old Testament: hence it is stated in the Apocalypse (13:8): "Whose names are not written in the Book of Life of the Lamb, which was slain from the beginning of the world." But according to the second reason, it is proper to this sacrament for Christ to be sacrificed in its celebration.

2/ Whether the time for celebrating this mystery has been properly determined?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP083.html#TPQ83A1THEP1)), in the celebration of this mystery, we must take into consideration the representation of our Lord's Passion, and the participation of its fruits; and the time suitable for the celebration of this mystery ought to be determined by each of these considerations. Now since, owing to our daily defects, we stand in daily need of the fruits of our Lord's Passion, this sacrament is offered regularly every day in the Church. Hence our Lord teaches us to pray ([Lk. 11:3](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++11:3)): "Give us this day our daily bread": in explanation of which words Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. xxviii): "If it be a daily bread, why do you take it once a year, as the Greeks have the custom in the east? Receive it daily that it may benefit you every day."

   But since our Lord's Passion was celebrated from the third to the ninth hour, therefore this sacrament is solemnly celebrated by the Church in that part of the day.

3/ Whether this sacrament ought to be celebrated in a house and with sacred vessels?

  *I answer that,* There are two things to be considered regarding the equipment of this sacrament: one of these belongs to the representation of the events connected with our Lord's Passion; while the other is connected with the reverence due to the sacrament, in which Christ is contained verily, and not in figure only.

   Hence we consecrate those things which we make use of in this sacrament; both that we may show our reverence for the sacrament, and in order to represent the holiness which is the effect of the Passion of Christ, according to Heb. 13:12: "Jesus, that He might sanctify the people by His own blood," etc.

4/ Whether the words spoken in this sacrament are properly framed?

  *I answer that,* Since the whole mystery of our salvation is comprised in this sacrament, therefore is it performed with greater solemnity than the other sacraments. And since it is written ([Eccles. 4:17](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Eccles++4:17)): "Keep thy foot when thou goest into the house of God"; and (Ecclus. 18:23): "Before prayer prepare thy soul," therefore the celebration of this mystery is preceded by a certain preparation in order that we may perform worthily that which follows after. The first part of this preparation is Divine praise, and consists in the "Introit": according to Ps. 49:23: "The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me; and there is the way by which I will show him the salvation of God": and this is taken for the most part from the Psalms, or, at least, is sung with a Psalm, because, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii): "The Psalms comprise by way of praise whatever is contained in Sacred Scripture."

   The second part contains a reference to our present misery, by reason of which we pray for mercy, saying: "Lord, have mercy on us," thrice for the Person of the Father, and "Christ, have mercy on us," thrice for the Person of the Son, and "Lord, have mercy on us," thrice for the Person of the Holy Ghost; against the threefold misery of ignorance, sin, and punishment; or else to express the "circuminsession" of all the Divine Persons.

  The third part commemorates the heavenly glory, to the possession of which, after this life of misery, we are tending, in the words, "Glory be to God on high," which are sung on festival days, on which the heavenly glory is commemorated, but are omitted in those sorrowful offices which commemorate our unhappy state.

   The fourth part contains the prayer which the priest makes for the people, that they may be made worthy of such great mysteries.

   There precedes, in the second place, the instruction of the faithful, because this sacrament is "a mystery of faith," as stated above ([Question [78]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP078.html#TPQ78A3THEP1), ad 5). Now this instruction is given "dispositively," when the Lectors and Sub-deacons read aloud in the church the teachings of the prophets and apostles: after this "lesson," the choir sing the "Gradual," which signifies progress in life; then the "Alleluia" is intoned, and this denotes spiritual joy; or in mournful offices the "Tract", expressive of spiritual sighing; for all these things ought to result from the aforesaid teaching. But the people are instructed "perfectly" by Christ's teaching contained in the Gospel, which is read by the higher ministers, that is, by the Deacons. And because we believe Christ as the Divine truth, according to Jn. 8:46, "If I tell you the truth, why do you not believe Me?" after the Gospel has been read, the "Creed" is sung in which the people show that they assent by faith to Christ's doctrine. And it is sung on those festivals of which mention is made therein, as on the festivals of Christ, of the Blessed Virgin, and of the apostles, who laid the foundations of this faith, and on other such days.

   So then, after the people have been prepared and instructed, the next step is to proceed to the celebration of the mystery, which is both offered as a sacrifice, and consecrated and received as a sacrament: since first we have the oblation; then the consecration of the matter offered; and thirdly, its reception.

   In regard to the oblation, two things are done, namely, the people's praise in singing the "offertory," expressing the joy of the offerers, and the priest's prayer asking for the people's oblation to be made acceptable to God. Hence David said (1 Para 29:17): "In the simplicity of my heart, I have . . . offered all these things: and I have seen with great joy Thy people which are here present, offer Thee their offerings": and then he makes the following prayer: "O Lord God . . . keep . . . this will."

   Then, regarding the consecration, performed by supernatural power, the people are first of all excited to devotion in the "Preface," hence they are admonished "to lift up their hearts to the Lord," and therefore when the "Preface" is ended the people devoutly praise Christ's Godhead, saying with the angels: "Holy, Holy, Holy"; and His humanity, saying with the children: "Blessed is he that cometh." In the next place the priest makes a "commemoration," first of those for whom this sacrifice is offered, namely, for the whole Church, and "for those set in high places" ([1 Tim. 2:2](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Tim++2:2)), and, in a special manner, of them "who offer, or for whom the mass is offered." Secondly, he commemorates the saints, invoking their patronage for those mentioned above, when he says: "Communicating with, and honoring the memory," etc. Thirdly, he concludes the petition when he says: "Wherefore that this oblation," etc., in order that the oblation may be salutary to them for whom it is offered.

   Then he comes to the consecration itself. Here he asks first of all for the effect of the consecration, when he says: "Which oblation do Thou, O God," etc. Secondly, he performs the consecration using our Saviour's words, when he says: "Who the day before," etc. Thirdly, he makes excuse for his presumption in obeying Christ's command, saying: "Wherefore, calling to mind," etc. Fourthly, he asks that the sacrifice accomplished may find favor with God, when he says: "Look down upon them with a propitious," etc. Fifthly, he begs for the effect of this sacrifice and sacrament, first for the partakers, saying: "We humbly beseech Thee"; then for the dead, who can no longer receive it, saying: "Be mindful also, O Lord," etc.; thirdly, for the priests themselves who offer, saying: "And to us sinners," etc.

   Then follows the act of receiving the sacrament. First of all, the people are prepared for Communion; first, by the common prayer of the congregation, which is the Lord's Prayer, in which we ask for our daily bread to be given us; and also by private prayer, which the priest puts up specially for the people, when he says: "Deliver us, we beseech Thee, O Lord," etc. Secondly, the people are prepared by the "Pax" which is given with the words, "Lamb of God," etc., because this is the sacrament of unity and peace, as stated above ([Question [73]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73OUTP1), [Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP073.html#TPQ73A4THEP1); [Question [79]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP079.html#TPQ79A1THEP1)). But in masses for the dead, in which the sacrifice is offered not for present peace, but for the repose of the dead, the "Pax" is omitted.

   Then follows the reception of the sacrament, the priest receiving first, and afterwards giving it to others, because, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii), he who gives Divine things to others, ought first to partake thereof himself.

   Finally, the whole celebration of mass ends with the thanksgiving, the people rejoicing for having received the mystery (and this is the meaning of the singing after the Communion); and the priest returning thanks by prayer, as Christ, at the close of the supper with His disciples, "said a hymn" ([Mt. 26:30](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++26:30)).

5/ Whether the actions performed in celebrating this sacrament are becoming?

  *I answer that,* As was said above ([Question [60]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A6THEP1)), there is a twofold manner of signification in the sacraments, by words, and by actions, in order that the signification may thus be more perfect. Now, in the celebration of this sacrament words are used to signify things pertaining to Christ's Passion, which is represented in this sacrament; or again, pertaining to Christ's mystical body, which is signified therein; and again, things pertaining to the use of this sacrament, which use ought to be devout and reverent. Consequently, in the celebration of this mystery some things are done in order to represent Christ's Passion, or the disposing of His mystical body, and some others are done which pertain to the devotion and reverence due to this sacrament.

6/ Whether the defects occurring during the celebration of this sacrament can be sufficiently met by observing the Church's statutes?

  *I answer that,* Dangers or defects happening to this sacrament can be met in two ways: first, by preventing any such mishaps from occurring: secondly, by dealing with them in such a way, that what may have happened amiss is put right, either by employing a remedy, or at least by repentance on his part who has acted negligently regarding this sacrament.

PENANCE (Questions [84]-90)

Q. 84 OF THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE (TEN ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the Sacrament of Penance. We shall consider (1) Penance itself; (2) Its effect; (3) Its Parts; (4) The recipients of this sacrament; (5) The power of the ministers, which pertains to the keys; (6) The solemnization of this sacrament.

   The first of these considerations will be two fold: (1) Penance as a sacrament; (2) Penance as a virtue. Under the first head there are ten points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A1THEP1) Whether Penance is a sacrament?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A2THEP1) Of its proper matter;

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A3THEP1) Of its form;

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A4THEP1) Whether imposition of hands is necessary for this sacrament?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A5THEP1) Whether this sacrament is necessary for salvation?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A6THEP1) Of its relation to the other sacraments;

    [(7)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A7THEP1) Of its institution;

    [(8)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A8THEP1) Of its duration;

    [(9)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A9THEP1) Of its continuance;

    [(10)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A10THEP1) Whether it can be repeated?

1/ Whether Penance is a sacrament?

  *I answer that,* As Gregory says [\*Isidore, Etym. vi, ch. 19], "a sacrament consists in a solemn act, whereby something is so done that we understand it to signify the holiness which it confers." Now it is evident that in Penance something is done so that something holy is signified both on the part of the penitent sinner, and on the part of the priest absolving, because the penitent sinner, by deed and word, shows his heart to have renounced sin, and in like manner the priest, by his deed and word with regard to the penitent, signifies the work of God Who forgives his sins. Therefore it is evident that Penance, as practiced in the Church, is a sacrament.

2/ Whether sins are the proper matter of this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* Matter is twofold, viz. proximate and remote: thus the proximate matter of a statue is a metal, while the remote matter is water. Now it has been stated ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A1THEP1), ad 1, ad 2), that the proximate matter of this sacrament consists in the acts of the penitent, the matter of which acts are the sins over which he grieves, which he confesses, and for which he satisfies. Hence it follows that sins are the remote matter of Penance, as a matter, not for approval, but for detestation, and destruction.

3/ Whether the form of this sacrament is: "I absolve thee"?

  *I answer that,* The perfection of a thing is ascribed to its form. Now it has been stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A1THEP1), ad 2) that this sacrament is perfected by that which is done by the priest. Wherefore the part taken by the penitent, whether it consist of words or deeds, must needs be the matter of this sacrament, while the part taken by the priest, takes the place of the form.

   Now since the sacraments of the New Law accomplish what they signify, as stated above ([Question [62]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP062.html#TPQ62A1THEP1), ad 1), it behooves the sacramental form to signify the sacramental effect in a manner that is in keeping with the matter. Hence the form of Baptism is: "I baptize thee," and the form of Confirmation is: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation," because these sacraments are perfected in the use of their matter: while in the sacrament of the Eucharist, which consists in the very consecration of the matter, the reality of the consecration is expressed in the words: "This is My Body."

   Now this sacrament, namely the sacrament of Penance, consists not in the consecration of a matter, nor in the use of a hallowed matter, but rather in the removal of a certain matter, viz. sin, in so far as sins are said to be the matter of Penance, as explained above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A2THEP1)). This removal is expressed by the priest saying: "I absolve thee": because sins are fetters, according to Prov. 5:22. "His own iniquities catch the wicked, and he is fast bound with the ropes of his own sins." Wherefore it is evident that this is the most fitting form of this sacrament: "I absolve thee."

4/ Whether the imposition of the priest's hands is necessary for this sacrament?

  *I answer that,* In the sacraments of the Church the imposition of hands is made, to signify some abundant effect of grace, through those on whom the hands are laid being, as it were, united to the ministers in whom grace should be plentiful. Wherefore an imposition of hands is made in the sacrament of Confirmation, wherein the fulness of the Holy Ghost is conferred; and in the sacrament of order, wherein is bestowed a certain excellence of power over the Divine mysteries; hence it is written (2 Tim. 1:6): "Stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands."

   Now the sacrament of Penance is ordained, not that man may receive some abundance of grace, but that his sins may be taken away; and therefore no imposition of hands is required for this sacrament, as neither is there for Baptism, wherein nevertheless a fuller remission of sins is bestowed.

5/ Whether this sacrament is necessary for salvation?

  *I answer that,* A thing is necessary for salvation in two ways: first, absolutely; secondly, on a supposition. A thing is absolutely necessary for salvation, if no one can obtain salvation without it, as, for example, the grace of Christ, and the sacrament of Baptism, whereby a man is born again in Christ. The sacrament of Penance is necessary on a supposition, for it is necessary, not for all, but for those who are in sin. For it is written (2 Paral 37 [\*The prayer of Manasses, among the Apocrypha]), "Thou, Lord, God of the righteous, hast not appointed repentance to the righteous, to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, nor to those who sinned not against Thee." But "sin, when it is completed, begetteth death" ([James 1:15](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?James+1:15)). Consequently it is necessary for the sinner's salvation that sin be taken away from him; which cannot be done without the sacrament of Penance, wherein the power of Christ's Passion operates through the priest's absolution and the acts of the penitent, who co-operates with grace unto the destruction of his sin. For as Augustine says (Tract. lxxii in Joan. [\*Implicitly in the passage referred to, but explicitly Serm. xv de verb Apost.]), "He Who created thee without thee, will not justify thee without thee." Therefore it is evident that after sin the sacrament of Penance is necessary for salvation, even as bodily medicine after man has contracted a dangerous disease.

6/ Whether Penance is a second plank after shipwreck?

  *I answer that,* That which is of itself precedes naturally that which is accidental, as substance precedes accident. Now some sacraments are, of themselves, ordained to man's salvation, e.g. Baptism, which is the spiritual birth, Confirmation which is the spiritual growth, the Eucharist which is the spiritual food; whereas Penance is ordained to man's salvation accidentally as it were, and on something being supposed, viz. sin: for unless man were to sin actually, he would not stand in need of Penance and yet he would need Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist; even as in the life of the body, man would need no medical treatment, unless he were ill, and yet life, birth, growth, and food are, of themselves, necessary to man.

   Consequently Penance holds the second place with regard to the state of integrity which is bestowed and safeguarded by the aforesaid sacraments, so that it is called metaphorically "a second plank after shipwreck." For just as the first help for those who cross the sea is to be safeguarded in a whole ship, while the second help when the ship is wrecked, is to cling to a plank; so too the first help in this life's ocean is that man safeguard his integrity, while the second help is, if he lose his integrity through sin, that he regain it by means of Penance.

7/ Whether this sacrament was suitably instituted in the New Law?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A1THEP1), ad 1, ad 2), in this sacrament the acts of the penitent are as matter, while the part taken by the priest, who works as Christ's minister, is the formal and completive element of the sacrament. Now in the other sacraments the matter pre-exists, being provided by nature, as water, or by art, as bread: but that such and such a matter be employed for a sacrament requires to be decided by the institution; while the sacrament derives its form and power entirely from the institution of Christ, from Whose Passion the power of the sacraments proceeds.

   Accordingly the matter of this sacrament pre-exists, being provided by nature; since it is by a natural principle of reason that man is moved to repent of the evil he has done: yet it is due to Divine institution that man does penance in this or that way. Wherefore at the outset of His preaching, our Lord admonished men, not only to repent, but also to "do penance," thus pointing to the particular manner of actions required for this sacrament. As to the part to be taken by the ministers, this was fixed by our Lord when He said to Peter ([Mt. 16:19](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Mt++16:19)): "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc.; but it was after His resurrection that He made known the efficacy of this sacrament and the source of its power, when He said ([Lk. 24:47](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++24:47)) that "penance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all nations," after speaking of His Passion and resurrection. Because it is from the power of the name of Jesus Christ suffering and rising again that this sacrament is efficacious unto the remission of sins.

   It is therefore evident that this sacrament was suitably instituted in the New Law.

8/ Whether Penance should last till the end of life?

  *I answer that,* Penance is twofold, internal and external. Internal penance is that whereby one grieves for a sin one has committed, and this penance should last until the end of life. Because man should always be displeased at having sinned, for if he were to be pleased thereat, he would for this very reason fall into sin and lose the fruit of pardon. Now displeasure causes sorrow in one who is susceptible to sorrow, as man is in this life; but after this life the saints are not susceptible to sorrow, wherefore they will be displeased at, without sorrowing for, their past sins, according to Is. 65:16. "The former distresses are forgotten."

   External penance is that whereby a man shows external signs of sorrow, confesses his sins verbally to the priest who absolves him, and makes satisfaction for his sins according to the judgment of the priest. Such penance need not last until the end of life, but only for a fixed time according to the measure of the sin.

9/ Whether Penance can be continuous?

  *I answer that,* One is said to repent in two ways, actually and habitually. It is impossible for a man continually to repent actually. for the acts, whether internal or external, of a penitent must needs be interrupted by sleep and other things which the body needs. Secondly, a man is said to repent habitually. and thus he should repent continually, both by never doing anything contrary to penance, so as to destroy the habitual disposition of the penitent, and by being resolved that his past sins should always be displeasing to him.

10/ Whether the sacrament of Penance may be repeated?

  *I answer that,* As regards Penance, some have erred, saying that a man cannot obtain pardon of his sins through Penance a second time. Some of these, viz. the Novatians, went so far as to say that he who sins after the first Penance which is done in Baptism, cannot be restored again through Penance. There were also other heretics who, as Augustine relates in De Poenitentia [\*De vera et falsa Poenitentia, the authorship of which is unknown], said that, after Baptism, Penance is useful, not many times, but only once.

   These errors seem to have arisen from a twofold source: first from not knowing the nature of true Penance. For since true Penance requires charity, without which sins are not taken away, they thought that charity once possessed could not be lost, and that, consequently, Penance, if true, could never be removed by sin, so that it should be necessary to repeat it. But this was refuted in the SS, Question [24], Article [11], where it was shown that on account of free-will charity, once possessed, can be lost, and that, consequently, after true Penance, a man can sin mortally. Secondly, they erred in their estimation of the gravity of sin. For they deemed a sin committed by a man after he had received pardon, to be so grave that it could not be forgiven. In this they erred not only with regard to sin which, even after a sin has been forgiven, can be either more or less grievous than the first, which was forgiven, but much more did they err against the infinity of Divine mercy, which surpasses any number and magnitude of sins, according to Ps. 50:1,2: "Have mercy on me, O God, according to Thy great mercy: and according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies, blot out my iniquity." Wherefore the words of Cain were reprehensible, when he said ([Gn. 4:13](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Gn++4:13)): "My iniquity is greater than that I may deserve pardon." And so God's mercy, through Penance, grants pardon to sinners without any end, wherefore it is written (2 Paral 37 [\*Prayer of Manasses, among the Apocrypha. St. Thomas is evidently quoting from memory, and omits the words in brackets.]): "Thy merciful promise is unmeasurable and unsearchable . . . (and Thou repentest) for the evil brought upon man." It is therefore evident that Penance can be repeated many times.

Q. 85 OF PENANCE AS A VIRTUE (SIX ARTICLES)

   We must now consider penance as a virtue, under which head there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A1THEP1) Whether penance is a virtue?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A2THEP1) Whether it is a special virtue?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A3THEP1) To what species of virtue does it belong?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A4THEP1) Of its subject;

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A5THEP1) Of its cause;

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A6THEP1) Of its relation to the other virtues.

1/ Whether Penance is a virtue?

  *I answer that,* As stated above (Objection [2]; [Question [84]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84OUTP1), [Article [10]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A10THEP1), ad 4), to repent is to deplore something one has done. Now it has been stated above ([Question [84]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84OUTP1), [Article [9]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A9THEP1)) that sorrow or sadness is twofold. First, it denotes a passion of the sensitive appetite, and in this sense penance is not a virtue, but a passion. Secondly, it denotes an act of the will, and in this way it implies choice, and if this be right, it must, of necessity, be an act of virtue. For it is stated in Ethic. ii, 6 that virtue is a habit of choosing according to right reason. Now it belongs to right reason than one should grieve for a proper object of grief as one ought to grieve, and for an end for which one ought to grieve. And this is observed in the penance of which we are speaking now; since the penitent assumes a moderated grief for his past sins, with the intention of removing them. Hence it is evident that the penance of which we are speaking now, is either a virtue or the act of a virtue.

2/ Whether Penance is a special virtue?

  *I answer that,* As stated in the FS, Question [54], Article [1], ad 1, Article [2], habits are specifically distinguished according to the species of their acts, so that whenever an act has a special reason for being praiseworthy, there must needs be a special habit. Now it is evident that there is a special reason for praising the act of penance, because it aims at the destruction of past sin, considered as an offense against God, which does not apply to any other virtue. We must therefore conclude that penance is a special virtue.

3/ Whether the virtue of penance is a species of justice?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A1THEP1), ad 2) penance is a special virtue not merely because it sorrows for evil done (since charity would suffice for that), but also because the penitent grieves for the sin he has committed, inasmuch as it is an offense against God, and purposes to amend. Now amendment for an offense committed against anyone is not made by merely ceasing to offend, but it is necessary to make some kind of compensation, which obtains in offenses committed against another, just as retribution does, only that compensation is on the part of the offender, as when he makes satisfaction, whereas retribution is on the part of the person offended against. Each of these belongs to the matter of justice, because each is a kind of commutation. Wherefore it is evident that penance, as a virtue, is a part of justice.

   It must be observed, however, that according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 6) a thing is said to be just in two ways, simply and relatively. A thing is just simply when it is between equals, since justice is a kind of equality, and he calls this the politic or civil just, because all citizens are equal, in the point of being immediately under the ruler, retaining their freedom. But a thing is just relatively when it is between parties of whom one is subject to the other, as a servant under his master, a son under his father, a wife under her husband. It is this kind of just that we consider in penance. Wherefore the penitent has recourse to God with a purpose of amendment, as a servant to his master, according to Ps. 122:2: "Behold, as the eyes of servants are on the hands of their masters . . . so are our eyes unto the Lord our God, until He have mercy on us"; and as a son to his father, according to Lk. 15:21: "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee"; and as a wife to her husband, according to Jer. 3:1: "Thou hast prostituted thyself to many lovers; nevertheless return to Me, saith the Lord."

4/ Whether the will is properly the subject of penance?

  *I answer that,* We can speak of penance in two ways: first, in so far as it is a passion, and thus, since it is a kind of sorrow, it is in the concupiscible part as its subject; secondly, in so far as it is a virtue, and thus, as stated above ([Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A3THEP1)), it is a species of justice. Now justice, as stated in the FS, Question [56], Article [6], is subjected in the rational appetite which is the will. Therefore it is evident that penance, in so far as it is a virtue, is subjected in the will, and its proper act is the purpose of amending what was committed against God.

5/ Whether penance originates from fear?

  *I answer that,* We may speak of penance in two ways: first, as to the habit, and then it is infused by God immediately without our operating as principal agents, but not without our co-operating dispositively by certain acts. Secondly, we may speak of penance, with regard to the acts whereby in penance we co-operate with God operating, the first principle [\*Cf. FS, Question [113]] of which acts is the operation of God in turning the heart, according to Lam. 5:21: "Convert us, O Lord, to Thee, and we shall be converted"; the second, an act of faith; the third, a movement of servile fear, whereby a man is withdrawn from sin through fear of punishment; the fourth, a movement of hope, whereby a man makes a purpose of amendment, in the hope of obtaining pardon; the fifth, a movement of charity, whereby sin is displeasing to man for its own sake and no longer for the sake of the punishment; the sixth, a movement of filial fear whereby a man, of his own accord, offers to make amends to God through fear of Him.

   Accordingly it is evident that the act of penance results from servile fear as from the first movement of the appetite in this direction and from filial fear as from its immediate and proper principle.

6/ Whether penance is the first of the virtues?

  *I answer that,* In speaking of the virtues, we do not consider the order of time with regard to the habits, because, since the virtues are connected with one another, as stated in the FS, Question [65], Article [1], they all begin at the same time to be in the soul; but one is said to precede the other in the order of nature, which order depends on the order of their acts, in so far as the act of one virtue presupposes the act of another. Accordingly, then, one must say that, even in the order of time, certain praiseworthy acts can precede the act and the habit of penance, e.g. acts of dead faith and hope, and an act of servile fear; while the act and habit of charity are, in point of time, simultaneous with the act and habit of penance, and with the habits of the other virtues. For, as was stated in the FS, Question [113], Articles [7],8, in the justification of the ungodly, the movement of the free-will towards God, which is an act of faith quickened by charity, and the movement of the free-will towards sin, which is the act of penance, are simultaneous. Yet of these two acts, the former naturally precedes the latter, because the act of the virtue of penance is directed against sin, through love of God; where the first-mentioned act is the reason and cause of the second.

   Consequently penance is not simply the first of the virtues, either in the order of time, or in the order of nature, because, in the order of nature, the theological virtues precede it simply. Nevertheless, in a certain respect, it is the first of the other virtues in the order of time, as regards its act, because this act is the first in the justification of the ungodly; whereas in the order of nature, the other virtues seem to precede, as that which is natural precedes that which is accidental; because the other virtues seem to be necessary for man's good, by reason of their very nature, whereas penance is only necessary if something, viz. sin, be presupposed, as stated above ([Question [55]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP055.html#TPQ55OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP055.html#TPQ55A2THEP1)), when we spoke of the relation of the sacrament of penance to the other sacraments aforesaid.

Q. 86 OF THE EFFECT OF PENANCE, AS REGARDS THE PARDON OF MORTAL SIN (SIX ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the effect of Penance; and (1) as regards the pardon of mortal sins; (2) as regards the pardon of venial sins; (3) as regards the return of sins which have been pardoned; (4) as regards the recovery of the virtues.

   Under the first head there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A1THEP1) Whether all mortal sins are taken away by Penance?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A2THEP1) Whether they can be taken away without Penance?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A3THEP1) Whether one can be taken away without the other?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A4THEP1) Whether Penance takes away the guilt while the debt remains?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A5THEP1) Whether any remnants of sin remain?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A6THEP1) Whether the removal of sin is the effect of Penance as a virtue, or as a sacrament?

1/ Whether all sins are taken away by Penance?

  *I answer that,* The fact that a sin cannot be taken away by Penance may happen in two ways: first, because of the impossibility of repenting of sin; secondly, because of Penance being unable to blot out a sin. In the first way the sins of the demons and of men who are lost, cannot be blotted out by Penance, because their will is confirmed in evil, so that sin cannot displease them as to its guilt, but only as to the punishment which they suffer, by reason of which they have a kind of repentance, which yet is fruitless, according to Wis. 5:3: "Repenting, and groaning for anguish of spirit." Consequently such Penance brings no hope of pardon, but only despair. Nevertheless no sin of a wayfarer can be such as that, because his will is flexible to good and evil. Wherefore to say that in this life there is any sin of which one cannot repent, is erroneous, first, because this would destroy free-will, secondly, because this would be derogatory to the power of grace, whereby the heart of any sinner whatsoever can be moved to repent, according to Prov. 21:1: "The heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whithersoever He will He shall turn it."

   It is also erroneous to say that any sin cannot be pardoned through true Penance. First, because this is contrary to Divine mercy, of which it is written (Joel 2:13) that God is "gracious and merciful, patient, and rich in mercy, and ready to repent of the evil"; for, in a manner, God would be overcome by man, if man wished a sin to be blotted out, which God were unwilling to blot out. Secondly, because this would be derogatory to the power of Christ's Passion, through which Penance produces its effect, as do the other sacraments, since it is written ([1 Jn. 2:2](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?1+Jn++2:2)): "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world."

   Therefore we must say simply that, in this life, every sin can be blotted out by true Penance.

2/ Whether sin can be pardoned without Penance?

  *I answer that,* It is impossible for a mortal actual sin to be pardoned without penance, if we speak of penance as a virtue. For, as sin is an offense against God, He pardons sin in the same way as he pardons an offense committed against Him. Now an offense is directly opposed to grace, since one man is said to be offended with another, because he excludes him from his grace. Now, as stated in the FS, Question [110], Article [1], the difference between the grace of God and the grace of man, is that the latter does not cause, but presupposes true or apparent goodness in him who is graced, whereas the grace of God causes goodness in the man who is graced, because the good-will of God, which is denoted by the word "grace," is the cause of all created good. Hence it is possible for a man to pardon an offense, for which he is offended with someone, without any change in the latter's will; but it is impossible that God pardon a man for an offense, without his will being changed. Now the offense of mortal sin is due to man's will being turned away from God, through being turned to some mutable good. Consequently, for the pardon of this offense against God, it is necessary for man's will to be so changed as to turn to God and to renounce having turned to something else in the aforesaid manner, together with a purpose of amendment; all of which belongs to the nature of penance as a virtue. Therefore it is impossible for a sin to be pardoned anyone without penance as a virtue.

   But the sacrament of Penance, as stated above ([Question [88]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88A3THEP1)), is perfected by the priestly office of binding and loosing, without which God can forgive sins, even as Christ pardoned the adulterous woman, as related in Jn. 8, and the woman that was a sinner, as related in Luke vii, whose sins, however, He did not forgive without the virtue of penance: for as Gregory states (Hom. xxxiii in Evang.), "He drew inwardly by grace," i.e. by penance, "her whom He received outwardly by His mercy."

3/ Whether by Penance one sin can be pardoned without another?

  *I answer that,* It is impossible for Penance to take one sin away without another. First because sin is taken away by grace removing the offense against God. Wherefore it was stated in the FS, Question [109], Article [7]; FS, Question [113], Article [2] that without grace no sin can be forgiven. Now every mortal sin is opposed to grace and excludes it. Therefore it is impossible for one sin to be pardoned without another. Secondly, because, as shown above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A2THEP1)) mortal sin cannot be forgiven without true Penance, to which it belongs to renounce sin, by reason of its being against God, which is common to all mortal sins: and where the same reason applies, the result will be the same. Consequently a man cannot be truly penitent, if he repent of one sin and not of another. For if one particular sin were displeasing to him, because it is against the love of God above all things (which motive is necessary for true repentance), it follows that he would repent of all. Whence it follows that it is impossible for one sin to be pardoned through Penance, without another. Thirdly, because this would be contrary to the perfection of God's mercy, since His works are perfect, as stated in Dt. 32:4; wherefore whomsoever He pardons, He pardons altogether. Hence Augustine says [\*De vera et falsa Poenitentia, the authorship of which is unknown], that "it is irreverent and heretical to expect half a pardon from Him Who is just and justice itself."

4/ Whether the debt of punishment remains after the guilt has been forgiven through Penance?

  *I answer that,* As stated in the FS, Question [87], Article [4], in mortal sin there are two things, namely, a turning from the immutable Good, and an inordinate turning to mutable good. Accordingly, in so far as mortal sin turns away from the immutable Good, it induces a debt of eternal punishment, so that whosoever sins against the eternal Good should be punished eternally. Again, in so far as mortal sin turns inordinately to a mutable good, it gives rise to a debt of some punishment, because the disorder of guilt is not brought back to the order of justice, except by punishment: since it is just that he who has been too indulgent to his will, should suffer something against his will, for thus will equality be restored. Hence it is written ([Apoc. 18:7](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rev+++18:7)): "As much as she hath glorified herself, and lived in delicacies, so much torment and sorrow give ye to her."

   Since, however, the turning to mutable good is finite, sin does not, in this respect, induce a debt of eternal punishment. Wherefore, if man turns inordinately to a mutable good, without turning from God, as happens in venial sins, he incurs a debt, not of eternal but of temporal punishment. Consequently when guilt is pardoned through grace, the soul ceases to be turned away from God, through being united to God by grace: so that at the same time, the debt of punishment is taken away, albeit a debt of some temporal punishment may yet remain.

5/ Whether the remnants of sin are removed when a mortal sin is forgiven?

  *I answer that,* Mortal sin, in so far as it turns inordinately to a mutable good, produces in the soul a certain disposition, or even a habit, if the acts be repeated frequently. Now it has been said above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A4THEP1)) that the guilt of mortal sin is pardoned through grace removing the aversion of the mind from God. Nevertheless when that which is on the part of the aversion has been taken away by grace, that which is on the part of the inordinate turning to a mutable good can remain, since this may happen to be without the other, as stated above ([Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A4THEP1)). Consequently, there is no reason why, after the guilt has been forgiven, the dispositions caused by preceding acts should not remain, which are called the remnants of sin. Yet they remain weakened and diminished, so as not to domineer over man, and they are after the manner of dispositions rather than of habits, like the "fomes" which remains after Baptism.

6/ Whether the forgiveness of guilt is an effect of Penance?

  *I answer that,* Penance is a virtue in so far as it is a principle of certain human acts. Now the human acts, which are performed by the sinner, are the material element in the sacrament of Penance. Moreover every sacrament produces its effect, in virtue not only of its form, but also of its matter. because both these together make the one sacrament, as stated above ([Question [60]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A6THEP1), ad 2, [Article [7]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A6A7THEP1)). Hence in Baptism forgiveness of sin is effected, in virtue not only of the form (but also of the matter, viz. water, albeit chiefly in virtue of the form) [\*The words in brackets are omitted in the Leonine edition] from which the water receives its power---and, similarly, the forgiveness of sin is the effect of Penance, chiefly by the power of the keys, which is vested in the ministers, who furnish the formal part of the sacrament, as stated above ([Question [84]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A3THEP1)), and secondarily by the instrumentality of those acts of the penitent which pertain to the virtue of penance, but only in so far as such acts are, in some way, subordinate to the keys of the Church. Accordingly it is evident that the forgiveness of sin is the effect of penance as a virtue, but still more of Penance as a sacrament.

Q. 87 OF THE REMISSION OF VENIAL SIN (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the forgiveness of venial sins, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A1THEP1) Whether venial sin can be forgiven without Penance?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A2THEP1) Whether it can be forgiven without the infusion of grace?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A3THEP1) Whether venial sins are forgiven by the sprinkling of holy water, a bishop's blessing, the beating of the breast, the Lord's Prayer, and the like?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A4THEP1) Whether a venial sin can be taken away without a mortal sin?

1/ Whether venial sin can be forgiven without Penance?

  *I answer that,* Forgiveness of sin, as stated above ([Question [86]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A2THEP1)), is effected by man being united to God from Whom sin separates him in some way. Now this separation is made complete by mortal sin, and incomplete by venial sin: because, by mortal sin, the mind through acting against charity is altogether turned away from God; whereas by venial sin man's affections are clogged, so that they are slow in tending towards God. Consequently both kinds of sin are taken away by penance, because by both of them man's will is disordered through turning inordinately to a created good; for just as mortal sin cannot be forgiven so long as the will is attached to sin, so neither can venial sin, because while the cause remains, the effect remains.

   Yet a more perfect penance is requisite for the forgiveness of mortal sin, namely that man should detest actually the mortal sin which he committed, so far as lies in his power, that is to say, he should endeavor to remember each single mortal sin, in order to detest each one. But this is, not required for the forgiveness of venial sins; although it does not suffice to have habitual displeasure, which is included in the habit of charity or of penance as a virtue, since then venial sin would be incompatible with charity, which is evidently untrue. Consequently it is necessary to have a certain virtual displeasure, so that, for instance, a man's affections so tend to God and Divine things, that whatever might happen to him to hamper that tendency would be displeasing to him, and would grieve him, were he to commit it, even though he were not to think of it actually: and this is not sufficient for the remission of mortal sin, except as regards those sins which he fails to remember after a careful examination.

2/ Whether infusion of grace is necessary for the remission of venial sins?

  *I answer that,* Each thing is removed by its contrary. But venial sin is not contrary to habitual grace or charity, but hampers its act, through man being too much attached to a created good, albeit not in opposition to God, as stated in the FS, Question [88], Article [1]; SS, Question [24], Article [10]. Therefore, in order that venial sin be removed, it is not necessary that habitual grace be infused, but a movement of grace or charity suffices for its forgiveness.

   Nevertheless, since in those who have the use of free-will (in whom alone can there be venial sins), there can be no infusion of grace without an actual movement of the free-will towards God and against sin, consequently whenever grace is infused anew, venial sins are forgiven.

3/ Whether venial sins are removed by the sprinkling of holy water and the like?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A2THEP1)), no infusion of fresh grace is required for the forgiveness of a venial sin, but it is enough to have an act proceeding from grace, in detestation of that venial sin, either explicit or at least implicit, as when one is moved fervently to God. Hence, for three reasons, certain things cause the remission of venial sins: first, because they imply the infusion of grace, since the infusion of grace removes venial sins, as stated above ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A2THEP1)); and so, by the Eucharist, Extreme Unction, and by all the sacraments of the New Law without exception, wherein grace is conferred, venial sins are remitted. Secondly, because they imply a movement of detestation for sin, and in this way the general confession [\*i.e. the recital of the Confiteor or of an act of contrition], the beating of one's breast, and the Lord's Prayer conduce to the remission of venial sins, for we ask in the Lord's Prayer: "Forgive us our trespasses." Thirdly, because they include a movement of reverence for God and Divine things; and in this way a bishop's blessing, the sprinkling of holy water, any sacramental anointing, a prayer said in a dedicated church, and anything else of the kind, conduce to the remission of venial sins.

4/ Whether venial sin can be taken away without mortal sin?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [87]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A3THEP1)), there is no remission of any sin whatever except by the power of grace, because, as the Apostle declares ([Rm. 4:8](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Rom+4:8)), it is owing to God's grace that He does not impute sin to a man, which a gloss on that passage expounds as referring to venial sin. Now he that is in a state of mortal sin is without the grace of God. Therefore no venial sin is forgiven him.

Q. 88 OF THE RETURN OF SINS WHICH HAVE BEEN TAKEN AWAY BY PENANCE (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the return of sins which have been taken away by Penance: under which head there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88A1THEP1) Whether sins which have been taken away by Penance return simply through a subsequent sin?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88A2THEP1) Whether more specially as regards certain sins they return, in a way, on account of ingratitude?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88A3THEP1) Whether the debt of punishment remains the same for sins thus returned?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88A4THEP1) Whether this ingratitude, on account of which sins return, is a special sin?

1/ Whether sins once forgiven return through a subsequent sin?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [86]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86OUTP1), [Article [4]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A4THEP1)), mortal sin contains two things, aversion from God and adherence to a created good. Now, in mortal sin, whatever attaches to the aversion, is, considered in itself, common to all mortal sins, since man turns away from God by every mortal sin, so that, in consequence, the stain resulting from the privation of grace, and the debt of everlasting punishment are common to all mortal sins. This is what is meant by what is written ([James 2:10](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?James+2:10)): "Whosoever . . . shall offend in one point, is become guilty of all." On the other hand, as regards their adherence they are different from, and sometimes contrary to one another. Hence it is evident, that on the part of the adherence, a subsequent mortal sin does not cause the return of mortal sins previously dispelled, else it would follow that by a sin of wastefulness a man would be brought back to the habit or disposition of avarice previously dispelled, so that one contrary would be the cause of another, which is impossible. But if in mortal sins we consider that which attaches to the aversion absolutely, then a subsequent mortal sin [causes the return of that which was comprised in the mortal sins before they were pardoned, in so far as the subsequent mortal sin] [\*The words in brackets are omitted in the Leonine edition.] deprives man of grace, and makes him deserving of everlasting punishment, just as he was before. Nevertheless, since the aversion of mortal sin is [in a way, caused by the adherence, those things which attach to the aversion are\*] diversified somewhat in relation to various adherences, as it were to various causes, so that there will be a different aversion, a different stain, a different debt of punishment, according to the different acts of mortal sin from which they arise; hence the question is moved whether the stain and the debt of eternal punishment, as caused by acts of sins previously pardoned, return through a subsequent mortal sin.

   Accordingly some have maintained that they return simply even in this way. But this is impossible, because what God has done cannot be undone by the work of man. Now the pardon of the previous sins was a work of Divine mercy, so that it cannot be undone by man's subsequent sin, according to Rm. 3:3: "Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?"

   Wherefore others who maintained the possibility of sins returning, said that God pardons the sins of a penitent who will afterwards sin again, not according to His foreknowledge, but only according to His present justice: since He foresees that He will punish such a man eternally for his sins, and yet, by His grace, He makes him righteous for the present. But this cannot stand: because if a cause be placed absolutely, its effect is placed absolutely; so that if the remission of sins were effected by grace and the sacraments of grace, not absolutely but under some condition dependent on some future event, it would follow that grace and the sacraments of grace are not the sufficient causes of the remission of sins, which is erroneous, as being derogatory to God's grace.

   Consequently it is in no way possible for the stain of past sins and the debt of punishment incurred thereby, to return, as caused by those acts. Yet it may happen that a subsequent sinful act virtually contains the debt of punishment due to the previous sin, in so far as when a man sins a second time, for this very reason he seems to sin more grievously than before, as stated in Rm. 2:5: "According to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath against the day of wrath," from the mere fact, namely, that God's goodness, which waits for us to repent, is despised. And so much the more is God's goodness despised, if the first sin is committed a second time after having been forgiven, as it is a greater favor for the sin to be forgiven than for the sinner to be endured.

   Accordingly the sin which follows repentance brings back, in a sense, the debt of punishment due to the sins previously forgiven, not as caused by those sins already forgiven but as caused by this last sin being committed, on account of its being aggravated in view of those previous sins. This means that those sins return, not simply, but in a restricted sense, viz., in so far as they are virtually contained in the subsequent sin.

2/ Whether sins that have been forgiven, return through ingratitude which is shown especially in four kinds of sin?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88A1THEP1)), sins pardoned through Penance are said to return, in so far as their debt of punishment, by reason of ingratitude, is virtually contained in the subsequent sin. Now one may be guilty of ingratitude in two ways: first by doing something against the favor received, and, in this way, man is ungrateful to God in every mortal sin whereby he offends God Who forgave his sins, so that by every subsequent mortal sin, the sins previously pardoned return, on account of the ingratitude. Secondly, one is guilty of ingratitude, by doing something not only against the favor itself, but also against the form of the favor received. If this form be considered on the part of the benefactor, it is the remission of something due to him; wherefore he who does not forgive his brother when he asks pardon, and persists in his hatred, acts against this form. If, however, this form be taken in regard to the penitent who receives this favor, we find on his part a twofold movement of the free-will. The first is the movement of the free-will towards God, and is an act of faith quickened by charity; and against this a man acts by apostatizing from the faith. The second is a movement of the free-will against sin, and is the act of penance. This act consists first, as we have stated above ([Question [85]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A2THEP1),5) in man's detestation of his past sins; and against this a man acts when he regrets having done penance. Secondly, the act of penance consists in the penitent purposing to subject himself to the keys of the Church by confession, according to Ps. 31:5: "I said: I will confess against myself my injustice to the Lord: and Thou hast forgiven the wickedness of my sin": and against this a man acts when he scorns to confess as he had purposed to do.

   Accordingly it is said that the ingratitude of sinners is a special cause of the return of sins previously forgiven.

3/ Whether the debt of punishment that arises through ingratitude in respect of a subsequent sin is as great as that of the sins previously pardoned?

  *I answer that,* Some have maintained that the debt of punishment incurred through ingratitude in respect of a subsequent sin is equal to that of the sins previously pardoned, in addition to the debt proper to this subsequent sin. But there is no need for this, because, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP088.html#TPQ88A1THEP1)), the debt of punishment incurred by previous sins does not return on account of a subsequent sin, as resulting from the acts of the subsequent sin. Wherefore the amount of the debt that returns must be according to the gravity of the subsequent sin.

   It is possible, however, for the gravity of the subsequent sin to equal the gravity of all previous sins. But it need not always be so, whether we speak of the gravity which a sin has from its species (since the subsequent sin may be one of simple fornication, while the previous sins were adulteries, murders, or sacrileges); or of the gravity which it incurs through the ingratitude connected with it. For it is not necessary that the measure of ingratitude should be exactly equal to the measure of the favor received, which latter is measured according to the greatness of the sins previously pardoned. Because it may happen that in respect of the same favor, one man is very ungrateful, either on account of the intensity of his scorn for the favor received, or on account of the gravity of the offense committed against the benefactor, while another man is slightly ungrateful, either because his scorn is less intense, or because his offense against the benefactor is less grave. But the measure of ingratitude is proportionately equal to the measure of the favor received: for supposing an equal contempt of the favor, or an equal offense against the benefactor, the ingratitude will be so much the greater, as the favor received is greater.

   Hence it is evident that the debt of punishment incurred by a subsequent sin need not always be equal to that of previous sins; but it must be in proportion thereto, so that the more numerous or the greater the sins previously pardoned, the greater must be the debt of punishment incurred by any subsequent mortal sin whatever.

4/ Whether the ingratitude whereby a subsequent sin causes the return of previous sins, is a special sin?

  *I answer that,* The ingratitude of the sinner is sometimes a special sin; and sometimes it is not, but a circumstance arising from all mortal sins in common committed against God. For a sin takes its species according to the sinner's intention, wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 2) that "he who commits adultery in order to steal is a thief rather than an adulterer."

   If, therefore, a sinner commits a sin in contempt of God and of the favor received from Him, that sin is drawn to the species of ingratitude, and in this way a sinner's ingratitude is a special sin. If, however, a man, while intending to commit a sin, e.g. murder or adultery, is not withheld from it on account of its implying contempt of God, his ingratitude will not be a special sin, but will be drawn to the species of the other sin, as a circumstance thereof. And, as Augustine observes (De Nat. et Grat. xxix), not every sin implies contempt of God in His commandments. Therefore it is evident that the sinner's ingratitude is sometimes a special sin, sometimes not.

Q. 89 OF THE RECOVERY OF VIRTUE BY MEANS OF PENANCE (SIX ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the recovery of virtues by means of Penance, under which head there are six points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89A1THEP1) Whether virtues are restored through Penance?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89A2THEP1) Whether they are restored in equal measure?

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89A3THEP1) Whether equal dignity is restored to the penitent?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89A4THEP1) Whether works of virtue are deadened by subsequent sin?

    [(5)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89A5THEP1) Whether works deadened by sin revive through Penance?

    [(6)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89A6THEP1) Whether dead works, i.e. works that are done without charity, are quickened by Penance?

1/ Whether the virtues are restored through Penance?

  *I answer that,* Sins are pardoned through Penance, as stated above ([Question [86]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A1THEP1)). But there can be no remission of sins except through the infusion of grace. Wherefore it follows that grace is infused into man through Penance. Now all the gratuitous virtues flow from grace, even as all the powers result from the essence of the soul; as stated in the FS, Question [110], Article [4], ad 1. Therefore all the virtues are restored through Penance.

2/ Whether, after Penance, man rises again to equal virtue?

  *I answer that,* As stated above ([Question [86]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86OUTP1), [Article [6]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A6THEP1), ad 3; [Question [89]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89OUTP1), [Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP089.html#TPQ89A1THEP1), ad 2), the movement of the free-will, in the justification of the ungodly, is the ultimate disposition to grace; so that in the same instant there is infusion of grace together with the aforesaid movement of the free-will, as stated in the FS, Question [113], Articles [5],7, which movement includes an act of penance, as stated above ([Question [86]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86OUTP1), [Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP086.html#TPQ86A2THEP1)). But it is evident that forms which admit of being more or less, become intense or remiss, according to the different dispositions of the subject, as stated in the FS, Question [52], Articles [1],2; FS, Question [66], Article [1]. Hence it is that, in Penance, according to the degree of intensity or remissness in the movement of the free-will, the penitent receives greater or lesser grace. Now the intensity of the penitent's movement may be proportionate sometimes to a greater grace than that from which man fell by sinning, sometimes to an equal grace, sometimes to a lesser. Wherefore the penitent sometimes arises to a greater grace than that which he had before, sometimes to an equal, sometimes to a lesser grace: and the same applies to the virtues, which flow from grace.

3/ Whether, by Penance, man is restored to his former dignity?

  *I answer that,* By sin, man loses a twofold dignity, one in respect of God, the other in respect of the Church. In respect of God he again loses a twofold dignity. one is his principal dignity, whereby he was counted among the children of God, and this he recovers by Penance, which is signified ([Lk. 15](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++15)) in the prodigal son, for when he repented, his father commanded that the first garment should be restored to him, together with a ring and shoes. The other is his secondary dignity, viz. innocence, of which, as we read in the same chapter, the elder son boasted saying ([Lk. 15:29](http://bible.gospelcom.net/bible?Lk++15:29)): "Behold, for so many years do I serve thee, and I have never transgressed thy commandments": and this dignity the penitent cannot recover. Nevertheless he recovers something greater sometimes; because as Gregory says (Hom. de centum Ovibus, 34 in Evang.), "those who acknowledge themselves to have strayed away from God, make up for their past losses, by subsequent gains: so that there is more joy in heaven on their account, even as in battle, the commanding officer thinks more of the soldier who, after running away, returns and bravely attacks the foe, than of one who has never turned his back, but has done nothing brave."

   By sin man loses his ecclesiastical dignity, because thereby he becomes unworthy of those things which appertain to the exercise of the ecclesiastical dignity. This he is debarred from recovering: first, because he fails to repent; wherefore Isidore wrote to the bishop Masso, and as we read in the Distinction quoted above (Objection [3]): "The canons order those to be restored to their former degree, who by repentance have made satisfaction for their sins, or have made worthy confession of them. On the other hand, those who do not mend their corrupt and wicked ways are neither allowed to exercise their order, nor received to the grace of communion."

   Secondly, because he does penance negligently, wherefore it is written in the same Distinction (OBJ 3): "We can be sure that those who show no signs of humble compunction, or of earnest prayer, who avoid fasting or study, would exercise their former duties with great negligence if they were restored to them."

   Thirdly, if he has committed a sin to which an irregularity is attached; wherefore it is said in the same Distinction (Objection [3]), quoting the council of Pope Martin [\*Martin, bishop of Braga]: "If a man marry a widow or the relict of another, he must not be admitted to the ranks of the clergy: and if he has succeeded in creeping in, he must be turned out. In like manner, if anyone after Baptism be guilty of homicide, whether by deed, or by command, or by counsel, or in self-defense." But this is in consequence not of sin, but of irregularity.

   Fourthly, on account of scandal, wherefore it is said in the same Distinction (Objection [3]): "Those who have been publicly convicted or caught in the act of perjury, robbery, fornication, and of such like crimes, according to the prescription of the sacred canons must be deprived of the exercise of their respective orders, because it is a scandal to God's people that such persons should be placed over them. But those who commit such sins occultly and confess them secretly to a priest, may be retained in the exercise of their respective orders, with the assurance of God's merciful forgiveness, provided they be careful to expiate their sins by fasts and alms, vigils and holy deeds." The same is expressed (Extra, De Qual. Ordinand.): "If the aforesaid crimes are not proved by a judicial process, or in some other way made notorious, those who are guilty of them must not be hindered, after they have done penance, from exercising the orders they have received, or from receiving further orders, except in cases of homicide."

4/ Whether virtuous deeds done in charity can be deadened?

  *I answer that,* A living thing, by dying, ceases to have vital operations: for which reason, by a kind of metaphor, a thing is said to be deadened when it is hindered from producing its proper effect or operation.

   Now the effect of virtuous works, which are done in charity, is to bring man to eternal life; and this is hindered by a subsequent mortal sin, inasmuch as it takes away grace. Wherefore deeds done in charity are said to be deadened by a subsequent mortal sin.

5/ Whether deeds deadened by sin, are revived by Penance?

  *I answer that,* Some have said that meritorious works deadened by subsequent sin are not revived by the ensuing Penance, because they deemed such works to have passed away, so that they could not be revived. But that is no reason why they should not be revived: because they are conducive to eternal life (wherein their life consists) not only as actually existing, but also after they cease to exist actually, and as abiding in the Divine acceptance. Now, they abide thus, so far as they are concerned, even after they have been deadened by sin, because those works, according as they were done, will ever be acceptable to God and give joy to the saints, according to Apoc. 3:11: "Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." That they fail in their efficacy to bring the man, who did them, to eternal life, is due to the impediment of the supervening sin whereby he is become unworthy of eternal life. But this impediment is removed by Penance, inasmuch as sins are taken away thereby. Hence it follows that deeds previously deadened, recover, through Penance, their efficacy in bringing him, who did them, to eternal life, and, in other words, they are revived. It is therefore evident that deadened works are revived by Penance.

6/ Whether the effect of subsequent Penance is to quicken even dead works?

  *I answer that,* A work is said to be dead in two ways: first, effectively, because, to wit, it is a cause of death, in which sense sinful works are said to be dead, according to Heb. 9:14: "The blood of Christ . . . shall cleanse our conscience from dead works." These dead works are not quickened but removed by Penance, according to Heb. 6:1: "Not laying again the foundation of Penance from dead works." Secondly, works are said to be dead privatively, because, to wit, they lack spiritual life, which is founded on charity, whereby the soul is united to God, the result being that it is quickened as the body by the soul: in which sense too, faith, if it lack charity, is said to be dead, according to James 2:20: "Faith without works is dead." In this way also, all works that are generically good, are said to be dead, if they be done without charity, inasmuch as they fail to proceed from the principle of life; even as we might call the sound of a harp, a dead voice. Accordingly, the difference of life and death in works is in relation to the principle from which they proceed. But works cannot proceed a second time from a principle, because they are transitory, and the same identical deed cannot be resumed. Therefore it is impossible for dead works to be quickened by Penance.

Q. 90 OF THE PARTS OF PENANCE, IN GENERAL (FOUR ARTICLES)

   We must now consider the parts of Penance: (1) in general. (2) each one in particular.

   Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

    [(1)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP090.html#TPQ90A1THEP1) Whether Penance has any parts?

    [(2)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP090.html#TPQ90A2THEP1) Of the number of its parts;

    [(3)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP090.html#TPQ90A3THEP1) What kind of parts are they?

    [(4)](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP090.html#TPQ90A4THEP1) Of its division into subjective parts.

1/ Whether Penance should be assigned any parts?

  *I answer that,* The parts of a thing are those into which the whole is divided materially, for the parts of a thing are to the whole, what matter is to the form; wherefore the parts are reckoned as a kind of material cause, and the whole as a kind of formal cause (Phys. ii). Accordingly wherever, on the part of matter, we find a kind of plurality, there we shall find a reason for assigning parts.

   Now it has been stated above ([Question [84]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84A2THEP1),3), that, in the sacrament of Penance, human actions stand as matter: and so, since several actions are requisite for the perfection of Penance, viz., contrition, confession, and satisfaction, as we shall show further on ([Article [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP090.html#TPQ90A2THEP1)), it follows that the sacrament of Penance has parts.

2/ Whether contrition, confession, and satisfaction are fittingly assigned as parts of Penance?

  *I answer that,* A part is twofold, essential and quantitative. The essential parts are naturally the form and the matter, and logically the genus and the difference. In this way, each sacrament is divided into matter and form as its essential parts. Hence it has been said above ([Question [60]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60OUTP1), [Articles [5]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP060.html#TPQ60A5THEP1),6) that sacraments consist of things and words. But since quantity is on the part of matter, quantitative parts are parts of matter: and, in this way, as stated above ([Article [1]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP090.html#TPQ90A1THEP1)), parts are assigned specially to the sacrament of Penance, as regards the acts of the penitent, which are the matter of this sacrament.

   Now it has been said above ([Question [85]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85OUTP1), [Article [3]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP085.html#TPQ85A3THEP1), ad 3) that an offense is atoned otherwise in Penance than in vindictive justice. Because, in vindictive justice the atonement is made according to the judge's decision, and not according to the discretion of the offender or of the person offended; whereas, in Penance, the offense is atoned according to the will of the sinner, and the judgment of God against Whom the sin was committed, because in the latter case we seek not only the restoration of the equality of justice, as in vindictive justice, but also and still more the reconciliation of friendship, which is accomplished by the offender making atonement according to the will of the person offended. Accordingly the first requisite on the part of the penitent is the will to atone, and this is done by contrition; the second is that he submit to the judgment of the priest standing in God's place, and this is done in confession; and the third is that he atone according to the decision of God's minister, and this is done in satisfaction: and so contrition, confession, and satisfaction are assigned as parts of Penance.

3/ Whether these three are integral parts of Penance?

  *I answer that,* Some have said that these three are subjective parts of Penance. But this is impossible, because the entire power of the whole is present in each subjective part at the same time and equally, just as the entire power of an animal, as such, is assured to each animal species, all of which species divide the animal genus at the same time and equally: which does not apply to the point in question. Wherefore others have said that these are potential parts: yet neither can this be true, since the whole is present, as to the entire essence, in each potential part, just as the entire essence of the soul is present in each of its powers: which does not apply to the case in point. Therefore it follows that these three are integral parts of Penance, the nature of which is that the whole is not present in each of the parts, either as to its entire power, or as to its entire essence, but that it is present to all of them together at the same time.

4/ Whether Penance is fittingly divided into penance before Baptism, penance for mortal sins, and penance for venial sins?

  *I answer that,* This is a division of penance as a virtue. Now it must be observed that every virtue acts in accordance with the time being, as also in keeping with other due circumstances, wherefore the virtue of penance has its act at this time, according to the requirements of the New Law.

   Now it belongs to penance to detest one's past sins, and to purpose, at the same time, to change one's life for the better, which is the end, so to speak, of penance. And since moral matters take their species from the end, as stated in the FS, Question [1], Article [3]; FS, 18, Articles [4],6, it is reasonable to distinguish various species of penance, according to the various changes intended by the penitent.

   Accordingly there is a threefold change intended by the penitent. The first is by regeneration unto a new life, and this belongs to that penance which precedes Baptism. The second is by reforming one's past life after it has been already destroyed, and this belongs to penance for mortal sins committed after Baptism. The third is by changing to a more perfect operation of life, and this belongs to penance for venial sins, which are remitted through a fervent act of charity, as stated above ([Question [87]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87OUTP1), [Articles [2]](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/TP/TP087.html#TPQ87A2THEP1),3).