

PONTIFICAL UNIVERSITY OF STUDIES
St. THOMAS AQUINAS IN URBE

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

P. M. M. MATTHIJS, OP

THE ETERNITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF JESUS CHRIST

and

**THE UNITY OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS AND THE
ALTAR**

The sacrifice which is offered every day in the Church is not distinct
from that which Christ Himself offered, but is a commemoration thereof.
[III, q. 22, a. 3, ad 2um]

ROME

1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proemium		4
Chapter I	The Eternal Priest in His Act of Being	10
Article 1:	Christ is truly, properly and excellently a Priest.	10
Article 2:	The Eternal Priest	17
1º	Christ is said to be an eternal priest , both properly and strictly through the communication of idioms.	
2º	Christ as priest is subjected to the succession of time according to His human nature shared with eternity.	
3º	Broadly stated, eternity pertains to Christ the priest – in other words, Christ remains a priest for ever.	
Chapter II	The Exercise of the Eternal Priesthood of Christ	37
Article 1:	The Notion of the sacrificial act.	37
Article 2:	The Internal and External Sacrifice of Christ	55
A.	Christ, as Priest and Victim, from the first instant of His Terrestrial Existence offered a Perfect Internal Sacrifice.	
B.	Christ as Priest offered a Perfect Internal and External Sacrifice at one and the same Time.	
Article 3:	Concerning the Perpetuity of the Sacrifice of the Cross.	64
A.	In general, all the Actions and the Passions of Christ are in some way Perpetual.	
1º	As a Meritorious and Satisfactory Cause.	
2º	As a Perpetual and Exemplary Cause	
3º	As an Efficient Instrumental Cause.	
C.	The Sacrifice of Christ in Particular	
1º	The Sacrifice of Christ is perpetually achieved concerning its Consummation, so that it would not need to be renewed.	
2º	The Celestial Sacrifice.	
Chapter III	The Exercise of the Eternal Priesthood in the Sacramental Sacrifice.	97
Article 1:	The Offering Priest	109
1º	The Minister	
2º	The Principal [Celebrant] Offerer	
Article 2:	The Perpetual Host	126
1º	Christ becomes really present in the Sacrifice of the Mass, formally 'as suffering', i.e. through respect to His Passion with everlasting efficacy.	
2º	Christ is rendered present in the Sacrifice of the Mass as the	

**Perpetual Host of the One Oblation of the Eternal
Priest sacramentally perpetuated in the ministry
of Priests.**

Article 3:	The Unity of the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross and on the Altar.	151
	Conclusion	167

Nihil Obstat:

**Rome, February 18, 1963.
Fr. Raymond Sigmond, OP, Censor
Fr. Benedict Lemeer, OP, Censor**

Imprimi potest:

**Fr. Anicetus Fernandez,
Magis. Generalis. OP**

Imprimatur:

Aloysius Card. [Traglia], *Pro-Vicarius*.

PROEMIUM

In these recent years, a matter has been much discussed among Catholic theologians concerning the most sublime mystery of the Eucharistic sacrifice, especially concerning **the unity of this daily Sacramental Sacrifice with the Sacrifice offered once and for all on the Cross**. A real center of interest in these discussions has been **the very sacrificial act of the Eternal Priest**. Has there been a two-fold Sacrifice of Jesus Christ – one **bloody**, and the other **un-bloody** – or is the **one** Sacrifice of Christ, and the other the Sacrifice of the Church?

From the NT Document to the Hebrews It appears very clearly that Jesus Christ is a Priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech. He once and for all offered Himself and most sufficiently did He do so for all of us:

... For He is attested by Prophecy. The earlier commandment is thus abolished because of its weakness and ineffectiveness, since **the Law could not make anything perfect** ... 'The Lord has sworn an oath He will never retract: you are a priest forever of the order of Melchisedech'... **He has no need to offer sacrifices every day, as the high priests do**, first for their own sins and only then for those of the people; this **He did once and for all, by offering Himself** ... [cf. Heb 7:15-24, 27].

... and He has **entered the sanctuary once and for all**, taking with Him not the blood of goats and bull calves, **but His own blood**, having won an eternal redemption...And **He does not have to offer Himself again and again, as the high priest goes into the sanctuary year after year** with the blood that is not His own, or else **He would have had to suffer over and over** since the world began... [cf. Heb 9:12, 25].

... He is abolishing the first sort to establish the second. And this will was for us to be made holy **by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ made once and for all**... He, on the other hand, **has offered one single sacrifice for sins**, and then taken his seat forever, at the right hand of God... By **one single offering** He has achieved the eternal perfection of all who are sanctified... [cf. Heb 10:10, 12, 14].

For indeed it is no longer necessary, nor would it even be fitting that Jesus Christ would offer Himself anew, by simply a repeated sacrifice as though that one offered once and for all on the Cross had not been sufficient.

Those following modern theories of the Protestant Reformation and led by this biblical conviction of 'once and for all' contended that the Sacrifice of the Mass is not a true and proper Sacrifice, but merely a nude, bland commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross carried out one time for all – or, that it was merely a Banquet to be celebrated in memory of the glorious Resurrection of Jesus Christ. It was also thought to be nothing more than pre-figuration of the Heavenly Banquet, in so far this is still held. [There is still another question disputed among Catholics which is whether the Most Holy Eucharist is primarily a **Sacrifice**, or is it a **Banquet**].

Moreover, the Council of Trent has defined that the Sacrifice of the Mass is **a true and real sacrifice** [Sess. 22, can. 1] and that it is in **propitiation for sins** [can.] and that therefore this is **not blasphemous to cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross** [can. 4] [cf. Denz. ## 948, ff.]. In this same Council, treating of the institution of the sacrifice of most Holy Mass that the traditional Catholic teaching proposes in these words:

938 Since under the former Testament (as the Apostle Paul bears witness) there was no consummation because of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood, it was necessary (God the Father of mercies ordaining it thus) that another priest according to the order of Melchisedech [Gen. 14:18 ;Ps. 109:4;Heb. 7:11] arise, our Lord Jesus Christ, who could perfect [Heb. 10:14] all who were to be sanctified, and lead them to perfection.

He, therefore, our God and Lord, though He was about **to offer Himself once to God the Father upon the altar of the Cross** by the mediation of death, so that He might **accomplish an eternal redemption** for them [edd.: illic, there], nevertheless, that **His sacerdotal office might not come to an end** with His death [Heb. 7:24, 27] at the Last Supper, on the night He was betrayed, **so that He might leave to His beloved spouse the Church a visible sacrifice** [can. 1] (as the nature of man demands), whereby **that bloody sacrifice once to be completed on the Cross might be represented, and the memory of it remain even to the end of the world** [1 Cor. 11:23 ff.] and its saving grace be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit, declaring Himself constituted "a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech" Ps. 109:4; **offered to God the Father His own body and blood under the species of bread and wine**, and under the symbols of those same things gave to the apostles (whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament), so that they might partake, and He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood in these words to make offering: "Do this in commemoration of me, etc." [Luke 22:19;1 Cor. 11:23], **as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught** [can. 2].

For, after He had celebrated the ancient feast of the Passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel sacrificed [Exod. 12:1 ff.] in memory of their exodus from Egypt, He instituted a new Passover, Himself to be immolated under visible signs by the Church through the priests, in memory of His own passage from this world to the Father, when by the shedding of His blood He redeemed us and "delivered us from the power of darkness and translated us into His kingdom [Col. 1:13]. [can. 2] [Sess, 22, c. 1, Denz. 938].

And further **the Sacred Synod teaches** that this sacrifice is truly is also one of propitiation [can. 3]... For it is one and the same Victim, the same one now offering by the ministry of the priests as He who then offered Himself on the Cross, the manner of offering alone being different. [ib. c. 2, Denz. 940].

Therefore, there is indeed One and the Same Victim in the Bloody sacrifice of the Cross and in the un-bloody sacrifice of the Mass and the same Principal Priest celebrant Who offers in the ministry of the Priests. But, what is to be said about the very sacrificial act, or of the oblation or the immolation? For indeed is manifest from the Acts of the Council of Trent that the intention of the Council Fathers was not to give a definition strictly so called of sacrifice in general, nether of the sacrifice of the Altar, but to teach against the new theories to define the Sacrifice of the Mass is indeed a true and genuine Sacrifice and a propitiatory without anything being derogated from the sacrifice of the Cross Whether, however, for the sacrifice properly so called there would be required a certain immolation of the Victim, or an oblation only, the Council did not intend to determine. – and neither whether the words now offering ought to be understood concerning the virtual or actual oblation or the **immolation** on the part of the **Eternal Priest**. It is *De Fide* that Jesus Christ instituted priests and ordained that they should offer His Body and Blood [cf. Trent I, can. 2, **Denz. 949**], as His ministers. The expression **by the ministry of priests**, this could be understood in this sense, that by the power of the institution priests in act, offer the sacrifice, while Christ would not actually but **virtually** only from the fact of His institution of the sacrifice – or, in this sense, that **Jesus actually offers the sacrifice of the Mass, making use of the ministers only as His instruments**, and actually differently from that which He offered Himself on the Cross, or in the same manner in the same sense.

In a similar manner can the words of the Encyclical, *Quas Primas*, of Pius XIth, on Christ the King: **Christ as Priest offered and perpetually offers Himself as a Victim for sins [Denz. # 2195]** – as well as he words of

the Encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, of Pius XIIth, on the Sacred Liturgy [**Denz 2297**]:

In every liturgical act there is present together with the Church her divine Founder; Christ is present in the august sacrifice of the altar not only in the person of His minister, but especially in the species of the Eucharist; He is present in the sacraments through His power which **He transfuses into them as instruments for effecting sanctity**...The august Sacrifice of the altar is not a mere and simple holocaust and commemoration of His death, but it is **a true and proper offering of the sacrifice** by which **through an un-bloody immolation** the Supreme Priest performs **this which on the Cross He already accomplished offering Himself** as a most acceptable Host to His Father...This Same Priest, Christ Jesus, **in Whose Person** the ministerial priest acts ...

The problem in these recent years was brought up especially on the occasion of the theory advanced by **Dom Odo Casel, OSB** [† 1947] in many of his writings has proposed his view as the traditional doctrine of the Church drawn from the words of sacred Scripture and from the Patristic documents. Not a few theologians today at least partly, have followed his thinking. According to Dom Casel, in the Ritual of the Mass, the real Presence is rendered **objectively, and extra-temporally**, the **same oblation of Jesus Christ historically accomplished on the Cross**. The **Sacrificial Action of the eternal Priest** in so far as it is taken not merely according to historical circumstances, but as a **salvific act**, has a certain value that is **perennial**, i.e., it is **supra-temporal** and becomes **entirely actually present** in the mystery of the sacramental ritual, or in the mystery of the Christian economy, **in the Christian Worship**. The Eternal Priest renders His Bloody Sacrifice **in a supra-temporal manner** as the work of salvation on the Cross is rendered present in the sacrifice of the Mass in an **un-bloody manner** so that it is **one sacrifice Bloody and Un-bloody, on the Cross as on the Altar**, and is **one and the same in the mystery of Worship**.

And in order to inquire into the solution of the problem regarding the Unity of the Bloody and **the Un-bloody daily Sacrifice**, **especially regarding that sacrificial action** in which **principally** the Sacrifice is constituted, it is of great importance to examine how **the action of the Eternal High Priest** [on a day in history, two millennia ago] **remains perennial**. Certainly the Eternal Priest once and for all on Mount Calvary offered the Bloody Sacrifice of the Cross which **as such, is not repeated** – just as neither is the death of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, the sacrifice of the altar

is a true and proper action of sacrifice according to that old saying quoted by St. Thomas [**III, q. 83, a. 1**]:

On the contrary, Augustine says in the Liber Sententiarum Prosperi (Ep. 98): **"Christ was sacrificed once in Himself, and yet He is sacrificed daily in the Sacrament."** And according to the words already cited in the Encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, ...**The august Sacrifice of the altar is not a mere and simple holocaust and commemoration of His death, but it is a true and proper offering of the sacrifice by which through an un-bloody immolation the Supreme Priest performs this which on the Cross He already accomplished offering Himself as a most acceptable Host to His Father...**[Denz. # 2195]. It can be asked whether **this oblation or immolation**, which once and for all took place on the Cross and which according to itself is not repeated, yet is perpetuated, and becomes in some manner present on the Sacrifice of the Mass and further, how is this?

And so, we intend here to investigate in this short treatise by what reason **is the Priesthood of Jesus Christ said to be eternal** and indeed especially with respect to the Eucharistic sacrifice **which every day and perpetually throughout the whole world is celebrated**, so that there might appear from this how the sacrifice of the **Cross** and that of the **Altar** befit one another and which might be said, and should be said to be **one**.

Even though St. Thomas did not bring up the question **regarding the perpetuity of this sacrificial act of Jesus Christ**, or of **the presence of this act in the sacrifice of the daily Mass** in express terms, nonetheless he has written extensively many aspects of the matter, drawn from the Sacred Letters, from the tradition of the Apostles, and always keeping his intelligent view on the doctrine and practice of the Church. Regarding the institution of the sacraments, the sacred Doctor was quite profound:

Reply OBJ 1: Human institutions observed in the sacraments are not essential to the sacrament; but belong to the solemnity which is added to the sacraments in order to arouse devotion and reverence in the recipients. **But those things that are essential to the sacrament, are instituted by Christ Himself, Who is God and man. And though they are not all handed down by the Scriptures, yet the Church holds them from the intimate tradition of the apostles, according to the saying of the Apostle (1 Corinthians 11:34): "The rest I will set in order when I come." ...**

Reply OBJ 2: From their very nature **sensible things have a certain aptitude for the signifying of spiritual effects**; but **this aptitude** is fixed by the

Divine institution to some special signification. This is what Hugh of Saint Victor means by saying (De Sacramentis i) that "a sacrament owes its signification to its institution." Yet **God chooses certain things rather than others for sacramental signification, not as though His choice were restricted to them, but in order that their signification be more suitable to them.** [III, q. 64, a. 2, ad 1^{um} & 2^{um}].

On the contrary, it is known that the Church is ruled by **the Holy Spirit, Who orders nothing in an inordinate manner** [III, q. 66, a. 10 – *Sed contra*].

Of these matters, and others, the Doctor of the Church has written brilliantly and in his angelic manner he has drawn up a synthesis of these matters regarding **sacrifice in general**, regarding the **Eternal Priesthood of Jesus Christ**, as well as regards the **sacraments in general and in particular** - and especially, regarding the **Most Holy Eucharist** as both **sacrament** and **sacrifice**. Therefore, in order to unearth the truly traditional teaching of the Church, it is certainly of no small moment to consider those elements that pertain to these matters under discussion here which are treated by the Angelic Doctor, especially in the IIIrd Part of his *Summa Theologica*.

Moreover, since it is a question of the presence of **the salvific sacrifice of the Eternal Priest in the sacrifice of the Mass**, and regarding **the unity of this sacrifice with that on the Cross**, performed in a bloody manner we will take up this matter under the aspect of **the perpetuity or the eternity of the Priesthood of Jesus Christ**:

[1] insofar as this perpetuity pertains to the Eternal Priest Himself in His being;

[2] insofar as this pertains to the exercise of the priestly office or power of Jesus Christ noted in a common manner;

[3] insofar as this pertains to the Eucharistic Sacrifice in particular.

†
†††
†

Chapter I

On the Eternal Priesthood in His Being

We intend to determine in the very first place in what sense and for what reason can and should Christ be said to be constituted a **Priest Forever**. And so, in this first article the discussion will be on Jesus Christ as a **Priest**, and in a second article, the reflection will be on that **eternity** which in varied ways befits Christ the Priest.

Article 1

Jesus Christ, as the Incarnate Word is truly and properly and excellently a Priest

Among all peoples a priest is said to be a certain man who is **called and deputed** by his very office from some legitimate, public and supreme authority to exercising the ministries of divine worship, or to the office of mediator, between the Divinity and human beings.

The foundation, or the reason for such an office is drawn first from the **very rational and social nature of humanity**, and then from **the elevation of human beings to the supernatural order**, and thirdly from **sin to be repaired**.

a. As creatures, humans ought to **recognize the Creator** as their Lord and therefore, to **honor Him** under a legal indebtedness as First Principle and Last End. And since it is not only the individual but also society in general is held to worship God with supreme cult, i.e., that worship of *latria*, on account of the absolute excellence of God and His supreme dominion, this official worship ought to be hierarchically organized so that in the name of all it might be rendered, even by the very prince or the head of that society itself, or by some one chosen for this duty by the supreme legitimate authority.

b. Furthermore, on account of the elevation of man to the supernatural order, or to **adoptive filiation**, each human being and the society in general of the faithful ought to render worship to God as Father and in this order it pertains by a special reason if it is pleasing to determine all the modalities of this worship and therefore to constitute a hierarchy, to designate and to consecrate the priest or the minister of holy realities. This

pertains to God in a special manner in the supernatural order in that this not only by reason but by revelation, man in this order can to be trained how human beings ought to honor God.

c. And man, since he is a sinner from the beginning of the stock of Adam, and his own personal sin, cannot approach God unless his sin is removed. To God alone does it pertain exclusively to determine what reparation He would wish as sufficient and therefore, it is up to Him to determine the genus and the number of the victims: which He requires as satisfaction, also to indicate the priest who might approach Him in the name of sinful humanity in order to obtain reconciliation.

The above-noted elements which pertain to the office of priest by right by the positive will of God these are found as a definition which is handed over by the Apostle in the Document to the *Hebrews* :

... Every high priest is taken from among human beings and is appointed to act on their behalf in relationships with God, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins; he can sympathize with those who are ignorant or who have gone astray, because he too is subject to limitations and weakness, That is why he has to make sin offerings for himself as well as for the people No one takes this honor on himself; it needs a call from God, as in Aaron's case...[Heb 5:1-4].

The fact that Jesus Christ is a Priest as man, truly, properly and excellently, is a doctrine of faith. Metaphorically indeed Jesus Christ, in so far as He is Himself the eternal Word, is the splendor and the figure of the substance of the Father, or the glory of God *within*, and may also be said to be a Priest. But He is properly a Priest as man, or as the Incarnate Word in the order toward the working out of reconciliation between the human race and God. For it is indeed revealed in the Messianic Psalm: ***The Lord God has sworn an oath and He will never retract, you are a Priest forever of the order of Melchisedek*** [cf. Ps 110:4].

In the Document to the Hebrews, which is totally developed around the Priesthood of Jesus Christ, it is manifested in many ways that Jesus Christ indeed is a priest:

... *Since in Jesus, the Son of God, we have the supreme high priest, who has gone through to the highest heaven, we must hold firm to our profession of faith...* [4:14]

... *It follows then that his power to save those who come to God through Him, is absolute, since He lives forever to intercede for them. Such is the high priest that*

met our need, holy, innocent and uncontaminated, set apart from sinners, and raised up above the heavens; He has no need to offer sacrifices every day, as the high priests do, first for their own sins and only then for those of the people; this He did once and for all, by offering Himself... [7:25, ff.].

There are many witnesses of this apostolic tradition among the most ancient Fathers of the Church, such as **St. Clement of Rome** [in his First Corinthians 36], St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Justine and so on. In his 10th Anathema approved in the Council of Ephesus, can. 10, the 3rd Ecumen., celebrated in the year 431 against Nestorius, St. Cyril stated:

The divine Scripture says that Jesus Christ was made the Pontiff and the Apostle of our Confession: ...turn your minds to Jesus, the apostle and the high priest ... in the odor of sweetness He offered Himself for us to God [Ep 5:2] and to the Father. Therefore if anyone says that the Word of God Himself was not made our High-priest and apostle when He was made flesh [Jn 1:14] and man in our likeness...a.s. [Denz # 122]

Likewise the Council of Trent centuries later:

... Since under the former Testament [as the Apostle Paul bears witness] there was no consummation because of the weakness of the Levitical Priesthood, it was necessary God the Father of mercies ordaining it thus] that another Priest according to the order of Melchisedek [Gn14:18; Ps 110:4; Heb 7:11] arise, our Lord Jesus Christ ... Denz. # 938].

From this very notion of the priest presented above from the Document to the Hebrews and there applied to Christ, there is made manifest that the man Christ has been made a priest, or the most excellent Pontiff. For indeed:

1^o Jesus Christ is true man, having a true human nature, from the race of Adam, and therefore it can be stated that He was assumed from among men and was constituted for them. And He can sympathize as befits the priest [Heb 5:2; 4:15; 2L17, 18]. He is perfect man having a human nature indeed from the race of Adam, but one that was integral and uncontaminated. He did not have defects other than those He assumed in view of His task as Redeemer. He indeed is perfect regarding knowledge, grace and power.

2^o Jesus Christ was called and deputed Pontiff: by the supreme legitimate authority, i.e., by God: **And so it was not Christ Who gave Himself the glory of becoming high priest, but the One Who said to Him: 'You are My Son, today I have fathered You' ... 'You are a priest forever of**

the order of Melchisedek'... [Heb 5:5]. Christ did not call Himself but it was the Father who called Him and deputed Him in the very Decree of His Incarnation, Christ is consecrated a Priest: ... **He was acclaimed by God with the title of high priest of the order of Melchisedek...** [Heb 5:10]. The fact that He alone was called and deputed as High Priest was made by the Decree with the solemn oath and not through any process of inheritance as was for centuries true for the Levitical priests, but He was called directly by God: ... **the Lord has sworn an oath and He will not retract it; You are a priest forever...** [Heb 7:21].

3^o **Jesus Christ was constituted the Most Excellent Mediator:**

a. **From the Part of the Agent:** Jesus Christ is Mediator not as God but as man, or in accord with His human nature. Therefore, He enjoys the perfect reasons of Median, distant from each part, and as existing under God and above men – **under God in accord with His human nature, and above men because of the fullness of graces and His [hypostatic] union** [III Sent., d. 19, a. 5, ad 2 q.], joining in His Divine Person both elements. And so, of Himself He is suitable for exercising the office of **Mediator**, i.e., of reconciling men to God. For although He is **Mediator as man**, i.e., according to His human nature, nonetheless, in the strength of His hypostatic union, He is the Son of God: ... **in our time, in these final times God has spoken to us in the Person of His Son, Whom He has appointed heir of all things and through Whom He made the ages...** [Heb 1:2-14] And in His humanity, Jesus is endowed with the highest level of habitual grace, set apart Him from sinners [cf. Heb 7:26], as a Capital Grace. **He made Him the Head of the Church** [cf. Ep 1:22].

b. **From the part of the act:** because He can offer the most perfect sacrifice of an infinite price, i.e. by offering Himself, the terrestrial life of the God-man: ... **follow Christ by loving as He loved you, giving Himself up for us as an offering and a sweet smelling sacrifice to God...** [Ep 5:2, ff.; cf. Heb 9:12].

c. **From the part of the Effect:** He was able to provide and did bestow the perfect and indeed the superabundant satisfaction. **Through Him to reconcile all things to Him.** [Col 1:19]. **Christ offered Himself as a ransom for all** [cf. Heb 1:9; 1 Tm 2:5] - by conferring sanctifying grace and by leading those to be saved to perfect salvation: ... **our Lord Jesus Christ,**

Who could perfect [Heb 10:4] all who were to be sanctified... [Trent, Session 22, c. 2, - Denz # 938].

Therefore, He is the **one and sole and perfect Mediator** : ... **for there is only one Mediator between God and humanity, Himself a human being, Christ Jesus, Who offered Himself as a ransom for all... [1 Tm 2:5]. I am the Way, and the Truth and the Life; no one comes to the Father but through Me... [Jn 14:6]. ... for of all the names in the world given to men, this is the only one by which we can be saved ... [Ac 4:12]...He has no need to offer sacrifices every day, as the high priests [of the old law] do... this He did once and for all by offering Himself ... Heb 7:27].** Therefore, He is the one and only perfect Mediator Who alone could perfectively [and not only dispositively , or ministerially] reconcile men to God, namely by His own virtue and authority:

On the contrary, It is written (1 Timothy 2:5): "There is . . . one Mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

I answer that, Properly speaking, the office of a mediator is **to join together** and unite those between whom he mediates: for extremes are united in the mean [medio].

Now **to unite men to God perfectively belongs to Christ**, through Whom men are reconciled to God, according to 2 Corinthians 5:19: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself." And, consequently, Christ alone is the perfect Mediator of God and men, inasmuch as, by His death, He reconciled the human race to God. Hence the Apostle, after saying, "Mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus," added: "Who gave Himself a redemption for all."

However, nothing hinders certain others from being called mediators, in some respect, between God and man, forasmuch as they cooperate in uniting men to God, **dispositively or ministerially**.

[In an extensive **Note**, Fr. Matthijs explains the following: it is disputed among theologians on **what is the formal constitutive aspect of the Priesthood of Jesus Christ**. It is manifest that the Priesthood of Christ, insofar as it is constituted in the present order of divine Providence, there pertain both **the grace of union as well as sanctifying, habitual and capital grace**. The question among the theologians is what is its formal constitutive element. The different opinions might be reduced to three:

- The **Salmanticenses** [Treatise 21, On the Incarnation, disp. 31] hold that Jesus Christ formally is a Priest through **the Capital Grace**, having supposed the Grace of Union as its root;
- a number of modern theologians and also some Thomists more commonly hold out in the view that the formal constitutive element is **the Grace of Union** [as Schebeen, Pohle, Diekamp, Garrigou-Lagrange, and others];
- then there are some others who hold in some way **both the Grace of Union as well as the capital grace** to be the formal reason of being [e.g., V. Heris OP, *Le mystère du Christ in St. Thomas*. Paderborn 1934].

Those who hold the first view point out that the hypostatic union, or the Grace of Union, is aimed at this, that the Man Jesus Christ is the Son of God and not at this, that He is the Mediator and a Priest who is less than God. Moreover, the Person of Christ, they say, is the principle *quod* of the operations while the principle *quo* is His human nature sanctified by sanctifying grace, that is both habitual-capital. From the grace of union His operation enjoys infinite value and therefore it is required as the root, but His sanctifying grace is its specifying principle.

Those who follow the third point of view by distinguishing the order of being and acting, maintain that Jesus Christ is **both priest by the very hypostatic union by which He is substantially consecrated**, in that the Incarnation is redemptive; but for the exercise of the priestly office there is required by moral necessity habitual grace: by this hypostatic union Jesus Christ is already a priest and also that the soul in His essence is veritably intellectual but there are lacking to Him the faculties of exercising by which He will act according to that which He is. As a priest these faculties He has received from His elevation to the supernatural order by sanctifying grace.

It is the second view that has attracted most Thomists **the hypostatic union is terminated in this that Jesus Christ is the God-Man, both Mediator and Priest as man. The principle quod is the Divine Person subsisting in His human nature, and the principle quo of His operations as Mediator or as Priest is His human nature conjoined to the Divinity and the organ and the animated conjoined instrument of this.** Further there is required the habitual grace and that of head not that Christ might simply be able to operate as a priest, but so that His operation might intrinsically be proportioned to His supernatural end. By a two-fold anointing Jesus Christ is constituted as Mediator and Priest in His Blood, or to

offering the Sacrifice of Reconciliation: by a **substantial anointing** through **the Grace of Union** by which Christ in His humanity is rendered apt for exercising the priestly office. By the **accidental anointing** by which through the gift of sanctifying grace He is empowered to operate connaturally in the order toward the supernatural end of all. Even though Christ was not a Priest in so far as He is God, but in His humanity, nonetheless He is one and at the same time, He is a priest and God. And so, in so far as His humanity is at work in virtue of His Divinity, that sacrifice is most efficacious for the removal of sins [**III, q. 22, a. 3, ad 3 um**]:

Reply OBJ 1: Although Christ was a priest, not as God, **but as man, yet one and the same was both priest and God**. Wherefore in the Council of Ephesus (Part 3, chapter 1, anathema 10) we read: "If anyone says that the very Word of God did not become our High-Priest and Apostle, when He became flesh and a man like us, but altogether another one, the man born of a woman, let him be anathema."

Hence in so far as His human nature operated **by virtue of the Divine**, that sacrifice was most efficacious for the blotting out of sins. For this reason Augustine says (De Trinitate iv,14): "So that, since four things are to be observed in every sacrifice - **to whom** it is offered, **by whom** it is offered, **what** is offered, **for whom** it is offered; the same one true Mediator reconciling us to God **by the sacrifice of peace**, was **one with Him to Whom it was offered, united in Himself those for whom He offered it, at the same time offered it Himself, and was Himself that which He offered.**"

His sanctifying and capital grace is indeed the ultimate form but not absolutely required to constitute Jesus Christ as a Priest, but rather to its perfection.

†
†††
†

Article 2

On the Eternal Priesthood

Eternity signifies a certain duration or permanence in being which we are unable to determine, unless with respect to a better known duration, such as that of time.

Duration, or permanence in being is distinguished according to the manner in which realities have being. Those realities which are substantially – and therefore, also accidentally – are subjected to mutation or corruption, or to movement, and therefore, such are called moveable realities have their flowing existence or duration in so far as this befits movement. This fluid duration or existence is apprehensible and is retained by memory in the manner of one total simultaneity, in which the parts are numerated and this is called '**time**.' Really all that exists in this duration of time is one instant and that is called '**now**' – and this is an imperfect, transient entity since it is motion or an act of a being in potency in so far indeed as it is in potency.

As something real that is fundamentally and formally 'of reason', time is a moving number measured by '**before and after**', i.e. a numbered number of a regular motion as a measure of other moving realities, whether '**primary**' [the ultimate numbered number], or **secondary** [as that of a watch]. To continuous movement there responds **continuous** time; to that movement which is not 'continuous', such as would be the motion of the angelic intellect there responds '**discreet**' time. 'Continuous' time is that time strictly so called by which there is measured the motion of all movable realities, those that may be generated, and which remain corruptible and even the quiet of these realities which lasts as long as the privation of motion endures.

In addition to those realities that are substantially movable which are of themselves subject to, there are those realities which are **substantially** unmovable, or those that are **immutable**, or **incorruptible** which are only 'accidentally' mutable, or those that are mobile either by local movement or by the motion of thought and volition. The duration of such realities are called '**ageless**'. Ageless realities are not measured by time according to their substance [since they are substantially immovable], but only '**by accident**', either corporal [such as local motion] or spiritual [such as thought], and these are measured by time that is either continuous or discreet.

As to the very rational of time it is a succession according to **before and after**; hence, there is given the principle and the end at least in some part taken together. As to the nature of the ageless, this is not a succession according to the substance of the matter and so there are not necessarily a principle and an end unless in so far as the reality is created or will be destroyed. Hence, the duration of an 'age' is by the conservation of its very existence while time is a fluid existence.

In addition to the movable and the incorruptible there is given also that totally immovable which then is Being Itself, subsisting of Itself. Hence, in this Being there is no succession. The duration of this unique Being is called **eternity** and this is defined as **the total and perfect possession of interminable life**:

I answer that, As we attain to the knowledge of simple things by way of compound things, so must **we reach to the knowledge of eternity by means of time**, which is nothing but **the numbering of movement by before and after**.

For since succession occurs in every movement, and one part comes after another, the fact that we reckon before and after in movement, makes us apprehend time, which is nothing else but the measure of before and after in movement.

Now in a thing bereft of movement, which is always the same, there is no before or after. As therefore the idea of time consists in the numbering of before and after in movement; so likewise **in the apprehension of the uniformity of what is outside of movement, consists the idea of eternity**.

Further, those things are said to be measured by time which have a beginning and an end in time, because in everything which is moved there is a beginning, and there is an end. **But as whatever is wholly immutable can have no succession, so it has no beginning, and no end**.

Thus **eternity is known from two sources: first, because what is eternal is interminable - that is, has no beginning nor end** (that is, no term either way); **secondly, because eternity has no succession, being simultaneously whole. [I. q. 10, a. 1]**.

It is **interminable duration**, or One lacking terms, i.e., **lacking a beginning and an end**, and it is **all simultaneously, lacking succession and division of parts**, and is the perfect possession which does not imply distension, but metaphorically designates the quiet of the divine being and is

as perfect, and excludes the *now of time*, since it is all at once that which is now standing. It is said to be of interminable life rather than 'being', because it is thus signifying operation [since to live implies being and acting]; extension moreover of duration is seen to be attended according to operation more than by being. Therefore, time, too, is a moved number.

Eternity is properly and strictly, since it cannot be but One, just as Being of Itself is One, is Its own measure, and is not measured by anything else, but is in Itself a measure exceeding and is the supreme measure of all duration. The very reason, or concept of eternity consists in its apprehension because it is absolutely outside of everything moved. Or in the apprehension *now standing*. Therefore, no creature can be 'eternal' of itself, but only enjoy something of a participation in it, or in some broad sense.

In the light of all this, in what sense might Christ be said to be an eternal priest?

1^o Jesus Christ is properly and strictly said to be a Priest forever, only according to the Communication of Idioms.

Eternity, properly and strictly taken, is **an essential divine attribute** which befits only that Being which is entirely immobile, nor can it ever befit creature at all. Eternity, then, is a property of God as is Being in and of itself it He is immutable, infinite or immense. That attribute, since it is essential is common to all three Persons of the Trinity. As a result in the Athanasian Symbol it is said the Father is eternal, eternal is the Son and Eternal is the Holy Spirit. These are not three eternals but ONE Eternal [if nevertheless *eternal* is to be adjectively as qualifying, it might be said: **in the Trinity there are three eternals, but never three gods, because God always designates substance**]. Since it is a **common essential attribute**, it is not said of the Son as 'Son' but since He is God.

Christ is a priest in His assumed humanity, i.e., in accord with His human nature assumed to the Personal Being of the Word, and not to His essential being as such. Therefore, to Christ as Priest it befits Him to be 'eternal' in so far as the personal Being is really of a divine nature. And since this Same is the Subject of a divine and human nature in Jesus Christ through the Communication of Idioms, this Christ Who is God, is said to be a Priest according to the divine nature. He is therefore a **Priest in His**

humanity in time according to His human nature assumed in time and subject to time.

It should be noted there is not to be given in Jesus Christ a two-fold being simply, since He is One *Supposit*, i.e., the Divine Word, **Who has drawn to His Personal Being a human nature, so by acquiring a rational relationship to this nature, really related to Him.** The Personal Being of the Divine Word **does not inform His human nature** but **actuates this terminatively** so that He is an eternal Being and at the same time, temporal existing in history, as He is the Divine Word made man:

On the contrary, Everything is said to be a being, inasmuch as it is one, for one and being are convertible. Therefore, if there were two beings in Christ, and not one only, Christ would be two, and not one.

I answer that, **Because in Christ there are two natures and one hypostasis**, it follows that **things belonging to the nature in Christ must be two**; and that **those belonging to the hypostasis in Christ must be only one.**

Now Being pertains both to the nature and to the hypostasis; to the hypostasis as to that which has being - and to the nature as to that whereby it has being. For **nature is taken after the manner of a form**, which is said to be a being because something is by it; as by whiteness a thing is white, and by manhood a thing is man.

Now it must be borne in mind that if there is **a form or nature which does not pertain to the personal being of the subsisting hypostasis**, this being is not said to belong to the person simply, but relatively; as to be white is the being of Socrates, not as he is Socrates, but inasmuch as he is white. And there is no reason why this being should not be multiplied in one hypostasis or person; for the being whereby Socrates is white is distinct from the being whereby he is a musician.

But the being which belongs to the very hypostasis or person in itself cannot possibly be multiplied in one hypostasis or person, since it is impossible that there should not be one being for one thing. If, therefore, the human nature accrued to the Son of God, not hypostatically or personally, but accidentally, as some maintained, it **would be necessary to assert two beings in Christ - one, inasmuch as He is God - the other, inasmuch as He is Man**; even as in Socrates we place one being inasmuch as he is white, and another inasmuch as he is a man, since "being white" does not pertain to the personal being of Socrates.

But being possessed of a head, being corporeal, being animated - all these pertain to the one person of Socrates, and hence there arises from these only the one being of Socrates. And if it so happened that after the person of Socrates was constituted there accrued to him hands or feet or eyes, as happened to him who was born blind, no new being would be thereby added to Socrates, but only a relation to these, i.e. inasmuch as he would be said to be, not only with reference to what he had previously, but also with reference to what accrued to him afterwards.

And thus, since **the human nature is united to the Son of God, hypostatically or personally** as was said above (q. 2, aa. 5,6), and not accidentally, it follows that **by the human nature there accrued to Him no new personal being, but only a new relation of the pre-existing personal being to the human nature, in such a way that the Person is said to subsist not merely in the Divine, but also in the human nature. [III, q. 17, a. 2].**

2^o Jesus Christ as Priest is subjected to the succession of Time in accord with his human nature with a participated eternity.

The human nature in Jesus Christ can be considered in two ways: in Itself, or in accord with its own capacity, or in accord with its capacity united to the Word:

a. In Itself, or according to its proper capacity, natural or gratuitous:

1.] In this Life: Jesus Christ as Priest has a human nature subjected to mutations which befit all human nature in so far as the Divine Word has assumed this human nature, and as such, He is a Priest subject, as every way-farer, to mutation in the common mode and to time according to His passible human nature and his passible human body. Nonetheless, He was endowed with the fullness of grace and infused knowledge. Jesus Christ was already a Comprehensor according to the superior part of His soul and forms the first instant of His temporal life He enjoyed the immutable vision of the Deity:

ARTICLE 2: Whether Christ had the knowledge which the blessed or comprehensors have?

OBJ 1: It would seem that in Christ there was not the knowledge of the blessed or comprehensors. **For the knowledge of the blessed is a participation of Divine light, according to Psalm 36:9: "In Thy light we**

shall see light." Now Christ had not a participated light, but He had the Godhead Itself substantially abiding in Him, according to Colossians 2:9: "For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead corporeally." Therefore in Christ there was not the knowledge of the blessed.

OBJ 2: Further, **the knowledge of the blessed makes them blessed, according to John 17:3: "This is eternal life : that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent."** But this Man was blessed through being united to God in person, according to Psalm 65:4: "Blessed is He Whom Thou hast chosen and taken to Thee." Therefore it is not necessary to suppose the knowledge of the blessed in Him.

OBJ 3: Further, to man belongs a double knowledge - one by nature, one above nature. Now **the knowledge of the blessed, which consists in the vision of God, is not natural to man, but above his nature.** But in Christ there was another and much higher supernatural knowledge, i.e. the Divine knowledge. Therefore there was no need of the knowledge of the blessed in Christ.

On the contrary, The knowledge of the blessed consists in the knowledge of God. But He knew God fully, even as He was man, according to John 8:55: "I do know Him, and do keep His word." Therefore **in Christ there was the knowledge of the blessed.**

I answer that, What is in potentiality is reduced to act by what is in act; for that whereby things are heated must itself be hot. **Now man is in potentiality to the knowledge of the blessed, which consists in the vision of God; and is ordained to it as to an end; since the rational creature is capable of that blessed knowledge, inasmuch as he is made in the image of God.** Now men are brought to this end of beatitude by the humanity of Christ, according to Hebrews 2:10: "For it became Him, for Whom are all things, and by Whom are all things, Who had brought many children unto glory, to perfect the author of their salvation by His passion."

And hence it was necessary that **the beatific knowledge, which consists in the vision of God, should belong to Christ pre-eminently, since the cause ought always to be more efficacious than the effect.**

Reply OBJ 1: The Godhead is united to the manhood of Christ in Person, not in essence or nature; yet with **the unity of Person remains the distinction of natures.** And therefore the soul of Christ, which is a part of human nature, **through a light participated from the Divine Nature, is perfected with the beatific knowledge whereby it sees God in essence.**

Reply OBJ 2: By the union this Man is **blessed with the uncreated beatitude**, even as by the union He is God; yet besides the uncreated beatitude it was necessary that **there should be in the human nature of Christ a created beatitude, whereby His soul was established in the last end of human nature.**

Reply OBJ 3: The beatific vision and knowledge are to some extent **above the nature of the rational soul**, inasmuch as it cannot reach it of its own strength; but in another way it is in accordance with its nature, inasmuch as it is capable of it by nature, having been made to the likeness of God, as stated above. But the uncreated knowledge is in every way above the nature of the human soul. **[III. q. 9. a. 2].**



ARTICLE 4: Whether Christ was a perfect comprehensor in the first instant of His conception?

OBJ 1: It would seem that Christ was not a perfect comprehensor in the first instant of His conception. For **merit precedes reward**, as fault precedes punishment. But **Christ merited in the first instant of His conception**, as stated above (A3). Since, therefore, the state of comprehension is the principal reward, it seems that Christ was not a comprehensor in the first instant of His conception.

OBJ 2: Further, our Lord said (Luke 24:26): "**Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into His glory?**" But glory belongs to the state of comprehension. Therefore **Christ was not in the state of comprehension in the first instant of His conception, when as yet He had not suffered.**

OBJ 3: Further, what befits neither man nor angel seems proper to God; and therefore is not becoming to Christ as man. But **to be always in the state of beatitude befits neither man nor angel**: for if they had been created in beatitude, they would not have sinned afterwards. Therefore Christ, as man, was not in the state of beatitude in the first instant of His conception.

On the contrary, It is written (Psalm 65:4): "Blessed is he whom Thou hast chosen, and taken to Thee"; which words, according to the gloss, **refer to Christ's human nature, which "was taken by the Word of God unto the unity of Person."** But human nature was taken by the Word of God in the first instant of His conception. Therefore, **in the first instant of His conception, Christ, as man, was in the state of beatitude; which is to be a comprehensor.**

I answer that, As appears from what was said above (A3), it was unbecoming that in His conception Christ should receive merely habitual grace without the act. Now, He received grace "not by measure" (John 3:34), as stated above (Q7,A11). But the grace of the wayfarer, being short of that of the comprehensor, is in less measure than that of the comprehensor. **Wherefore it is manifest that in the first instant of His conception Christ received not only as much grace as comprehensors have, but also greater than that which they all have. And because that grace was not without its act, it follows that He was a comprehensor in act, seeing God in His Essence more clearly than other creatures.**

Reply OBJ 1: As stated above (Q19,A3), Christ did not merit the glory of the soul, in respect of which He is said to have been a comprehensor, but **the glory of the body, to which He came through His Passion.**

Wherefore the reply to the Second Objection is clear.

Reply OBJ 3: Since **Christ was both God and man**, He had, even in His humanity, something more than other creatures - namely, that He was in the state of beatitude from the very beginning. [III, q. 34, a. 4].

This knowledge, which is above all others, is to be placed outside of all controversy [cf. A. Les, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 1930]. In the blessed vision which takes place through that divine essence which is united to the created intellect, so that it be understood in act, through itself it establishes the intellect in act:

Reply OBJ 3: **The divine essence is existence itself.** Hence as other intelligible forms which are not their own existence are united to the intellect by means of some entity, whereby the intellect itself is informed, and made in act; so **the divine essence is united to the created intellect, as the object actually understood, making the intellect in act by and of itself.** [I, q. 12, a. 2, ad 3 um].

In this, there are not distinguished before and after, or successive parts, rather the blessed person adheres to God in an immediate vision that is both immutable and of itself, cannot be lost. Thus, Beatitude is the consumed perfection which excludes all defect from the blessed person. Therefore, without mutability it happens to the one blessed by it accomplishing this by divine power, which raises a person into a participation of eternity transcending all mutation:

Reply OBJ 1: **Happiness is consummate perfection**, which excludes every defect from the happy. And therefore **whoever has happiness has it altogether unchangeably: this is done by the Divine power, which raises man to the participation of eternity which transcends all change.** [I-II, q. 5, a. 4 ad 1^{um}].

Therefore, although Christ, as Wayfarer, was subject to mutation, nonetheless, as Comprehensor therefore from the very beginning He knew in the Word those things which are existing in any manner whatever, those that will be, and all that there ever were, whether spoken, or thought by anyone whatsoever, in whatever time frame they occurred, as all such things pertain to Him even those which exist only in potency of the creature:

ARTICLE 2: Whether the Son of God knew all things in the Word?

OBJ 2: It would seem that the soul of Christ does not know all things in the Word. For it is written (Mark 13:32): "**But of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but the Father.**" Therefore He does not know all things in the Word.

OBJ 2: Further, **the more perfectly anyone knows a principle the more he knows in the principle.** But God sees His Essence more perfectly than the soul of Christ does. Therefore He knows more than the soul of Christ knows in the Word. Therefore the soul of Christ does not know all things in the Word.

OBJ 3: Further, **the extent depends on the number of things known.** If, therefore, the soul of Christ knew in the Word all that the Word knows, it would follow that the knowledge of the soul of Christ would equal the Divine knowledge, i.e. the created would equal the uncreated, which is impossible.

On the contrary, on Apocalypse 5:12, "**The Lamb that was slain is worthy to receive . . . divinity and wisdom,**" a gloss says, i.e. "the knowledge of all things."

I answer that, When it is inquired whether Christ knows all things in the Word, **all things may be taken in two ways:**

- First, **properly, to stand for all that in any way whatsoever is, will be, or was done, said, or thought, by whomsoever and at any time.** And in this way it must be said that the soul of Christ knows all things in the Word. For every created intellect knows in the Word, not all simply, but **so many more things the more perfectly it sees the Word.** Yet no beatified intellect fails to know in the Word whatever pertains to itself. Now to Christ and to His dignity all things to some extent belong, **inasmuch as all things are subject to Him.**

Moreover, **He has been appointed Judge** of all by God, "because He is the Son of Man," as is said John 5:27; and therefore the soul of Christ knows in the Word all things existing in whatever time, and the thoughts of men, of which He is the Judge, so that what is said of Him (John 2:25), "For He knew what was in man," can be understood not merely of the Divine knowledge, but also of His soul's knowledge, which it had in the Word.

Secondly, **all things** may be taken **widely**, as extending not merely to such things as are in act at some time, but even to **such things as are in potentiality, and never have been nor ever will be reduced to act**. Now some of these are in the Divine power alone, and not all of these does the soul of Christ know in the Word. For this would be to comprehend all that God could do, which would be to comprehend the Divine power, and, consequently, the Divine Essence.

For **every power is known from the knowledge of all it can do**. Some, however, are not only in the power of God, but also in the power of the creature; and all of these the soul of Christ knows in the Word; for **it comprehends in the Word the essence of every creature, and, consequently, its power and virtue, and all things that are in the power of the creature**.

Reply OBJ 1: Arius and Eunomius understood this saying, not of the knowledge of the soul, which they did not hold to be in Christ, as was said above (q. 9, a. 1), but of the Divine knowledge of the Son, Whom they held to be less than the Father as regards knowledge. But this will not stand, since all things were made by the Word of God, as is said John 1:3, and, amongst other things, all times were made by Him. Now He is not ignorant of anything that was made by Him. **He is said, therefore, not to know the day and the hour of the Judgment**, for that He does not make it known, since, on being asked by the apostles (Acts 1:7), He was unwilling to reveal it; and, on the contrary, we read (Genesis 22:12): "Now I know that thou fearest God," i.e. "Now I have made thee know."

But the Father is said to know, because He imparted this knowledge to the Son. Hence, by saying but the Father, we are given to understand that the Son knows, not merely in the Divine Nature, but also in the human, because, as Chrysostom argues (Hom. 78 in Matthaeum), **if it is given to Christ as man to know how to judge - which is greater - much more is it given to Him to know the less, viz. the time of Judgment**. Origen, however (Tractatus 30 in Matthaeum), expounds it of His body, which is the Church, which is ignorant of this time. Lastly, some say this is to be understood of the **adoptive**, and not of the natural Son of God.

Reply OBJ 2: God knows His Essence so much the more perfectly than the soul of Christ, as He comprehends it. And hence He knows all things, not merely whatever are in act at any time, which things He is said to know by knowledge of vision, but also what ever He Himself can do, which He is said to know by simple intelligence, as was shown in the **I, q. 14, a. 9**. Therefore the soul of Christ knows all things that God knows in Himself by the knowledge of vision, but not all that God knows in Himself by knowledge of simple intelligence; and thus in Himself God knows many more things than the soul of Christ.

Reply OBJ 3: The extent of knowledge depends not merely on the number of knowable things, but also on the clearness of the knowledge. Therefore, although the knowledge of the soul of Christ which He has in the Word is equal to the knowledge of vision as regards the number of things known, nevertheless the knowledge of God infinitely exceeds the knowledge of the soul of Christ in clearness of cognition, since the uncreated light of the Divine intellect infinitely exceeds any created light received by the soul of Christ; although, absolutely speaking, the Divine knowledge exceeds the knowledge of the soul of Christ, not only as regards the mode of knowing, but also as regards the number of things known, as was stated above. **[III, q. 10, a. 2]**.

The beatific vision has its beginning but not succession, nor terminus unless perhaps in passing manner it would be conceded surpassing the light of glory.

2.] In Heaven: in the state of heavenly glory, of course, Jesus Christ has no deficiency or corruptibility:

On the contrary, it is impossible for the same thing to be in motion and at rest, else contradictories would be verified of the same subject. But **Christ's body is at rest in heaven. Therefore it is not movably in this sacrament**.

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 (a. 5). 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. [III, q. 76, a. 6 c].

Christ's impassible soul immovably enjoys the beatific vision, and while His body is perfectly subjected to His glorious soul. As a result, He and His body are impassible, subtle, agile and resplendent in clarity; for in that state, He is not subject to passion, or to change except to the extent that Christ wills. Indeed His human nature since it is not subject substantially to change, to time or to the succession other than according to willed thoughts outside the beatific vision, and like volition, and since He pure spirit His body might be subject to various mutation through His will, as when Christ after His resurrection came to the disciples and even ate some food. Moreover He is naturally in place and indeed locally according to the nature of dimensional quantity and in time according to successive local movements even though in time He is also imperceptible to us, should He so choose: [cf. Suppl. q. 83 (86), a. 6].

b. According to His Capacity as United to the Word: Having retained His human nature with a determined dimensional quantity and situated in any given place, **the Body of Christ was able by a miracle to be simultaneously with another body in one and the same place**. Hence it is attributed to the Body of Christ by a number of the Saints that He came forth from the closed Virginal Womb of Mary and that He entered through the closed doors in the Cenacle by divine power [cf. Quodl. I, q. 10, a. 22, c]. For it is not repugnant that two bodies that two dimensional quantities should be circumscribed in one place, and they would have one location, or one

extrinsic position. **Com-penetration** is not repugnant since each quantity serves with quantity in location where it has its intrinsic placing which of itself pertains to dimensional quantity.

But **to be located in two places is repugnant** to one body, or to one dimensional quantity. The reason being that in this way one dimensional quantity would be simultaneously two, in that **a two-fold extrinsic location supposes a two-fold location, or a two-fold intrinsic place**. For even though a location and site that are intrinsic can be understood without the extrinsic counter-part, even though the opposite is not so. The reason is the secondary formal effect is not without the first, while the first by divine power can be without the second. For one manner is that by which the dimensional quantity of Christ is rendered present by divine power in the Most Blessed Sacrament so that later it that its location is to be said sacramental.

In so far as time is concerned, which is really nothing other than the flowing existence of motion and therefore does not exist unless it is posited in one passing instant, it is manifestly repugnant that one instant is together with another instant that is either prior or posterior – or that one movement is prior or posterior to itself. According to accident, Christ's movement cannot be as man present unless according to succession from one instant into another. Christ as God is above all time and above all ages: ***Before Abraham was, I am!*** [Jn 8:58]. But, in His humanity, in so far as He is moved, He is in time, but He could not have his total existence in one single 'now' of time. He could have indeed be moved almost in an instant since each instant is divisible in potency, and can by divine power become divided in act. There is another question to be later considered, concerning the in-temporal presence of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist.

In His humanity, Jesus Christ through His being an animated conjoined instrument of the Divinity, can indeed operate in His instrumental power participated on the **Divine virtuality** certain immutations that can be ordered to the purpose of the Incarnation, with the exception only of those mutations which in no way can be accomplished by a creature, such as creation and annihilation.

Since each and every creature has limited being according to each one's certain determined form, it cannot on its own power produce out of nothing, not even **instrumentally** or **dispositively**, since in the production of any

total entity as such there is nothing which could dispose this to be. Nor, by the same token, is there anything presently existing which can be reduced into total nothingness since every operation of a creature tends toward some certain entity [cf. **I, q. 45, a. 5**]:

QUESTION 45: THE MODE OF EMANATION OF THINGS FROM THE FIRST PRINCIPLE

ARTICLE 5: Whether it belongs to God alone to create?

OBJ 1: It would seem that it does not belong to God alone to create, because, according to the Philosopher (De Anima ii,34), what is perfect can make its own likeness. But immaterial creatures are more perfect than material creatures, which nevertheless can make their own likeness, for fire generates fire, and man begets man. Therefore an immaterial substance can make a substance like to itself. But immaterial substance can be made only by creation, since it has no matter from which to be made. Therefore a creature can create.

OBJ 2: Further, the greater the resistance is on the part of the thing made, so much the greater power is required in the maker. But a "contrary" resists more than "nothing." Therefore it requires more power to make (something) from its contrary, which nevertheless a creature can do, than to make a thing from nothing. Much more therefore can a creature do this.

OBJ 3: Further, the power of the maker is considered according to the measure of what is made. But created being is finite, as we proved above when treating of the infinity of God (Q7, AA2, 3,4). Therefore only a finite power is needed to produce a creature by creation. But to have a finite power is not contrary to the nature of a creature. Therefore it is not impossible for a creature to create.

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Trinitate iii,8) that neither good nor bad angels can create anything. **Much less therefore can any other creatures.**

I answer that, It sufficiently appears at the first glance, according to what precedes (a. 1), that **to create can be the action of God alone**. For **the more universal effects must be reduced to the more universal and prior causes**. Now among all effects **the most universal is being itself**; and hence **it must be the proper effect of the first and most universal cause, and that is God.**

Hence also it is said (De Causis, proposition 3) that "neither intelligence nor the soul gives us being, except inasmuch as it works by divine operation." Now to **produce being absolutely**, not as this or that being, **belongs to creation. Hence it is manifest that creation is the proper act of God alone.**

It happens, however, **that something participates the proper action of another, not by its own power, but instrumentally, inasmuch as it acts by the power of another**; as air can heat and ignite by the power of fire. And so some have supposed that although creation is the proper act of the universal cause, still some inferior cause acting by the power of the first cause, can create. And thus Avicenna asserted that the first separate substance created by God created another after itself, and the substance of the world and its soul; and that the substance of the world creates the matter of inferior bodies. And in the same manner the Master says (Sententiarum iv, 5) that God can communicate to a creature the power of creating, so that the latter can create ministerially, not by its own power. **But such a thing cannot be, because the secondary instrumental cause does not participate the action of the superior cause, except inasmuch as by something proper to itself it acts dispositively to the effect of the principal agent.** If therefore it effects nothing, according to what is proper to itself, it is used to no purpose; nor would there be any need of certain instruments for certain actions. Thus we see that a saw, in cutting wood, which it does by the property of its own form, produces the form of a bench, which is the proper effect of the principal agent.

Now **the proper effect of God creating is what is presupposed to all other effects, and that is absolute being.** Hence **nothing else can act dispositively and instrumentally to this effect, since creation is not from anything presupposed, which can be disposed by the action of the instrumental agent.**

So therefore **it is impossible for any creature to create, either by its own power or instrumentally - that is, ministerially.** And above all it is absurd to suppose that a body can create, for no body acts except by touching or moving; and thus it requires in its action some pre-existing thing, which can be touched or moved, which is contrary to the very idea of creation.

Reply OBJ 1: A perfect thing participating any nature, makes a likeness to itself, **not by absolutely producing that nature, but by applying it to something else.** For an individual man cannot be the cause of human nature absolutely, because he would then be the cause of himself; but he is the cause of human nature being in the man begotten; and thus he presupposes in

his action a determinate matter whereby he is an individual man. **But as an individual man participates human nature, so every created being participates, so to speak, the nature of being; for God alone is His own being**, as we have said above (q. 7, aa. 1,2).

Therefore **no created being can produce a being absolutely, except forasmuch as it causes "being" in "this"**: and so it is necessary to presuppose that whereby a thing is this thing, before the action whereby it makes its own likeness. But in an immaterial substance it is not possible to presuppose anything whereby it is this thing; because it is what it is by its form, whereby it has being, since it is a subsisting form. Therefore an immaterial substance cannot produce another immaterial substance like to itself as regards its being, but only as regards some added perfection; as we may say that a superior angel illuminates an inferior, as Dionysius says (De Coelesti Hierarchia iv,x). In this way even in heaven there is paternity, as the Apostle says (Ephesians 3:15): "From whom all paternity in heaven and on earth is named." From which evidently appears that no created being can cause anything, unless something is presupposed; which is against the very idea of creation.

Reply OBJ 2: A thing is made from its contrary indirectly (De Physica i,43), but directly from the subject which is in potentiality. And so the contrary resists the agent, inasmuch as it impedes the potentiality from the act which the agent intends to induce, as fire intends to reduce the matter of water to an act like to itself, but is impeded by the form and contrary dispositions, whereby the potentiality (of the water) is restrained from being reduced to act; and the more the potentiality is restrained, the more power is required in the agent to reduce the matter to act. Hence **a much greater power is required in the agent when no potentiality pre-exists**. Thus therefore it appears that it is **an act of much greater power to make a thing from nothing, than from its contrary**.

Reply OBJ 3: The power of the maker is reckoned not only from the substance of the thing made, **but also from the mode of its being made**; for a greater heat heats not only more, but quicker. Therefore although to create a finite effect does not show an infinite power, yet **to create it from nothing does show an infinite power**: which appears from what has been said (r 2). For if a greater power is required in the agent in proportion to the distance of the potentiality from the act, **it follows that the power of that which produces something from no presupposed potentiality is infinite**, because there is no proportion between "no potentiality" and the potentiality presupposed by the power of a natural agent, as there is no proportion between "not being" and "being." And because no creature has simply an

infinite power, any more than it has an infinite being, as was proved above (q. 7, a. 2), it follows that no creature can create. [cf. also **De Pot., q. 3, a. 4**].

Having supposed all this the divine omnipotence is not forced to act within the restricted limits of the instrument because it does not depend on the instrument, in that this is a created potency. The problem concerning **instrumental operation** of the humanity of Christ in a fuller manner will be treated where the reflection will be on the **efficiency of the Mysteries of Christ** in Chapter II, which follows.

3. To Jesus Christ there pertains eternity in the broad sense in so far as this is perpetual duration, or, in other words: Christ remains a priest forever.

It is **of Faith** that Christ is a priest forever, i.e., **without end**. For it is according to sacred Scripture that Christ is a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedek [Ps 110:4]. Since Melchisedek is 'beyond all time' [and the first priest mentioned in God's Word], there is no word about his origin, age, father and mother, or anything concerning his genealogy nor concerning the end of his priesthood. Thus, Jesus Christ is also beyond all time but this is not said merely negatively, but also **positively**, because the Priest remains forever. St. Thomas notes¹: And indeed many other priests had been made, and therefore these by death would be prohibited from remaining; but This High Priest by the fact that He remains forever, He enjoys a priesthood forever. And as a result He may also save for all eternity perpetually, those acceding to God through Him: He is always living for interceding for us The Council of Trent ² stated:

... He, therefore, our Lord and God, though He was about to offer Himself to our God the Father upon the altar of the Cross by the mediation of death, so that He might accomplish an eternal redemption for them there, nevertheless, that His sacerdotal office might not come to an end with His death accomplish an eternal redemption for them there, nevertheless that His sacerdotal office might not come to an end with His death [Heb 7:24, 27], at the Last Supper on the night He was betrayed, so that He might leave to His beloved spouse the Church a visible sacrifice [can. 1] [as the nature of man demands] whereby that bloody sacrifice once to be completed on the Cross might be represented and the memory of it remain even to the end of the world [1 Co 11:23, ff.] and its saving grace be applied to the remission of those since which we daily commit, declaring Himself constituted 'a priest forever according to the Order of Melchisedek [Ps

¹ *Ad Hebraeos*, VII, 3, 23-25.

² Sess. 22, c. 1 [Denz. 938].

110:4], offered to God the Father His own body and blood under the species of bread and wine and under the symbols of those same things gave to the apostles [whom He then constituted priests of the NT] so that they might partake, and He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood in these words to make offering 'Do this in commemoration of Me' [Lk 22:19; 1 Co 11:24, as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught [can. 2]...

This may be proven by a theological argument:

QUESTION 50: OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST

ARTICLE 2: Whether the Godhead was separated from the flesh when Christ died?

OBJ 1: It would seem that the Godhead was separated from the flesh when Christ died. For as Matthew relates (Matthew 27:46), when our Lord was hanging upon the cross He cried out: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" which words Ambrose, commenting on Luke 23:46, explains as follows: "The man cried out when about to expire by being severed from the Godhead; for since **the Godhead is immune from death**, assuredly death could not be there, except life departed, for the Godhead is life." And so it seems that when Christ died, the Godhead was separated from His flesh.

OBJ 2: Further, extremes are severed when the mean is removed. But the soul was the mean through which the Godhead was united with the flesh, as stated above (Q6,A1). Therefore since the soul was severed from the flesh by death, it seems that, in consequence, His Godhead was also separated from it.

OBJ 3: Further, God's life-giving power is greater than that of the soul. But the body could not die unless the soul quitted it. Therefore, much less could it die unless the Godhead departed.

On the contrary, As stated above (q. 6, aa. 4,5), the attributes of human nature are predicated of the Son of God **only by reason of the union**. But what belongs to the body of Christ after death is predicated of the Son of God - namely, being buried: as is evident from the Creed, in which it is said that the **Son of God "was conceived and born of a Virgin, suffered, died, and was buried."** Therefore Christ's Godhead was not separated from the flesh when He died.

I answer that, **What is bestowed through God's grace is never withdrawn except through fault**. Hence it is written (Romans 11:29): "The gifts and the calling of God are without repentance." But **the grace of union**

whereby the Godhead was united to the flesh in Christ's Person, is greater than **the grace of adoption** whereby others are sanctified: also it is more enduring of itself, because **this grace is ordained for personal union, whereas the grace of adoption is referred to a certain affective union.**

And yet we see that the **grace of adoption** is never lost without fault. Since, then there was **no sin in Christ**, it was impossible for the union of the Godhead with the flesh to be dissolved.

Consequently, as **before death Christ's flesh was united personally and hypostatically with the Word of God, it remained so after His death, so that the hypostasis of the Word of God was not different from that of Christ's flesh after death**, as Damascene says (De Fide Orthodoxa iii).

Reply OBJ 1: Such forsaking is **not to be referred to the dissolving of the personal union**, but to this, that God **the Father gave Him up to the Passion**: hence there "to forsake" means simply not to protect from persecutors. or else He says there that He is forsaken, with reference to the prayer He had made: "Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass away from Me," as Augustine explains it (De Gratia Novi Testament).

Reply OBJ 2: The Word of God is said to be united with the flesh through the medium of the soul, inasmuch as it is through the soul that the flesh belongs to human nature, which the Son of God intended to assume; but not as though the soul were the medium linking them together. But it is due to the soul that the flesh is human even after the soul has been separated from it - namely, inasmuch as by God's ordinance **there remains in the dead flesh a certain relation to the resurrection**. And therefore **the union of the Godhead with the flesh is not taken away**.

Reply OBJ 3: The soul formally possesses the life-giving energy, and therefore, while it is present, and united formally, the body must necessarily be a living one, whereas **the Godhead has not the life-giving energy formally, but effectively**; because It cannot be the form of the body: and therefore it is not necessary for the flesh to be living while the union of the Godhead with the flesh remains, since God does not act of necessity, but of His own will.

What is bestowed through God's grace is never withdrawn except through fault - the gifts of God and vocation are given without repentance [Rm 2:23]. But **the grace of union** whereby the Godhead was united to the flesh in Christ's Person, is greater than **the grace of adoption** whereby others are sanctified. There remains a greater union is had when two

natures are joined together. Furthermore, this bears with it a supreme habitual and capital grace. For the grace of union remains forever, or the human nature assumed and sanctified by Christ remains forever. By this grace of union Christ is constituted a priest [either formally, or at least radically]. Therefore, Christ remains a priest forever.

Also in the triduum of Holy Week of His death He remained a Priest and there remained intact His hypostatic union with His separated body and soul [III, q. 50, a. 4, ad 3 um]:

Reply OBJ 3: That **a man is competent to be a priest is by reason of the soul, which is the subject of the character of order**: hence a man does not lose his priestly order by death, and much less does **Christ, who is the fount of the entire priesthood**.

††††

CHAPTER II

THE EXERCISE OF THE ETERNAL PRIESTHOOD OF JESUS CHRIST

The proper priestly office according to which it has been established by the positive will of God and which the social human nature dictate, **principally consists in the Oblation of the Sacrifice, or its principal act of publish worship.** Thus the theologian may ask whether and how Jesus Christ as Priest has exercised this office and whether He exercises it in perpetuity, and still without any abstraction made from the Eucharistic Sacrifice concerning which in particular it will be treated in the following Chapter III.

In order to come to the solution of this question, three matters are to be considered here:

1^o What is understood by **the oblation of the sacrifice,** or by the **act of sacrifice?**

2^o Whether and how **Jesus Christ as Priest has offered Himself as the Victim,** therefore **from the Incarnation to the bloody immolation on the Cross?**

3^o Whether and how **is the Sacrifice of the Cross perpetual?**



Article 1

The Notion of the Sacrificial Act, or of Sacrifice

On account of the many and varied definitions of ‘**sacrifice**’ which theologians, especially since the Council of Trent, in their treatises especially of the Eucharistic Sacrifice have forwarded, some modern theologians have come to the idea that it is better not to try to give any definition so that due to an erroneous or too narrow an idea, have thought there would be given false explanation of sacrifice which by Faith as a true sacrifice there should be held.³ Of course, it has already been made clear from Revelation alone and the Magisterium of the Church that **the Passion of Jesus Christ is a Sacrifice,** and further, so **is the Most Holy Eucharist.** As a result these two may be compared between themselves and these can be investigated how they are in harmony with one another.

³ A. Michel, , article *Messe*, in: *DTC*.

Moreover, since divine revelation does not at all make use of new concepts, but employs those naturally acquired and the more common, and this is not for demonstrating and fully manifesting its sublime truths. Rather, theologians proceeding under the light of divine revelation in some way propose the mysteries in both an intelligible and systematic manner. In this task of sacred theology, the scholars can and should make use of the light of reason, as well as of historical and of the perennial philosophical data. And in their task theologians need to be guided by taking into account the prevailing doctrine of the Magisterium of the Church, so that truly from all this, they may pursue their intensification in sacred doctrine.

Therefore having taken into consideration those actions which the official worship of the OT as well as those sacrifices in vogue in pagan worship, and also investigating the data which the light of reason may offer, some insights might be gained regarding the proper worship to be rendered to the excellent and supreme God, and they are able to notice certain essential elements in all practiced 'sacrifice'. The data thus obtained might lead to some solution in the quest for a definition and these truths need to be kept in mind whenever it is a question, then, for example, of the Passion of Jesus Christ and also the Most Holy Eucharist that may be seen how these elements regarding sacrifice might indeed truly and properly be called sacrifice in so far as this is firmly held now to be of faith. It has been in this manner, that the Holy Doctor, in connecting that which appears from revelation and reason, has provided some basic insights regarding the central notion of 'sacrifice', and his data sheds considerable light on each and every subsequent treatise of **sacrifice** in particular.⁴

The Notion of Sacrifice

1. A sacrifice properly and strictly speaking is the principle act of external, or public, divine worship elicited by the virtue of religion. In order for an act of external, **public divine worship would have the meaning of a sign or symbol, it is offered with respect to the oblation or the immolation of the mind**: 'every visible sacrifice which is a sacrament of an invisible sacrifice, i.e. is a sacred sign thereof' **St. Augustine 10, City of God, c. 5**]:

⁴ St. Thomas Aquinas: I-II, q. 101; q. 102; II-II, qq. 85 & 86; III, q. 22, a. 2; q. 83, a. 1; CG III, c. 119.

II-II, QUESTION 85: OF SACRIFICE

ARTICLE 2: Whether sacrifice should be offered to God alone?

OBJ 1: It would seem that sacrifice should not be offered to the most high God alone. Since sacrifice ought to be offered to God, it would seem that it ought to be offered to all such as are partakers of the Godhead. Now **holy men are made "partakers of the Divine nature," according to 2 Peter 1:4; wherefore of them is it written (Psalm 82:6): "I have said, You are gods": and angels too are called "sons of God," according to Job 1:6.** Thus sacrifice should be offered to all these.

OBJ 2: Further, **the greater a person is the greater the honor due to him from man.** Now the angels and saints are far greater than any earthly princes: and **yet the subjects of the latter pay them much greater honor, by prostrating before them, and offering them gifts,** than is implied by offering an animal or any other thing in sacrifice. Much more therefore may one offer sacrifice to the angels and saints.

OBJ 3: Further, temples and altars are raised for the offering of sacrifices. Yet temples and altars are raised to angels and saints. Therefore sacrifices also may be offered to them.

On the contrary, It is written (Exodus 22:20): "He that sacrificeth to gods shall be put to death, save only to the Lord."

I answer that, As stated above (A1), **a sacrifice [oblatio] is offered in order that something may be represented.** Now the sacrifice that is offered outwardly represents the inward spiritual sacrifice, whereby the soul offers itself to God according to Psalm 51:17, "A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit," since, as stated above (Q81,A7; Q84,A2), the outward acts of religion are directed to the inward acts.

Again **the soul offers itself in sacrifice to God as its beginning by creation, and its end by beatification:** and according to the true faith God alone is the **creator** of our souls, as stated in the I, q. 90,A3; I-II, q. 114, a. 2, while **in Him alone the beatitude of our soul consists**, as stated above (I-II q. 1, a. 8; , q. 2, a. 8; q. 3, aa. 1,7,8).

Wherefore **just as to God alone ought we to offer spiritual sacrifice, so too ought we to offer outward sacrifices to Him alone:** even so "in our prayers and praises we proffer significant words to Him to Whom in our hearts we offer the things which we designate thereby," as Augustine states (De Civitate Dei x,19). Moreover we find that in every country the people are

wont to show the sovereign ruler some special sign of honor, and that if this be shown to anyone else, it is a crime of high-treason. Therefore, in the Divine law, the death punishment is assigned to those who offer Divine honor to another than God.

Reply OBJ 1: The name of the Godhead is communicated to certain ones, not equally with God, **but by participation**; hence neither is equal honor due to them.

Reply OBJ 2: **The offering of a sacrifice is measured not by the value of the animal killed, but by its signification, for it is done in honor of the sovereign Ruler of the whole universe.** Wherefore, as Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,19), "the demons rejoice, not in the stench of corpses, but in receiving divine honors."

Reply OBJ 3: As Augustine says (De Civitate Dei viii,19), "we do not raise temples and priesthoods to the martyrs, because not they but their God is our God. Wherefore the priest says not: I offer sacrifice to thee, Peter or Paul. **But we give thanks to God for their triumphs, and urge ourselves to imitate them.**"

†

QUESTION 22: OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST

ARTICLE 2: Whether Christ was Himself both priest and victim?

OBJ 1: It would seem that Christ Himself was not both priest and victim. For it is the duty of the priest to slay the victim. But Christ did not kill Himself. Therefore He was not both priest and victim.

OBJ 2: Further, the priesthood of Christ has a greater similarity to the Jewish priesthood, instituted by God, than to the priesthood of the Gentiles, by which the demons were worshiped. Now in the Old Law man was never offered up in sacrifice: whereas this was very much to be reprehended in the sacrifices of the Gentiles, according to Psalm 106:38: "They shed innocent blood; the blood of their sons and of their daughters, which they sacrificed to the idols of Chanaan." Therefore in Christ's priesthood the Man Christ should not have been the victim.

OBJ 3: Further, **every victim, through being offered to God, is consecrated to God.** But the humanity of Christ was from the beginning consecrated and united to God. Therefore it cannot be said fittingly that Christ as man was a victim.

On the contrary, The Apostle says (Ephesians 5:2): "Christ hath loved us, and hath **delivered Himself for us, an oblation and a victim** [Douay: sacrifice] to God for an odor of sweetness."

I answer that, As **Augustine** says (**De Civitate Dei x,5**): "**Every visible sacrifice is a sacrament, that is a sacred sign, of the invisible sacrifice.**" Now the invisible sacrifice is that by which a man offers his spirit to God, according to Psalm 51:19: "**A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit.**" Wherefore, **whatever is offered to God in order to raise man's spirit to Him, may be called a sacrifice.**

Now man is required to offer sacrifice for three reasons.

First, for **the remission of sin**, by which he is turned away from God. Hence the Apostle says (Hebrews 5:1) that it appertains to the priest "to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins."

Secondly, that **man may be preserved in a state of grace**, by ever adhering to God, wherein his peace and salvation consist. Wherefore under the Old Law the sacrifice of peace-offerings was offered up for the salvation of the offerers, as is prescribed in the third chapter of Leviticus.

Thirdly, in order **that the spirit of man be perfectly united to God**: which will be **most perfectly realized in glory**. Hence, under the Old Law, the holocaust was offered, so called because the victim was **wholly burnt**, as we read in the first chapter of Leviticus.

Now these effects were conferred on us by the humanity of Christ.

- For, in the first place, **our sins were blotted out**, according to Romans 4:25: "Who was delivered up for our sins."

- Secondly, through Him **we received the grace of salvation**, according to Hebrews 5:9: "**He became to all that obey Him the cause of eternal salvation.**" - Thirdly, through Him we have acquired **the perfection of glory**, according to Hebrews 10:19: "We have [Vulgate: Having] a confidence in the entering into the Holies" (i.e. the heavenly glory) "through His Blood."

Therefore **Christ Himself, as man, was not only priest, but also a perfect victim, being at the same time victim for sin, victim for a peace-offering, and a holocaust.**

Reply OBJ 1: Christ did not slay Himself, but **of His own free-will He exposed Himself to death**, according to Isaiah 53:7: "He was offered because it was His own will." Thus He is said to have offered Himself.

Reply OBJ 2: The slaying of the Man Christ may be referred to a twofold will.

First, to the will of those who slew Him: and in this respect He was not a victim: for the slayers of Christ are not accounted as offering a sacrifice to God, but as **guilty of a great crime**: a similitude of which was borne by the wicked sacrifices of the Gentiles, in which they offered up men to idols.

Secondly, the slaying of Christ may be considered in reference to the will of the Sufferer, Who **freely offered Himself to suffering**. In this respect He is a victim, and in this He differs from the sacrifices of the Gentiles.

(The reply to the third objection is wanting in the original manuscripts, but it may be gathered from the above.) (Some editions, however, give the following reply:) Reply OBJ 3: The fact that Christ's manhood was holy from its beginning does not prevent that same manhood, when it was offered to God in the Passion, being **sanctified in a new way - namely, as a victim actually offered then**. For it acquired then **the actual holiness of a victim, from the charity which it had from the beginning, and from the grace of union** sanctifying it **absolutely**.

As a result, **sacrifice** is comprised of a two-fold element: For indeed, should the internal sacrifice be lack the external sacrifice not only would be like **a body without a soul**, but it would be **a false sign, a lie** and **injurious to God**. *My sacrifice is this broken heart!* [Ps 51: 19] - *For it is impossible that with the blood of oxen ad goats sin should be taken away...* [Heb 10:4]. Therefore, even though under the respect of external worship, an external act is its principle symbolic element – nonetheless, in order that an act of the virtue of religion, or under the perspective of the moral goodness, it is necessary that **the internal element should prevail**. Yet. Whether essentially there is required that the symbolic act of religion should be complete. For this reason, then, **the more perfect the sacrificial act is meant to be, so much the more perfect should the oblation of the spirit and so much the more perfect should this oblation be externally manifested**.

2. **Sacrifice** is a certain **oblation**, i.e. the direct handing over of a certain gift to God, or is to be exhibited for His worship, or so that **the gift exhibited might be truly sacred and offered to God**. '**Oblation**' might be taken **generically**, in so far as it comprehends **a mere oblation**. It can also be specifically taken, or considered to be properly **a sacrificial oblation**. **Mere Oblation** is said when concerning the reality offered **nothing is done**.

However, if the reality that is offered in some way **is changed**, as when the wine is poured out or the bread is broken or is blessed, or **when the victim is immolated or burned**, so that the **offered reality is removed, so that it is made clear that it is totally withdrawn from profane use**, there is had **an oblation**, that is **specifically sacrificial**, or a sacrifice, in that **it is perfectly made sacred**:

Reply OBJ 3: A **sacrifice**, properly speaking, requires that something be **done to the thing which is offered to God**, for instance animals were **slain** and **burnt**, the bread is **broken, eaten, blessed**. The very word signifies this, since sacrifice is so called because a man does something sacred [**facit sacrum**].

On the other hand **an oblation** is properly the offering of something to God even if nothing be done thereto, thus we speak of **offering money or bread** at the altar, and yet **nothing is done to them**.

Hence **every sacrifice is an oblation, but not conversely**. First-fruits are oblations, because they were offered to God, according to Deuteronomy 26, but **they are not a sacrifice, because nothing sacred was done to them**. Tithes, however, are neither a sacrifice nor an oblation, properly speaking, because they are not offered immediately to God, but to the ministers of Divine worship. [II-II, q. 85, a.3 ad 3um].

†

QUESTION 86: OF OBLATIONS AND FIRST-FRUITS

ARTICLE 1: Whether men are under a necessity of precept to make oblations?

OBJ 1: It would seem that men are not bound by precept to make oblations. Men are not bound, at the time of the Gospel, to observe the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law, as stated above (FS,Q103,AA3,4). Now since it is written (Exodus 23:14): "Three times every year you **the offering of oblations is one of the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law**, shall celebrate feasts with Me," and further on (Exodus 23:15): "Thou shalt not appear empty before Me." Therefore men are not now under a necessity of precept to make oblations.

OBJ 2: Further, before they are made, oblations depend on man's will, as appears from our Lord's saying (Matthew 5:23), "If . . . thou offer thy gift at the

altar,” as though this were left to the choice of the offerer: and when once oblations have been made, there is no way of offering them again. Therefore in no way is a man under a necessity of precept to make oblations.

OBJ 3: Further, if anyone is bound to give a certain thing to the Church, and fails to give it, he can be compelled to do so by being deprived of the Church’s sacraments. But it would seem unlawful to refuse the sacraments of the Church to those who refuse to make oblations according to a decree of the sixth council (Canon Trullan 23), quoted Decretals I,Q1, canon Nullus): “Let none who dispense Holy Communion exact anything of the recipient, and if they exact anything let them be deposed.” Therefore it is not necessary that men should make oblations.

On the contrary, Gregory VII says (Concil. Roman. V, Canon 12): “**Let every Christian take care that he offer something to God at the celebration of Mass.**”

I answer that, As stated above (Q85,A3,r 3), **the term oblation is common to all things offered for the Divine worship, so that if a thing be offered to be destroyed in worship of God, as though it were being made into something holy, it is both an oblation and a sacrifice.**

Wherefore it is written (Exodus 29:18): “Thou shalt offer **the whole ram** for a burnt-offering upon the altar; it is **an oblation to the Lord, a most sweet savor of the victim of the Lord**”; and (Leviticus 2:1): “When anyone shall offer an oblation of sacrifice to the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour.”

If, on the other hand, **it be offered with a view to its remaining entire and being deputed to the worship of God or to the use of His ministers, it will be an oblation and not a sacrifice.** Accordingly it is essential to oblations of this kind that they be offered voluntarily, according to Exodus 25:2, of “every man that offereth of his own accord you shall take them.”

Nevertheless it may happen in four ways that one is bound to make oblations.

First, on account of **a previous agreement**: as when a person is granted a portion of Church land, that he may make certain oblations at fixed times, although this has the character of rent.

Secondly, by reason of **a previous assignment or promise**; as when a man offers a gift among the living, or by will bequeaths to the Church

something whether movable or immovable to be delivered at some future time.

Thirdly, on account of **the need of the Church**, for instance if her ministers were without means of support.

Fourthly, on account of custom; for the faithful are bound at certain solemn feasts to make certain customary oblations.

In the last two cases, however, the oblation remains voluntary, as regards, to wit, the quantity or kind of the thing offered.

Reply OBJ 1: Under the New Law men are not bound to make oblations on account of legal solemnities, as stated in Exodus, but **on account of certain other reasons**, as stated above.

Reply OBJ 2: Some are bound to make oblations, both before making them, as in the first, third, and fourth cases, and after they have made them by assignment or promise: for they are bound to offer in reality that which has been already offered to the Church by way of assignment.

Reply OBJ 3: Those who do not make the oblations they are bound to make may be punished by being deprived of the sacraments, not by the priest himself to whom the oblations should be made, lest he seem to exact, something for bestowing the sacraments, but by someone superior to him.

†

Therefore, **oblation** specifically understood and **sacrifice** are opposed in contrary manner as a species under one genus. For St. Thomas, therefore, it is impossible for **sacrifice** to be constituted formally by **oblation** unless according to its genus. In this way should those texts of the Holy Doctor be understood in which he teaches, for example, that the **Eucharist is a sacrifice in so far as it is offered, i.e. in so far as it is offered, and not as It is assumed**. **Receiving** the Eucharist pertains to the nature of the **sacrament**; and **oblation** pertains to the nature of **sacrifice** [III, q. 79, a. 7, ad 3^{um}]. This Sacrament is **both a sacrifice and a sacrament**; but it exhibits the nature of **sacrifice** in so far as it is **offered**; it exhibits the nature of **sacrament** in so far as it is **received**. [ib., a. 5]. The Eucharist as a Sacrament is ordered to reception as spiritual food; as a sacrifice it is ordered toward worship as an act of cult, and so it is an **oblation** generically speaking although **it is truly offered specifically as a sacrament**.

Even though among some pagan peoples there might not be had a clear distinction between **oblation** and **sacrifice**, this is found rather commonly and specially in the OT.

3. Concerning the special symbolism of the sacrificial act: from natural reason it is clear that that human beings use sensible realities offering them to God as a sign of their due subjection and honor rendered to Him. [II-II, q. 85, a. 1]. And in the supernatural religion it immediately pertains to God to determine the nature of that sign, especially by reason of the **sacrifice for the removal of sin**. The symbolic act is placed in **recognition of God, the Absolute Lord and our total subjection to Him**: As a result, it is most strictly reserved to God, or to God alone the sacrifice that is to be offered. Therefore, the proper end of the sacrificial act is to honor God by recognizing His supreme dominion [by an act of **latriae**], as well as **for thanking God for the benefits already received** [in the **Eucharistic** act], also for **begging from God those helps that we need** [by an **imprecatory** act] and **satisfaction** for sins, by exhibiting [by the **propitiatory** act].

Indeed every sacrifice as such tends toward all these diverse proximate ends at least **implicitly**, even though one or other of them it might **the more explicitly tend**. Moreover, since sacrifice is an act of the virtue of religion by which the due worship of God is rendered to Him, is ordained as toward an ultimate end at the same time to that perfection of charity for God as by a holy society.

4. The act of public worship has to be offered by a legitimate minister [cf. II-II, q. 85, a. 4]:

QUESTION 85: OF SACRIFICE

ARTICLE 4: Whether all are bound to offer sacrifices?

OBJ 1: It would seem that all are not bound to offer sacrifices. The Apostle says (Romans 3:19): "What things soever the Law speaketh, it speaketh to them that are in the Law." Now the law of sacrifices was not given to all, but only to the Hebrew people. Therefore all are not bound to offer sacrifices.

OBJ 2: Further, **sacrifices are offered to God in order to signify something**. But not everyone is capable of understanding these significations. Therefore not all are bound to offer sacrifices .

OBJ 3: Further, priests (Sacerdotes: Those who give or administer sacred things [**sacra dantes**]: 1 Corinthians 4:1) are so called because they offer sacrifice to God. But all are not priests. Therefore not all are bound to offer sacrifices.

On the contrary, The **offering of sacrifices is of the natural law**, as stated above (A1). Now all are bound to do that which is of the natural law. Therefore all are bound to offer sacrifice to God.

I answer that, **Sacrifice is twofold, as stated above** (a. 2). The first and principal is the **inward sacrifice, which all are bound to offer, since all are obliged to offer to God a devout mind**. The other is the **outward sacrifice**, and this again is twofold:

- There is a sacrifice which is deserving of praise merely through being offered to God **in protestation of our subjection to God**: and the obligation of offering this sacrifice was not the same for those under the New or the Old Law, as for those who were not under the Law. For those who are under the Law are bound to offer certain definite sacrifices according to the precepts of the Law, whereas those who were not under the Law were bound to perform certain outward actions **in God's honor**, as became those among whom they dwelt, but not definitely to this or that action.

-The other **outward sacrifice** is when **the outward actions of the other virtues are performed out of reverence for God**; some of which are a matter of precept; and to these all are bound, while others are works of supererogation, and to these all are not bound.

Reply OBJ 1: All were not bound to offer those particular sacrifices which were prescribed in the Law: but **they were bound to some sacrifices inward or outward**, as stated above.

Reply OBJ 2: Though all do not know explicitly the power of the sacrifices, **they know it implicitly**, even as they have implicit faith, as stated above (Q2,AA 6,7).

Reply OBJ 3: **The priests offer those sacrifices which are specially directed to the Divine worship**, not only for themselves but also for others. But there **are other sacrifices, which anyone can offer to God for himself** as explained above (AA2,3).

Indeed **sacrifice is the principal act of external and public worship which ought to be rendered to God through His minister deputed for**

this. Neither does any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God...[cf. Heb. 5:4]. This minister properly is the priest.

Therefore, a sacrifice properly and strictly speaking can be defined: **It is an oblation is a sensible reality that is figurative of the recognition of the supreme God and Lord and of our subjection to God alone, offered by a legitimate minister, or a priest.**

A Division of Sacrifice

Sacrifice properly and strictly understood in so far as it is a special act of the cult or the virtue of religion is not divided into further species properly so called, but into species-like ideas in so far as different sacrifices ordinarily are fitting according to a greater or lesser degree proportionately in the one ideal of worship that is due to God alone.

In treating of the causes of the Old Law ceremonial precepts, and in particular concerning those which pertain to sacrifices, the Holy Doctor distinguishes a three-fold or fourfold genus of sacrifices [**I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 8 um**]:

Reply OBJ 8: There were **three kinds of sacrifices**.

- There was one in which the **victim was entirely consumed by fire**: this was called a **holocaust**, i.e. all burnt. For this kind of sacrifice was offered to God specially to show **reverence to His majesty, and love of His goodness**: and typified the state of perfection as regards the fulfillment of the counsels. Wherefore the whole was burnt up: so that as **the whole animal by being dissolved into vapor soared aloft, so it might denote that the whole man, and whatever belongs to him, are subject to the authority of God, and should be offered to Him.**

- Another sacrifice was the **sin-offering**, which was offered to God **on account of man's need for the forgiveness of sin: and this typifies the state of penitents in satisfying for sins**. It was divided into two parts:

- for one part was **burnt**;

- while the other was granted to **the use of the priests** to signify that **remission of sins is granted by God through the ministry of His priests**. When, however, this sacrifice was offered for the sins of the **whole people**, or specially for the sin of the priest, the **whole victim** was burnt up. For it was not fitting that the priests should have the use of that which was offered for

their own sins, to signify that nothing sinful should remain in them. Moreover, this would not be **satisfaction for sin**: for if the offering were granted to the use of those for whose sins it was offered, it would seem to be the same as if it had not been offered.

- The third kind of sacrifice was called the **peace-offering**, which was offered to God, either in **thanksgiving**, or for the **welfare and prosperity** of the offerers, in **acknowledgment of benefits** already received or yet to be received: and this typifies the state of those who are proficient in the observance of the commandments.

These sacrifices were divided into three parts: for **one part was burnt** in honor of God; another part was **allotted to the use of the priests**; and the third part to the **use of the offerers**; in order to signify that man's salvation is from God, by the direction of God's ministers, and through the cooperation of those who are saved.

But it was **the universal rule** that the **blood and fat** were not allotted to the use either of the priests or of the offerers: **the blood** being **poured out at the foot of the altar, in honor of God**, while the fat was burnt upon the altar (Leviticus 9:9,10).

The reasons for this are:

- first, in order to **prevent idolatry**: because idolaters used to drink the blood and eat the fat of the victims, according to Deuteronomy 32:38: "Of whose victims they eat the fat, and drank the wine of their drink-offerings."
- Secondly, in order to **form them to a right way of living**. For they were forbidden the use of the blood that they might abhor the shedding of human blood; wherefore it is written (Genesis 9:4,5): "Flesh with blood you shall not eat: for I will require the blood of your lives": and they were forbidden to eat the fat, in order to withdraw them from lasciviousness; hence it is written (Ezekiel 34:3): "You have killed that which was fat."
- Thirdly, on account of the **reverence due to God**: because blood is most necessary for life, for which reason "life" is said to be "in the blood" (Leviticus 17:11,14): while fat is a sign of abundant nourishment. Wherefore, in order to show that to God we owe both life and a sufficiency of all good things, the blood was poured out, and the fat burnt up in His honor.
- Fourthly, in order to **foreshadow the shedding of Christ's blood**, and **the abundance of His charity, whereby He offered Himself to God for us**. In the peace-offerings, the breast-bone and the right shoulder were allotted to

the use of the priest, in order to prevent a certain kind of divination which is known as *spatulamantia*, so called because it was customary in divining to use the shoulder-blade [spatula], and the breast-bone of the animals offered in sacrifice; wherefore these things were taken away from the offerers. This is also denoted **the priest's need of wisdom in the heart, to instruct the people** - this was signified by the breast-bone, which covers the heart; and his need of **fortitude**, in order to bear with human frailty - and this was signified by the right shoulder.

[ib., OBJ 1: Further, all **the peace-offerings** seem to be of one kind. Therefore it was unfitting to make a distinction among them, so that it was forbidden to eat the flesh of certain peace-offerings on the following day, while **it was allowed to eat the flesh of other peace-offerings**, as laid down in Leviticus 7:15, seqq. [I-II, q. 102, a. 3, ad 8 um].

†

QUESTION 22: OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST

ARTICLE 2: Whether Christ was Himself both priest and victim?

OBJ 1: It would seem that Christ Himself was not **both priest and victim**. For it is the duty of the priest to slay the victim. But Christ did not kill Himself. Therefore He was not both priest and victim.

OBJ 2: Further, the priesthood of Christ has a greater similarity to the Jewish **priesthood, instituted by God**, than to the priesthood of the Gentiles, by which the demons were worshiped. Now **in the Old Law man was never offered up in sacrifice**: whereas this was very much to be reprehended in the sacrifices of the Gentiles, according to Psalm 106:38: "They shed innocent blood; the blood of their sons and of their daughters, which they sacrificed to the idols of Chanaan." Therefore in Christ's priesthood the Man Christ should not have been the victim.

OBJ 3: Further, **every victim, through being offered to God, is consecrated to God**. But **the humanity of Christ was from the beginning consecrated and united to God**. Therefore it cannot be said fittingly that Christ as man was a victim.

On the contrary, The Apostle says (Ephesians 5:2): "Christ hath loved us, and hath delivered Himself for us, **an oblation and a victim** [Douay: sacrifice] to God for an odor of sweetness."

I answer that, As Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,5): "**Every visible sacrifice is a sacrament, that is a sacred sign, of the invisible sacrifice**."

Now the invisible sacrifice is that by which **a man offers his spirit to God**, according to Psalm 51:19: "A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit." Wherefore, **whatever is offered to God in order to raise man's spirit to Him, may be called a sacrifice.**

Now man is required to offer sacrifice for three reasons.

- First, for the remission of sin, by which he is turned away from God. Hence the Apostle says (Hebrews 5:1) that it appertains to the priest "to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins."

- Secondly, that **man may be preserved in a state of grace**, by ever adhering to God, wherein his peace and salvation consist. Wherefore under the Old Law the sacrifice of **peace-offerings** was offered up **for the salvation of the offerers**, as is prescribed in the third chapter of Leviticus.

- Thirdly, in order **that the spirit of man be perfectly united to God**: which will be **most perfectly realized in glory**. Hence, under the Old Law, the **holocaust** was offered, so called because the victim was wholly burnt, as we read in the first chapter of Leviticus. Now these effects were conferred on us by the humanity of Christ:

- For, in the first place, **our sins were blotted out**, according to Romans 4:25: "Who was delivered up for our sins."

- Secondly, through Him **we received the grace of salvation**, according to Hebrews 5:9: "He became to all that obey Him the cause of eternal salvation."

- Thirdly, **through Him we have acquired the perfection of glory**, according to Hebrews 10:19: "We have [Vulgate: Having] a confidence in the entering into the Holies" (i.e. the heavenly glory) "through His Blood."

Therefore **Christ Himself, as man, was not only priest, but also a perfect victim, being at the same time victim for sin, victim for a peace-offering, and a holocaust.**

Reply OBJ 1: Christ did not slay Himself, but **of His own free-will He exposed Himself to death**, according to Isaiah 53:7: "He was offered because it was His own will." Thus He is said to have offered Himself.

Reply OBJ 2: The slaying of the Man Christ may be referred to a twofold will.

- First, to the will of those who slew Him: and in this respect He was not a victim: for the slayers of Christ are not accounted as offering a sacrifice to God,

but as guilty of a great crime: a similitude of which was borne by the wicked sacrifices of the Gentiles, in which they offered up men to idols.

- Secondly, the slaying of Christ may be considered **in reference to the will of the Sufferer, Who freely offered Himself to suffering**. In this respect He is a **victim**, and in this He differs from the sacrifices of the Gentiles.

(The reply to the third objection is wanting in the original manuscripts, but it may be gathered from the above.) (Some editions, however, give the following reply:) Reply OBJ 3: The fact that **Christ's manhood was holy from its beginning does not prevent that same manhood, when it was offered to God in the Passion, being sanctified in a new way** - namely, as a **victim** actually offered then. For it acquired then **the actual holiness of a victim, from the charity which it had from the beginning**, and **from the grace of union sanctifying it absolutely**.

After all this, there are especially three sacrifices properly so called according to the proximate ends, or according to the effects of grace:

[a] **a host for sin** [the reparation for an offence – aversion from sin];

[b] **a pacific host** [in thanksgiving and impetration – the conservation of the state of grace];

[c] **holocaust** [in reverence for the divine majesty – perfect union with God].

It should be properly noted that the sacrifices properly so called are not distinguished according to the superadded differences for some common reason, but only by the explanation of the different aspects of the act of symbolic worship by which there is recognized the supreme dominion of God and our total subjection to Him. Hence, the end of all sacrifice properly so called is *latreutical*. Nonetheless, this end implies several ideas because by reason of sin, we are not worthy to honor, or worship God, unless by **satisfying** for sins; as a result it is necessary that the sacrifice be also **propitiatory**; and moreover it is necessary to honor God as the Principle of all good by rendering Him thanks, and by confidently begging from Him the benefices needed. Hence, sacrifice is **Eucharistic** and **impetratory**.

In addition to this principal division of sacrifice, **in a secondary manner** various categories of sacrifices might be assigned, such as:

[a] according to **the different matters, or realities that are offered**: for some realities are apt to be immolated **in a bloody manner**, by the shedding of

blood – while others, of their very nature, cannot be immolated in this manner, such as salt, bread, wine, incense, and the like.

[b] according to **the very manner by which the sacrificial act is offered**: by a **bloody** immolation properly so called, or in some way, in an unbloody manner. The bloody immolation, properly so called, in a more apt manner signifies a total subjection and expiation.

[c] according to the virtuality of the oblation either from the activity of the one performing it [*ex opere operantis*];, or from the oblation offered in itself [*ex opere operato*], or in both manners.

Furthermore, the very word, *sacrifice*, [to make, render sacred] is extended from its proper significance to an improper one, or to one that it is in some proper, by participation:

[1] Improperly, or **denominatively**, the sacrifice can be applied to any good work whatsoever, in so far as it tends toward this that **we might be sanctified**, or that **we might adhere to God** since in this manner it would also **pertain to the divine reverence**. Thus, **any virtuous act whatsoever** even though formally it might not be an act of the virtue of religion – but rather **because it tends toward the same last end** and therefore it **pertains to divine reverence**. For this reason it can be called a **sacrifice** - whether it be a **merely internal action**, or an **external** one, e.g., to give almost **out of compassion or mercy or from the love of God** [*II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 1 um*]:

QUESTION 85: OF SACRIFICE

ARTICLE 3: Whether the offering of sacrifice is a special act of virtue?

OBJ 1: It would seem that the offering of sacrifice is not a special act of virtue. Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,6): "**A true sacrifice is any work done that we may cleave to God in holy fellowship.**" But not every good work is a special act of some definite virtue. Therefore the offering of sacrifice is not a special act of a definite virtue.

OBJ 2: Further, the mortification of the body by fasting belongs to abstinence, by continence belongs to chastity, by martyrdom belongs to fortitude. Now all these things seem to be comprised in the offering of sacrifice, according to Romans 12:1, "**Present your bodies a living sacrifice.**" Again the Apostle says (Hebrews 13:16): "Do not forget to do good and to impart, for **by such sacrifices God's favor is obtained.**" Now it belongs to

charity, mercy and liberality to do good and to impart. Therefore the offering of sacrifice is not a special act of a definite virtue.

OBJ 3: Further, a **sacrifice is apparently anything offered to God**. Now many things are offered to God, such as **devotion, prayer, tithes, first-fruits, oblations, and holocausts**. Therefore sacrifice does not appear to be a special act of a definite virtue.

On the contrary, The law contains special precepts about sacrifices, as appears from the beginning of Leviticus.

I answer that, As stated above (I-II, q. 18, aa. 6,7), where **an act of one virtue is directed to the end of another virtue it partakes somewhat of its species**; thus when a man thieves in order to commit fornication, his theft assumes, in a sense, the deformity of fornication, so that even though it were not a sin otherwise, it would be a sin from the very fact that it was directed to fornication.

Accordingly, **sacrifice is a special act deserving of praise in that it is done out of reverence for God**; and for this reason it belongs to a definite virtue, viz. religion. But it happens that the acts of the other virtues are **directed to the reverence of God**, as when a man gives alms of his own things for God's sake, or when a man subjects his own body to some affliction out of reverence for God; and in this way the acts also of other virtues may be called sacrifices.

On the other hand there are acts that are not deserving of praise save through **being done out of reverence for God**: such acts are properly called sacrifices, and belong to the virtue of religion.

Reply OBJ 1: **The very fact that we wish to cling to God in a spiritual fellowship pertains to reverence for God; and consequently the act of any virtue assumes the character of a sacrifice through being done in order that we may cling to God in holy fellowship.**

Reply OBJ 2: Man's good is threefold. There is first his **soul's good** which is offered to God in a certain inward sacrifice by devotion, prayer and other like **interior acts**; and **this is the principal sacrifice**. The second is his **body's good**, which is, so to speak, **offered to God in martyrdom, and abstinence or continency**. The third is the good which consists of external things: and of these we **offer a sacrifice to God, directly when we offer our possession to God immediately, and indirectly when we share them with our neighbor for God's sake**.

Reply OBJ 3: A sacrifice, properly speaking, requires that **something be done to the thing which is offered to God**, for instance animals were **slain and burnt**, the bread is **broken, eaten, blessed**. The very word signifies this, since sacrifice is so called because **a man does something sacred [facit sacrum]**. On the other hand **an oblation is properly the offering of something to God** even if nothing be done thereto, thus we speak of offering money or bread at the altar, and yet nothing is done to them. Hence **every sacrifice is an oblation, but not conversely**. First-fruits are oblations, because they were offered to God, according to Deuteronomy 26, but they are not a sacrifice, because **nothing sacred was done to them**. Tithes, however, are neither a sacrifice nor an oblation, properly speaking, because they are not offered immediately to God, but to the ministers of Divine worship.

[2] Furthermore, **participatively 'sacrifice'** might be stated in two ways:

[a] every **act commanded** [*imperatus*] by the virtue of religion as long as it is **being moved toward the object of virtue**, e.g., as when one gives alms from his own goods in order **to honor God himself**, or when someone submits his own body to some affliction **on account of divine reverence** [ib.].

[b] **any act elicited** by the virtue of religion, either internal or external, such as **adoration** [**the Sacrifice of Praise**], and each and every **mere libation**. So even more properly [i.e., generically speaking] each may be called a **sacrifice**. [cf. **II-II, q. 85, a. 3, c** and **objections**].

†††

Article 2

The Internal and External Sacrifice of Jesus Christ

A. Jesus Christ, both Priest and Victim, from the very First Instant of His Earthly Life offered the Perfect Internal Sacrifice.

A perfect internal sacrifice is **a perfect oblation of the mind** by which we honor God by **recognizing His supreme dominion** – by **subjecting our will to the Divine will** - out of perfect charity.

But, Jesus Christ from the very first instant of His earthly life had indeed a mentality of immolation toward God.

Therefore, He offered a perfect **internal oblation**.

As to the Major of this Syllogism: To honor God as the Supreme Lord is an act of the **virtue of religion**. For indeed the subjection of the human will is an act of the **virtue of obedience**, i.e., the will of carrying out and the execution of a precept, or mandate in particular regarding the celebration of the worship of God. And at the same time it is an act of **humility**. The perfect will is that which adheres to God in perfect charity, which is the form and the root of all the virtues. **Charity** itself is that virtue by which the mind is united to God, as our last end, **made as though one spirit with Him** and as such it already implies universally the immolation of one's own will and is compared to a holocaust, totally consumed in the fire of love – even though it is not formally the immolation of the spirit which is an act of the virtue of religion or obedience.

But, a firm will proceeds perfectly in the carrying out all the precepts which are set for the rendering of worship to God. **Obedience** is the subjection of the will to the precept of a superior, and therefore obedience itself is compared to a sacrifice and indeed is preferred to all external sacrifices according to this saying: ***obedience is better than sacrifices***. [1 S 15:22]. For a **sacrifice**, there is **immolated** the flesh of something else – whereas by obedience there is offered one's own will, as Gregory notes:

Reply OBJ 1: Obedience proceeds from reverence, which pays worship and honor to a superior, and in this respect it is contained under different virtues, although considered in itself, as regarding the aspect of precept, it is one special virtue. Accordingly, in so far as it proceeds from reverence for a **superior**, it is contained, in a way, under **observance**; while in so far as it proceeds from reverence for one's **parents**, it is contained under **piety**; and in so far as it proceeds from reverence for God, it comes under **religion**, and pertains to devotion, which is the principal act of religion. Wherefore from this point of view it **is more praiseworthy to obey God than to offer sacrifice**, as well as because, "in a sacrifice we slay another's body, whereas by obedience we slay our own will," as Gregory says (*Moralium xxxv*). As to the special case in which Samuel spoke, it would have been better for Saul to obey God than to offer in sacrifice the fat animals of the Amalekites against the commandment of God. [*II-II, q. 104, a. 3, ad 1 um*].

Charity is the principle and the last end, too. **Religion** [is the potential part of Justice] is the proximate **elicitive** principle of the formally act of worship. **Obedience** is the medium which charity employs for the carrying

out of the precept regarding worship, much like a **spiritual sword**. Therefore, in brief, the **internal sacrifice**, or the **sacrificial act** is the will of **worshipping God out of charity and obedience**.

As to the Minor of the Syllogism above: out of perfect charity, Jesus Christ wanted to honor God, i.e., He was read to carry out the precept of the Father concerning of restoring the proper and, therefore, the perfect worship. He enjoyed perfect charity, the perfect will of carrying out the precept imposed on Him, that of the perfect will of worshipping God.

[1] He enjoyed **the perfect will** from the very first instant of His terrestrial life:

[a] because He was 'sanctified' and **filled with perfect charity** for the very first action of His free will which He had from the first instant of His human life.

[b] because He knew the precept of the Father: ***This precept I received from my Father.*** [Jn 10: 18].

[c] this precept concerning worship, i.e., that of **immolating Himself** for the purpose of **instituting the perfect worship**, by accepting it freely and obediently: ... ***Wherefore when He comes into the world, He says: Sacrifice and oblation you would not: but a body You fitted to Me ... Holocaust for sin did not please You ... Then I said: Behold I come: in the head of the book it is written of Me: that I should do Your Will, o God...*** [Heb 10:5-7].

[2] **He maintained this will [of immolation] for His entire Life :** ... ***My food is to do the will of Him that sent Me that I may perfect His work*** ... [Jn 4:34] - ... ***did you not know that I must be about My Father's Business...***? [Lk 2:48]. Throughout His entire life His Passion was present to Him, and He kept it there as His **principal task** and the **consummation** of His entire life.

Mt 16:21, 24: ... ***From that time Jesus began to show to His disciples, that He must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the ancients and scribes, and chief priests, and be put to death, and the third day rise again*** ...

Mk 8: 32, 34: ... ***And Peter began ... to rebuke Him... Go behind Me, Satan, because you savor not the things that are of God, but that are of men*** ...

Lk 12:50: ...*And I have a baptism where with I am to be baptized: and how am I straitened until it be accomplished?*

Ph 2:8: ...*He humbled Himself becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the Cross...*

[3] Nonetheless, this will by which Christ by **the act of charity, obedience and religion** was always prepared for the precept to carry out the worship of God through the was not simply an ac bloody **immolation** of Himself was **not a sacrificial act** simply, or an **actual oblation of the Sacrifice of Himself** – because He had not yet carried out the external symbolic sign. Or, in other words, He had not yet handed Himself over to **His passion present in act**. There was, of course, that **sacrificial act** as well as the **internal sacrifice** but strictly speaking that **internal sacrifice** which is indeed the **formal part** of the sacrifice properly so called, did not suffer from any defect of the **sacrificial mind** – which **was always present to Him as His form of agape**. The fact is, **His Hour had not yet come**!

B] CONCERNING HIS BLOODY SACRIFICE – JESUS CHRIST, AS PRIEST, OFFERED ON THE CROSS BOTH HIS INTERNAL AND HIS EXTERNAL SACRIFICE

[1] This is indeed **the teaching of the Catholic Church**, even though it has not been solemnly defined in express terms:

Council of Ephesus [431] The Anathemisms of St. Cyril, can. 10:

... The Divine Scripture says that **Christ was made a high priest and apostle** of our confession [Heb3:1] and in the odor of fragrance **offered Himself to God and the Father for us** [Ep 5:2]... [Denz.122].

IVth Lateran Council [1215]:

... one Person in two natures... according to humanity was made passible and mortal, who, for the salvation of the human race, having **suffered on the wood of the Cross and died**, descended into hell, arose from the dead and **ascended** into heaven... [Denz. 429].

Council of Trent [Sept. 17, 1562] [Session 22, c. 2]:

... He, therefore, our God and Lord, though He was about to offer Himself to God the Father **upon the altar of the Cross by the mediation of death** ... [cf. Heb 7: 24, 27]... [Denz. 938].

Indeed, for this, Jesus Christ was constituted man in passible flesh, both priest and victim, so that by His bloody sacrifice He might reconcile human beings to God by fulfilling the Father's mandate concerning divine worship. From the Gospels [cf. Mt 20: 28, from the Epistles of Paul, from that to the Hebrews, the Letters of Peter and John as well as from the Apocalypse: *Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him Who takes away the sins of the World* [Jn 1:29, 36; 10:18] - *Walk in love as Christ has also loved us, and has delivered Himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweetness...* [Ep 5:2] - ... *you were redeemed... with the precious blood of Christ as a lamb unspotted and undefiled* ... [1 P 1:18, 19] - ... *And they sung a new canticle, saying: You are worthy, O Lord, to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; because You were slain, and have redeemed us to God, in Your blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation...* [Rv 5:9] ... *These are they who are come out of the great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and have made them white in the blood of the Lamb...* [Rv. 7:14].

The entire Document to the Hebrews treats of Jesus Christ, the great High Priest of Mercy and His bloody sacrifice – perhaps a most thorough commentary on the **OT Leviticus**. The Sacrifices of the Old Law are thought of by Christians as prophetic types of the sacrifice of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ. This same doctrine is very evident in **the Liturgy, the daily silent Magisterium of the Mysteries**: Christ Jesus is immolated as our Pasch [from the Easter Preface]. Furthermore, the entire Liturgy either flows toward or from the Eucharistic Mystery, which is the Memorial of the Passion of Jesus Christ.

[2] The elements of the true and perfect sacrifice are found in the passion and death of Jesus Christ on the Cross, i.e., the **matter** of the sacrifice, the **sensible reality, i.e., the Host, the Legitimate Priest, and the act of the immolative oblation.**

[a] **The sensible matter, destined for the Sacrifice, or the Host determined by God**: From the very beginning of His life Jesus was the Host dedicated to God by the strength of the hypostatic union itself, ordained, orientated, by the divine decree, toward the redemption by means of a **bloody immolation**. In His Passion, this Host is **actually exhibited**:

On the contrary, The Apostle says (Ephesians 5:2): "Christ hath loved us, and hath delivered Himself for us, **an oblation and a victim** [Douay: **sacrifice**] **to God** for an odor of sweetness."

I answer that, As Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,5): "**Every visible sacrifice is a sacrament, that is a sacred sign, of the invisible sacrifice.**" Now **the invisible sacrifice is that by which a man offers his spirit to God, according to Psalm 51:19: "A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit."** Wherefore, **whatever is offered to God** in order **to raise man's spirit to Him**, may be called a sacrifice.

Now man is required to offer sacrifice for three reasons. First, for the **remission of sin**, by which he is turned away from God. Hence the Apostle says (Hebrews 5:1) that it appertains to the priest "to offer gifts and **sacrifices for sins**." Secondly, that man may be **preserved in a state of grace**, by ever adhering to God, wherein his **peace** and **salvation** consist. Wherefore under the Old Law the sacrifice of **peace-offerings** was offered up for the salvation of the offerers, as is prescribed in the third chapter of Leviticus.

Thirdly, in order that the spirit of man **be perfectly united to God**: which will be most **perfectly realized in glory**. Hence, under the Old Law, the **holocaust** was offered, so called because the victim was wholly burnt, as we read in the first chapter of Leviticus.

Now these effects were **conferred on us by the humanity of Christ**. For, in the first place, **our sins were blotted out**, according to Romans 4:25: "Who was delivered up for our sins."

Secondly, through Him we received **the grace of salvation**, according to Hebrews 5:9: "He became to all that obey Him the cause of eternal salvation."

Thirdly, through Him we have **acquired the perfection of glory**, according to Hebrews 10:19: "We have [Vulgate: Having] a confidence in the entering into the Holies" (i.e. the heavenly glory) "through His Blood."

Therefore Christ Himself, as man, was not only priest, but also a perfect victim, being at the same time **victim for sin**, **victim for a peace-offering**, and a **holocaust**.

Reply OBJ 1: Christ did not slay Himself, but of His own free-will He exposed Himself to death, according to Isaiah 53:7: "**He was offered because it was His own will.**" Thus He is said to have **offered Himself**.

Reply OBJ 2: The slaying of the Man Christ may be referred to a twofold will. First, to the will of those who slew Him: and in this respect He

was not a victim: for the slayers of Christ are not accounted as offering a sacrifice to God, but as guilty of a great crime: a similitude of which was borne by the wicked sacrifices of the Gentiles, in which they offered up men to idols.

Secondly, the slaying of Christ may be considered **in reference to the will of the Sufferer**, Who **freely offered Himself** to suffering. In this respect He is a victim, and in this He differs from the sacrifices of the Gentiles.

(The reply to the third objection is wanting in the original manuscripts, but it may be gathered from the above.) (Some editions, however, give the following reply:

Reply OBJ 3: The fact that **Christ's manhood was holy from its beginning** does not prevent that **same manhood, when it was offered to God in the Passion, being sanctified in a new way** – namely, as a victim **actually offered** then. For it acquired then the actual holiness of a victim, from the charity which it had from the beginning, and from the grace of union sanctifying it absolutely. **[III, q. 22, a. 2]**.

†

Jesus was always a Host, Victim, actually, according to **His own internal free choice, by which from the beginning**, He always accepted His future passion: **while on the Cross He accepted His passion as present**. It is not required that the Passion and death be **always present at the same time physically**, with the internal action - but only **morally** speaking. Therefore, as a result, **from the Last Supper on, He might be said to be a Victim, Host, actually present.**

[b] Jesus Christ is the legitimate Priest, instituted by God Himself that He might supply satisfaction for the human race.

[c] The internal and external Act of Immolative Oblation – or, the symbolic oblation which is figurative of the Oblation of the Mind: even though according to some authors [e.g. Lepin, de la Taille], for the sacrifice there is not required the **immolation, at least as actual** – for these authors, there would suffice the oblation of the Victim. However, that oblation of Christ was performed in an **immolative manner**. **Out of charity**, Christ voluntarily offered Himself to His Passion and to death: ... ***Upon a high and lofty mountain, You have laid Your bed, and have gone up thither to offer victims...*** [Is 57:7] - Christ did not slay Himself, but of His own free-will He exposed Himself to death, according to Isaiah 53:7: "**He was offered**

because it was His own will." Thus He is said to have **offered Himself**. [St. Thomas, above] - Christ's Passion was indeed a malefice on His slayers' part; **but on His own it was the sacrifice of one suffering out of charity**. Hence it is Christ who is said to have offered this sacrifice, and not the executioners. [**III, q. 48, a. 2, ad 3 um**]. By an **act of religion**, Jesus Christ as Priest **offered Himself** in the reconciliation of the human race. He handed Himself over for our salvation as an oblation and a host [cf. Ep 5:2]. ***He humbled Himself and made Himself obedient even unto death!*** [Ph 2:8]:

III, QUESTION 47: OF THE EFFICIENT CAUSE OF CHRIST'S PASSION

ARTICLE 2: Whether Christ died out of obedience?

OBJ 1: It would seem that Christ did not die out of obedience. For obedience is referred to a command. But we do not read that Christ was commanded to suffer. Therefore He did not suffer out of obedience.

OBJ 2: Further, a man is said to do from obedience what he does from necessity of precept. But **Christ did not suffer necessarily, but voluntarily**. Therefore He did not suffer out of obedience.

OBJ 3: Further, **charity is a more excellent virtue than obedience**. But we read that **Christ suffered out of charity**, according to Ephesians 5:2: "Walk in love, as Christ also has loved us, and delivered Himself up for us." Therefore Christ's Passion ought to be ascribed rather to charity than to obedience.

On the contrary, It is written (Philippians 2:8): **"He became obedient to the Father unto death."**

I answer that, It was befitting **that Christ should suffer out of obedience**.

First of all, because it was **in keeping with human justification, that "as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners: so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just,"** as is written Romans 5:19.

Secondly, it was suitable for reconciling man with God: hence it is written (Romans 5:10): "We are reconciled to God by the death of His Son," in so far as **Christ's death was a most acceptable sacrifice to God**, according to Ephesians 5:2: "He delivered Himself for us **an oblation and a sacrifice to God** for an odor of sweetness." Now obedience is preferred to all sacrifices, according to 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 15:22: **"Obedience is better than sacrifices."**

Therefore it was fitting that the sacrifice of Christ's Passion and death should proceed from obedience.

Thirdly, it was in keeping with His victory whereby He triumphed over death and its author; because **a soldier cannot conquer unless he obeys his captain**. And so the Man-Christ secured the victory through being obedient to God, according to Proverbs 21:28: "**An obedient man shall speak of victory.**"

Reply OBJ 1: **Christ received a command from the Father to suffer**. For it is written (John 10:18): "I have power to lay down My life, and I have power to take it up again: (and) **this commandment have I received of My Father**" - namely, of laying down His life and of resuming it again. "From which," as Chrysostom says (Hom. 59 in Joannis), it is not to be understood "that at first He awaited the command, and that He had need to be told, but **He showed the proceeding to be a voluntary one, and destroyed suspicion of opposition**" to the Father. Yet because the Old Law was ended by Christ's death, according to His dying words, "It is consummated" (John 19:30), it may be understood that **by His suffering He fulfilled all the precepts of the Old Law**.

He fulfilled those of the moral order which are **founded on the precepts of charity**, inasmuch as He suffered both out of love of the Father, according to John 14:31: "That the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father hath given Me commandment, so do I: arise, let us go hence" - namely, to the place of His Passion: and out of love of His neighbor, according to Galatians 2:20: "He loved me, and delivered Himself up for me."

Christ likewise by His Passion fulfilled the ceremonial precepts of the Law, which are chiefly ordained for sacrifices and oblations, in so far as all the ancient sacrifices were figures of that true sacrifice which the dying Christ offered for us. Hence it is written (Colossians 2:16,17): "Let no man judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ's," for the reason that Christ is compared to them as a body is to a shadow.

Christ also by His Passion fulfilled the judicial precepts of the Law, which are chiefly ordained for making compensation to them who have suffered wrong, since, as is written Psalm 69:4: He "paid that which" He "took not away," suffering Himself to be fastened to a tree on account of the apple which man had plucked from the tree against God's command.

Reply OBJ 2: Although **obedience implies necessity with regard to the thing commanded, nevertheless it implies free-will with regard to the fulfilling of the precept**. And, indeed, such was Christ's obedience, for,

although His Passion and death, considered in themselves, were repugnant to the natural will, yet **Christ resolved to fulfill God's will with respect to the same, according to Psalm 40:8: "That I should do Thy will: O my God, I have desired it."** Hence He said (Matthew 26:42): "If this chalice may not pass away, but I must drink it, **Thy will be done.**"

Reply OBJ 3: For the same reason **Christ suffered out of charity and out of obedience;** because He **fulfilled even the precepts of charity out of obedience only; and was obedient, out of love, to the Father's command.**

†

The Passion which Christ freely sustained on the Cross, not only sufficiently – but, rather, **most perfectly** - expresses His **internal sacrifice which He, as Priest, made Himself the Victim of His own Sacrifice.**

NOTE: It is objected that a ritual action is required for *sacrifice*. Moreover, Christ on the Cross did not offer Himself by a ritual action, nor according to any ritual known to the Old Law, nor according to any ritual instituted by Himself, unless one admits with M. de la Taille, that the ritual oblation of the Last Supper, together with His bloody death on the Cross, would constitute a sacrifice, and that thus the Eucharistic Sacrifice would be the ritual oblation of the Victim, once immolated, in accord with the definition of sacrifice put together by this author, that became well known: i.e., *a sacrifice is the oblation of the victim either immolated, or one to be immolated*. However, it needs to be pointed out that Christ the supreme High Priest of Mercy in the New Law, to Whom it pertains to institute the new ritual, is not held personally by any ritual. The Passion which Jesus Christ freely sustained on the Cross exceeded all ritual.

†††

Article 3

Concerning the PERPETUITY of the Sacrifice of the Cross

A.] In General, all Christ's actions and passions, the Event of His Life and Death and His Resurrection - as well as all the Mysteries no matter how far back they go, are in some way perpetual, i.e., as the Meritorious Cause, and the Satisfactory Cause, with these exceptions: those which follow His Death, and which universally are an Exemplary Cause and as an Efficient Instrumental Cause.

1. The Meritorious and Satisfactory Cause in Perpetuity

Jesus Christ, in virtue of His hypostatic Union, ordained into redemption, and in the power of His Grace as Head, by which He is almost **a mystical person with human beings**, is constituted as the **Mediator** in His blood. He has satisfied super-abundantly for all sins and has merited the grace of salvation for all human beings **in perpetuity**, nor is there salvation in anyone else. And indeed Jesus Christ is the **universal and perpetual, meritorious and satisfactory Cause**, through **all that He accomplished and suffered**, and the same reasoning is true of everything **from His Crib to Cross**. Each and every act of Christ As Savior is ordained, orientated, toward the salvation of sinners, or to **making satisfaction for all sin, and for meriting**, and would have been sufficient from the part of the deed offered, as it is **the activity of the God-Man**. However, God, on account of our need, ordained it so that the fruit of human salvation would not have followed **unless Jesus Christ had suffered these things**:

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Trinitate xiii): "We assert that the way whereby God deigned to deliver us by the man Jesus Christ, who is mediator between God and man, is both good and befitting the Divine dignity; but let us also show that other possible means were not lacking on God's part, to whose power all things are equally subordinate."

I answer that, A thing may be said to be possible or impossible in two ways: first of all, **simply and absolutely**; or secondly, **from supposition**.

Therefore, speaking simply and absolutely, it was possible for God to deliver mankind otherwise than by the Passion of Christ, because "no word shall be impossible with God" (Luke 1:37). **Yet it was impossible if some supposition be made**. For since it is impossible for God's foreknowledge to be deceived and His will or ordinance to be frustrated, then, **supposing God's foreknowledge and ordinance regarding Christ's Passion, it was not possible at the same time for Christ not to suffer, and for mankind to be delivered otherwise than by Christ's Passion**.

And the same holds good of all things foreknown and preordained by God, as was laid down in the I, q. 14, a. 13.

Reply OBJ 1: Our Lord is speaking there presupposing God's foreknowledge and predetermination, according to which **it was resolved that the fruit of man's salvation should not follow unless Christ suffered**. [cf. **III, q. 46, a. 2**].

2. The Perpetual Exemplary Cause

a.] Through all that Jesus did and suffered, He is the indefectible, unfailing, exemplar for all human beings of whatever condition, in perpetuity and one which all are called to imitate:

Put on the new man who in God has been created in justice and in the holiness of truth [Ep 4:24]:

...we are the sons of God. And if sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs of Christ: yet, so, if we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified with Him... [Rm 8:17].

...And they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences... [Ga 5:24].

... But, God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; by Whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world...From henceforth, let no man be troublesome to me; for I bear the marks of the Lord Jesus in my body ... [Ga 6:14, 17].

...And putting on the new man, him who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of Him that created him... Out on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, the bowels of mercy, benignity, humility, modesty, patience...But, above all these things, have charity, which is the bond of perfection ... [Col 3:10, 12, 14].

b.] He is the Exemplar in which we are renewed according to our conjunction with Him:

... Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who has blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; As He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unspotted in His sight in charity. Who has predestined us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ unto Himself; according to the purpose of His will... [Ep 1:3-5].

He has communicated to us His similitude so that as our Head, infusing us with His grace by which we merit and are assimilated to Him.

3. He is our Efficient Instrumental Cause

Jesus Christ communicates to us in perpetuity even the grace that we merit through all that He accomplished and suffered by a certain instrumental efficiency:

On the contrary, It is written (Ephesians 1:22): "And He . . . hath made Him **head over all the Church.**"

I answer that, As the whole Church is termed **one mystic body** from its likeness to the natural body of a man, which in divers members has divers acts, as the Apostle teaches (Romans 12; 1 Corinthians 12), so likewise Christ is called the Head of the Church from a likeness with the human head, in which we may consider three things, viz. **order**, **perfection**, and **power**:

- **Order**, indeed; for the head is the first part of man, beginning from the higher part; and hence it is that every principle is usually called a head according to Ezekiel 16:25: "At every head of the way, thou hast set up a sign of thy prostitution"

- **Perfection**, inasmuch as in the head dwell all the senses, both interior and exterior, whereas in the other members there is only touch, and hence it is said (Isaiah 9:15): "The aged and honorable, he is the head"

- **Power**, because the power and movement of the other members, together with the direction of them in their acts, is from the head, by reason of the sensitive and motive power there ruling; hence the ruler is called the head of a people, according to 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 15:17: "When thou wast a little one in thy own eyes, wast thou not made the head of the tribes of Israel?"

Now these three things belong spiritually to Christ:

- **First**, on account of **His nearness to God** His grace is the highest and first, though not in time, since all have received grace on account of His grace, according to Romans 8:29: "For whom He foreknew, He also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of His Son; that He might be the first-born amongst many brethren."

- **Secondly**, He had perfection as regards the **fullness of all graces**, according to John 1:14, "We saw Him [Vulgate: His glory] . . . full of grace and truth," as was shown, q. 7, a. 9.

- **Thirdly**, He has the **power of bestowing grace** on all the members of the Church, according to John 1:16: "Of His fullness we have all received." And thus it is plain that Christ is fittingly called the Head of the Church.

Reply OBJ 1: To give grace or the Holy Ghost belongs to Christ as He is God, authoritatively; but **instrumentally** it belongs also to Him as man, inasmuch as His manhood is the instrument of His Godhead. And hence by the power of the Godhead His actions were beneficial, i.e. by **causing grace** in us, both meritoriously and efficiently. But Augustine denies that Christ as man gives the Holy Ghost authoritatively. Even other saints are said to give the Holy

Ghost **instrumentally, or ministerially**, according to Galatians 3:5: "He . . . who giveth to you the Spirit."

Reply OBJ 2: **In metaphorical speech we must not expect a likeness in all respects**; for thus there would be not likeness but identity. Accordingly a natural head has not another head because one human body is not part of another; but a metaphorical body, i.e. an ordered multitude, is part of another multitude as the domestic multitude is part of the civil multitude; and hence the father who is head of the domestic multitude has a head above him, i.e. the civil governor. And hence there is no reason why God should not be the Head of Christ, although Christ Himself is Head of the Church.

Reply OBJ 3: The head has **a manifest pre-eminence** over the other exterior members; but the heart has a certain hidden influence. And hence the Holy Ghost is likened to the heart, since He invisibly quickens and unifies the Church; but Christ is likened to the Head in His visible nature in which man is set over man. **[III, q. 8, a. 1]**

†

On the contrary, It is written (1 Corinthians 1:18) that "the word of the cross to them that are saved . . . is the power of God." But God's power brings about our salvation efficiently. Therefore Christ's Passion on the cross accomplished our salvation efficiently.

I answer that, There is **a twofold efficient agency** - namely, the **principal** and the **instrumental**. Now the **principal efficient cause** of man's salvation is **God**. But since **Christ's humanity is the instrument of the Godhead**, as stated above (q. 43, a. 2), therefore **all Christ's actions and sufferings operate instrumentally in virtue of His Godhead for the salvation of men.**

Consequently, then, Christ's Passion accomplishes man's salvation efficiently.

Reply OBJ 1: Christ's Passion in relation to His flesh is consistent with the infirmity which He took upon Himself, but **in relation to the Godhead it draws infinite might from It**, according to 1 Corinthians 1:25: "The weakness of God is stronger than men"; because Christ's weakness, inasmuch as He is God, has a might exceeding all human power.

Reply OBJ 2: Christ's Passion, although corporeal, has yet **a spiritual effect from the Godhead united**: and therefore it secures its efficacy by spiritual contact - namely, by faith and the sacraments of faith, as

the Apostle says (Romans 3:25): "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood."

Reply OBJ 3: Christ's Passion, according as it is compared with His Godhead, **operates in an efficient manner**: but in so far as it is compared with the will of Christ's soul it acts in a **meritorious manner**: considered as being within Christ's very flesh, it acts by way of satisfaction, inasmuch as we are liberated by it from the debt of punishment; while inasmuch as we are freed from the servitude of guilt, it acts by way of redemption: but in so far as we are reconciled with God it acts by way of sacrifice, as shall be shown farther on (q. 49). **[III, q. 48, a. 6]** .

†

On the contrary, on 1 Corinthians 15:12: "Now if Christ be preached, that He rose again from the dead," the gloss says: "Who is **the efficient cause of our resurrection**."

I answer that, As stated in De Metaphysica ii,4: "Whatever is first in any order, is the cause of all that come after it." But **Christ's Resurrection was the first in the order of our resurrection**, as is evident from what was said above (q. 53, a. 3). Hence **Christ's Resurrection must be the cause of ours**: and this is what the Apostle says (1 Corinthians 15:20,21) : "Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep; for by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead."

And this is reasonable. Because the principle of human life-giving is the Word of God, of whom it is said (Psalm 36:9): "With Thee is the fountain of life": hence He Himself says (John 5:21): "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and giveth life; so the Son also giveth life to whom He will." Now the divinely established natural order is that **every cause operates first upon what is nearest to it, and through it upon others which are more remote**; just as fire first heats the nearest air, and through it, it heats bodies that are further off: and God Himself first enlightens those substances which are closer to Him, and through them others that are more remote, as Dionysius says (De Coelesti Hierarchia xiii).

Consequently, **the Word of God first bestows immortal life upon that body which is naturally united with Himself, and through it works the resurrection in all other bodies.**

Reply OBJ 1: As was stated above, **Christ's Resurrection is the cause of ours through the power of the united Word, who operates according to His will.** And consequently, it is not necessary for the effect to follow at once, but **according as the Word of God disposes**, namely, that **first of all we be conformed to the suffering and dying Christ in this suffering and mortal life; and afterwards may come to share in the likeness of His Resurrection.**

Reply OBJ 2: **God's justice is the first cause of our resurrection, whereas Christ's Resurrection is the secondary, and as it were the instrumental cause.** But although the power of the principal cause is not restricted to one instrument determinately, nevertheless since **it works through this instrument, such instrument causes the effect.** So, then, the Divine justice in itself is not tied down to Christ's Resurrection as a means of bringing about our resurrection: because **God could deliver us in some other way than through Christ's Passion and Resurrection**, as already stated (q. 46, a. 22). But having once decreed to deliver us in this way, it is evident that **Christ's Resurrection is the cause of ours.**

Reply OBJ 3: **Properly speaking, Christ's Resurrection is not the meritorious cause, but the efficient and exemplar cause of our resurrection.** It is the efficient cause, inasmuch as Christ's humanity, according to which He rose again, is as it were the instrument of His Godhead, and works by Its power, as stated above (q. 13, aa. 2,3). And therefore, just as all other things which Christ did and endured in His humanity are profitable to our salvation through the power of the Godhead, as already stated (q. 48, a. 6), so also is **Christ's Resurrection the efficient cause of ours**, through the Divine power whose office it is to quicken the dead; and this power by its presence is in touch with all places and times; and such virtual contact suffices for its efficiency. And since, as was stated above (ad 2^{um}), **the primary cause of human resurrection is the Divine justice**, from which Christ has "the power of passing judgment, because He is the Son of Man" (John 5:27); **the efficient power of His Resurrection extends to the good and wicked alike**, who are subject to His judgment.

But just as the Resurrection of Christ's body, **through its personal union with the Word, is first in point of time**, so also is it **first in dignity and perfection**; as the gloss says on 1 Corinthians 15:20,23. But **whatever is most perfect** is always the exemplar, which the less perfect copies according to its mode; consequently Christ's Resurrection is the exemplar of ours.

And this is necessary, not on the part of Him who rose again, who needs no exemplar, but **on the part of them who are raised up, who must be**

likened to that Resurrection, according to Philippians 3:21: "He will reform the body of our lowliness, made like to the body of His glory." Now although the efficiency of Christ's Resurrection extends to the resurrection of the good and wicked alike, still its exemplarity extends properly only to the just, who are made conformable with His Sonship, according to Romans 8:29.

Reply OBJ 4: Considered on the part of their efficiency, which is **dependent on the Divine power**, both **Christ's death and His Resurrection are the cause both of the destruction of death and of the renewal of life**: but considered as **exemplar causes**, Christ's death - by which He withdrew from mortal life - is the cause of the destruction of our death; while His Resurrection, whereby He inaugurated immortal life, is the cause of the repairing of our life. But Christ's Passion is furthermore a meritorious cause, as stated above (q. 48, a. 1). **[III, q. 56, a. 1]**

Jesus Christ is the meritorious and exemplary cause of our Redemption according to His proper human operation: [in broad terms this is called ***theandric operation***, i.e., an operation which proceeds from the Person of the Word as the ***principle by Whom***]. But, furthermore, in so far as He operates through His human nature the proper effects by the power of God he operates **instrumentally, acting as a conjunct animated instrument - by an operation that is strictly *theandric***.

There is no reason why there would be excluded efficiency from the Mysteries of Jesus Christ, or from His actions and sufferings, in so far as this efficiency can be sustained, i.e., in an **instrumental manner**. Rather, on the contrary, **instrumental efficiency** is totally befitting both to the end, or purpose of the Incarnation, as well as to the hypostatic union, as well as to His Capital Grace.

a.] **Instrumental efficiency befits the End of the Incarnation**: the Incarnation is ordered to our redemption, or to our liberation from sin, and to our sanctification and eternal salvation. Hence, it is fitting that these effects should not be caused efficiently by God alone, but also, in so far as this is not repugnant to other aspects of divine revelation, it should be accomplished through a human nature. There is nothing that would prohibit that these goals should be accomplished by an **instrumental divine efficiency**. The human nature assumed in Jesus Christ that it might **instrumentally** achieve those effects which are operations that are proper to God, such as to cleanse sins, to illumine minds by grace, and to introduce into perfection of eternal life. **[CG IV, c. 31]**.

b.] **Instrumental Causality befits the Hypostatic Union:** for the human nature in Jesus Christ by means of His hypostatic union is naturally the **animated, conjoined instrument of His Divinity**, almost as its 'organ', or primary and universal instrument. The Divine Word uses its humanity as the first instrument, i.e., the most available and close for those operations proper to the Divinity to which the human nature is able to cooperate, always excluding in this creation and annihilation, and through that instrument, it can operate in distance by its divine virtuality. The reason is that the humanity of Jesus Christ is the Instrument of the Divinity is working out all the actions and passions of Christ that are achieved instrumentally in divine virtuality for human salvation:

On the contrary, It is written (1 Corinthians 1:18) that "**the word of the cross to them that are saved . . . is the power of God.**" But **God's power brings about our salvation efficiently. Therefore Christ's Passion on the cross accomplished our salvation efficiently.**

I answer that, There is **a twofold efficient agency** - namely, the **principal** and the **instrumental**.

Now the **principal efficient cause of man's salvation is God**. But since **Christ's humanity is the instrument of the Godhead**, as stated above (q. 43, a. 2), therefore **all Christ's actions and sufferings operate instrumentally in virtue of His Godhead for the salvation of men**. Consequently, then, Christ's Passion accomplishes man's salvation efficiently.

Reply OBJ 1: Christ's Passion in relation to His flesh is consistent with the infirmity which He took upon Himself, but **in relation to the Godhead it draws infinite might from It, according to 1 Corinthians 1:25: "The weakness of God is stronger than men"; because Christ's weakness, inasmuch as He is God, has a might exceeding all human power.**

Reply OBJ 2: **Christ's Passion, although corporeal, has yet a spiritual effect from the Godhead united:** and therefore it **secures its efficacy by spiritual contact** - namely, by **faith** and the **sacraments of faith**, as the Apostle says (Romans 3:25): "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood."

Reply OBJ 3: **Christ's Passion, according as it is compared with His Godhead, operates in an efficient manner:** but in so far as it is compared with the **will of Christ's soul it acts in a meritorious manner:** considered as being **within Christ's very flesh**, it acts by way of **satisfaction**, inasmuch as we are liberated by it from the debt of punishment; while inasmuch as we are

freed from **the servitude of guilt**, it acts by way of **redemption**: but in so far as we are reconciled with God it acts by way of sacrifice, as shall be shown farther on (q. 49). [**III. q. 48. a. 6**].



Similarly His death and resurrection: as for this latter, of Christ, properly speaking, is **the meritorious cause of our resurrection** - but it is also the **efficient** and **exemplary** cause. It is the efficient cause in so far as the humanity of Jesus Christ, according to which He has resurrected, is in some way the instrument of His divinity and in operates in virtues of this ... And therefore, just as other activities which are salvific for us which Jesus Christ in His humanity accomplished or suffered, by virtue of His divinity... and so the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the efficient cause of our resurrection by His divine virtue the property of which is to vivify the dead. Indeed, this virtue *presentially* attains all places and times. This virtual contact suffices under the aspect of its efficiency:

Reply OBJ 3: **Properly speaking, Christ's Resurrection is not the meritorious cause, but the efficient and exemplar cause of our resurrection.** It is the efficient cause, inasmuch as Christ's humanity, according to which He rose again, is as it were the instrument of His Godhead, and works by Its power, as stated above (q. 13, aa. 2,3). And therefore, just as all other things which Christ did and endured in His humanity are profitable to our salvation through the power of the Godhead, as already stated (q. 48, a. 6), so also is **Christ's Resurrection the efficient cause of ours**, through the Divine power whose office it is to quicken the dead; and this power by its presence is in touch with all places and times; and such virtual contact suffices for its efficiency. And since, as was stated above (r 2), **the primary cause of human resurrection is the Divine justice**, from which Christ has "the power of passing judgment, because He is the Son of Man" (John 5:27); **the efficient power of His Resurrection extends to the good and wicked alike**, who are subject to His judgment.

But just as the Resurrection of Christ's body, **through its personal union with the Word, is first in point of time**, so also is it **first in dignity and perfection**; as the gloss says on 1 Corinthians 15:20,23. But **whatever is most perfect** is always the **exemplar**, which the less perfect copies according to its mode; consequently Christ's Resurrection is the exemplar of ours.

And this is necessary, not on the part of Him who rose again, who needs no exemplar, but **on the part of them who are raised up, who must be likened to that Resurrection**, according to Philippians 3:21: "He will reform the body of our lowliness, made like to the body of His glory." Now although the

efficiency of Christ's Resurrection extends to the resurrection of the good and wicked alike, **still its exemplarity extends properly only to the just**, who are made **conformable with His Sonship**, according to Romans 8:29. [**III, q. 56, a. 1, ad 3 um**].

c.] Instrumental Causality befits His Capital Grace:

- **first**, if Christ, meriting solely and by exemplarity, were to cause grace, He would not be the Head of Grace in all those means which could be proper to Him.

- **secondly**, because Jesus Christ accepted the fullness of capital grace, i.e., not only for Himself but for all His members, **in perpetuity**, so this same grace which He meriting first of all, also merited ***derivatively*** for His members in His Mystical Body through His **instrumental efficiency**: ... ***indeed, from His fullness we have, all of us, received ...*** [cf. Jn 1:16].

- **thirdly**, that which is first in any 'genus' is the cause of all that comes after it, as the Philosopher taught, and as quoted by St. Thomas:

On the contrary, on the words of Philippians 2:9, "**Therefore God exalted Him,**" etc., Augustine says (Tractatus 104 in Joannis): "**The lowliness of the Passion merited glory; glory was the reward of lowliness.**" But He was glorified, not merely in Himself, but likewise in His faithful ones, as He says Himself (John 17:10). Therefore it appears that He merited the salvation of the faithful.

I answer that, As stated above (q. 7, aa. 1,9; q. 8, aa. 1,5), **grace was bestowed upon Christ, not only as an individual, but inasmuch as He is the Head of the Church, so that it might overflow into His members**; and therefore Christ's works are referred to Himself and to His members in the same way as the works of any other man in a state of grace are referred to himself. But it is evident that whosoever suffers for justice's sake, provided that he be in a state of grace, merits his salvation thereby, according to Matthew 5:10: "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice's sake." Consequently **Christ by His Passion merited salvation, not only for Himself, but likewise for all His members.** [**III, q. 56, a. 1**].

Jesus Christ, in His humanity, as the divinely appointed Head of Grace is the first in the order of all grace. For which reason, He is the First, Universal and Instrumental Cause of all graces, influencing in all time **in perpetuity**. It would not be fitting in the natural order that God would accomplish the flow of grace both in Christ as well as in others immediately,

but rather it is necessary that God would act in others through **that Source in which God in the greatest manner bears influence** - and this is through Jesus Christ in His human nature.

Therefore, it is to be maintained that just as the Holy Doctor affirms so many times that efficiently, and also instrumentally, **all the actions and passions of Christ accomplish our salvation**.

St. Thomas does not treat only of the humanity of Jesus Christ, but also about **the actions and the passions of Jesus Christ**. So, it is not the ;mind; of St. Thomas Aquinas that Jesus Christ in heaven would efficiently in perpetuity bear influence as the past mysteries remain in some effect now in glory, so that the operations and the passions, as His death, in acts actual taking place and the resurrection taken in themselves only in the passing of time might be able to be still in act and causing grace when they actually happened. Now, **their efficacy is exercised only in the glorious humanity of Jesus Christ, as they remain in some manner**.

Concerning these actions and passions especially those which were **formally meritorious of Christ the Way-farer, in this world**, the Holy Doctor also affirms that efficiently and instrumentally these work out our salvation - in other words these earthly mysteries of Jesus Christ have their effect **in perpetuity**:

Reply OBJ 3: **Christ's Passion, according as it is compared with His Godhead, operates in an efficient manner**: but in so far as it is compared with the will of Christ's soul it acts in a **meritorious manner**: considered as being **within Christ's very flesh**, it acts by way of **satisfaction**, inasmuch as we are **liberated by it from the debt of punishment**; while inasmuch as we are freed from **the servitude of guilt**, it acts by way of **redemption**: but in so far as we are reconciled with God it **acts by way of sacrifice**, as shall be shown farther on (q. 49). [**III, q. 48. a. 6. ad 3 um**].

Certainly the humanity of Jesus Christ is His **instrument**, and therefore, both His actions and His Passions operate instrumentally. But, it is not to be understood that the humanity of Jesus Christ, and not His actions and Passions act instrumentally unless in so far as **they remain in their effect** in the Celestial Christ, even though they could indeed act as such. Nor can the text on the resurrection already cited be interpreted concerning solely the glorious humanity:

Reply OBJ 3: Properly speaking, **Christ's Resurrection is not the meritorious cause, but the efficient and exemplar cause of our resurrection.** It is the efficient cause, inasmuch as Christ's humanity, according to which He rose again, is as it were the instrument of His Godhead, and works by Its power, as stated above (q. 13, aa. 2,3).

And therefore, just as **all other things which Christ did and endured in His humanity are profitable to our salvation through the power of the Godhead**, as already stated (q. 48, a. 6), so also is **Christ's Resurrection the efficient cause of ours, through the Divine power whose office it is to quicken the dead; and this power by its presence is in touch with all places and times; and such virtual contact suffices for its efficiency.**

And since, as was stated above (r 2), **the primary cause of human resurrection is the Divine justice**, from which Christ has "the power of passing judgment, because He is the Son of Man" (John 5:27); **the efficient power of His Resurrection extends to the good and wicked alike, who are subject to His judgment.**

But just as the **Resurrection of Christ's body, through its personal union with the Word, is first in point of time, so also is it first in dignity and perfection**; as the gloss says on 1 Corinthians 15:20,23. But **whatever is most perfect is always the exemplar, which the less perfect copies according to its mode**; consequently **Christ's Resurrection is the exemplar of ours.**

And **this is necessary, not on the part of Him who rose again, who needs no exemplar**, but on the part of them who are raised up, who must be likened to that Resurrection, according to Philippians 3:21: "He will reform the body of our lowliness, made like to the body of His glory."

Now although the efficiency of Christ's Resurrection extends to the resurrection of the good and wicked alike, still **its exemplarity extends properly only to the just, who are made conformable with His Sonship**, according to Romans 8:29. [**III, q. 56, a. 1 ad 3 um**].

In this article, St. Thomas contemplates the Mystery of the resurrection, i.e. **ponders the Rising Christ in His humanity**. Thus he reflects on **the glorious humanity of Jesus Christ**. Furthermore, the Holy Doctor in the first objection in this Article states the following:

OBJ 1: It would seem that Christ's Resurrection is not the cause of the resurrection of our bodies, because, **given a sufficient cause, the effect must follow of necessity**. If, then, Christ's Resurrection be the sufficient cause of

the resurrection of our bodies, **then all the dead should have risen again as soon as He rose.**

Reply OBJ 1: As was stated above, **Christ's Resurrection is the cause of ours through the power of the united Word**, who operates according to His will. And consequently, it is **not necessary for the effect to follow at once, but according as the Word of God disposes, namely, that first of all we be conformed to the suffering and dying Christ in this suffering and mortal life; and afterwards may come to share in the likeness of His Resurrection.**

This is in harmony with this other teaching of the Angelic Doctor: It needs to be said that the effect follows from the instrumental causes in accord with the condition of the Principal Cause. And therefore, since God is the Principle Cause of our resurrection, then the Resurrection of Jesus Christ according to His Divine disposition which He ordained that in such and such a time it would take place [cf. **Comm. in 1 Co 15, lect. 2.**].

Moreover, the Holy Doctor objects to his own teaching that there is not had any contact between the resurrection of Jesus Christ and ours, and he responds:

... And therefore, just as **all other things which Christ did and endured in His humanity are profitable to our salvation through the power of the Godhead**, as already stated (q. 48, a. 6), so also is **Christ's Resurrection the efficient cause of ours, through the Divine power whose office it is to quicken the dead; and this power by its presence is in touch with all places and times; and such virtual contact suffices for its efficiency...** [**III, q. 56, a. 1 ad 3 um**].

This same difficulty the Holy Doctor brings up where he treats of the **efficiency of the Lord's Passion:**

OBJ 2: **Further, no corporeal agency acts efficiently except by contact: hence even Christ cleansed the leper by touching him "in order to show that His flesh had saving power,"** as Chrysostom (Theophylact, Enarrationes in Lucam) says. But Christ's Passion could not touch all mankind. Therefore it could not efficiently bring about the salvation of all men.

Reply OBJ 2: **Christ's Passion, although corporeal, has yet a spiritual effect from the Godhead united**: and therefore it **secures its efficacy by spiritual contact** - namely, by faith and the sacraments of faith, as the Apostle says (Romans 3:25): **"Whom God hath proposed to be a**

propitiation, through faith in His blood" [III. q. 48. a. 6 ad 2 um], [i.e., through the act of His soul and the use of exterior realities.

Wherever the Holy Doctor treats of **the efficiency of the mysteries of Christ** for the resolution of difficulties or objections, **he always has recourse to the divine virtuality**, i.e., **to the power of the Divine Word united**, by which the mysteries are, **instrumentally accomplish our salvation, in every place and in all times, in accord with the disposition of the Divine Word Himself by His virtual, or spiritual, contact**. The actions and all that Jesus endured by the divine virtue, **no matter howsoever much distant in time and space**, could attain any and every subject whatsoever, in so far as He wills.

Indeed this **sublime Mystery** lies hidden in that **secret activity** by which the **divine virtuality** of the Incarnate Word of God dependently on the past actions and all that His humanity exercised and endured, works out our salvation through the sacraments and other means chosen by God. Indeed there is no contradiction in that **instrumentality** of the mysteries according to which the **immense and eternal God**, to Whom all instruments chosen by Him, obey his beck and call. This instrumentality communicates that **divine virtuality** in the order of producing the effect chosen by Him, where and when He Himself chooses, in so far as the Holy Doctor manifestly teaches as seen just above. It is only rightly to be pointed out that God, or the Divine Word does not make use of any instrument out any need of His own, or necessity, but He freely, sovereignly chooses realities so that they **become instruments** by His **divine creative power**, from their being non-instruments, whether these are material realities, or internal or external activities.

Therefore, even though an instrument actually is nothing other unless something that has its own inherent previous operation by the priority of its nature, but is elevated through a superior motion, and is moved toward the effect of the principal cause. Yet, this proper operation can be determined by God in whatever manner this might be pleasing to Him, even though there might be some similitude in the inherent nature of the instrument, and the action to which God, the Principal Cause, elevates it: as in Baptism, **water by and through its natural quality of washing the body, purifies the human soul from sin**, or causes grace, by **divine virtuality**.

Hence, the proper action of this or that mystery is assumed in so far as it bears with it a certain natural exemplarity, by which is special effect is figured and designated:

OBJ 4: Further, since death is the privation of life, then to destroy death seems to be nothing else than to bring life back again; and this is resurrection. But **"by dying, Christ destroyed our death"** (**Preface of Mass in Paschal Time**). Consequently, Christ's death, not His Resurrection, is the cause of our resurrection.

Reply OBJ 4: Considered on the part of their **efficiency**, which is **dependent on the Divine power**, both Christ's death and His Resurrection are the cause both of the destruction of death and of the renewal of life: but considered as exemplar causes, Christ's death - by which He withdrew from mortal life - is the cause of the destruction of our death; while His Resurrection, whereby He inaugurated immortal life, is the cause of the repairing of our life. But Christ's Passion is furthermore a meritorious cause, as stated above (q. 48, a. 1). [**III, q. 56, a.1 ad 4 um**].

Therefore, the single mysteries of His life, death and glorification, in various ways can be referred to the supernatural acts which by the divine virtue they instrumentally produce.

It must be kept uppermost in mind that an instrument - especially that of which the Divine Word chose to employ - by the action inherent in these acts, He did not necessarily have to cause the inherent dispositions in the subject of the effects, like a saw in wood, but it suffices that the Principal Cause in some way he **coordinates, co-opts His action** to the instrument because in this manner He acts **dispositively** just as water by its own operation by washing the body purifies the soul from sin by the **divine virtue** shared in a passing way. And even though in the time during which the effect is produced, the instrument [which is moving the moved induced by God in a transient way]. This instrument does not exist in act on this level in itself, nor is it already moved into act of its own inherent qualities - but, from these facts it is not to be concluded that the Divine Word by its **eternal virtuality** is not able in the present time to produce its effect dependently on the past instrumental activity. Instrumentally through His united humanity He was able to heal the sick man from a distance, indeed by His humanity united to His Divinity. This complicated point was discussed by the classical Benedictine philosopher, J Gredt: **a created agent from a distance can act as an instrument of God**. In all truth, though, this is not an action

from a distance, since God is present everywhere, Who as the Principal Cause, produces in the distant subject by means of the instrument its effect as dependently on the instrument.

That which is said of local distance is to be extended into temporal distance since God is immense and eternal and therefore, as St. Thomas teaches ... **Christ's Resurrection the efficient cause of ours, through the Divine power whose office it is to quicken the dead; and this power by its presence is in touch with all places and times; and such virtual contact suffices for its efficiency...** [III, q. 56, a. 1 ad 3 um]. Virtual contact is had because any and every instrument that is distant either in space or in time, is conjoined to its effect not according to itself, or by physical contact, but in accord and **under the influence of the acting divine virtuality.**

Not a few theologians, especially from the time of Fr. Suarez [+1617] on, and some of these even from among the Thomists who also accepted Suarez' reasoning, maintained that God can act in a subject through an instrument, **distant in space**, but **not distant in time**. These scholars would be: Sylvius, John of St. Thomas, the Salmanticenses, Gonet and Billuart and others for this principal reason because a non-existent agent cannot operate. These considerable theologians tried also to provide a benign interpretation of St. Thomas' texts. However, their view is not the authentic opinion of the Holy Doctor, as seems clear from the discussion. Nor can it be found among his more outstanding followers, or commentators, who admit an instrumental efficient causality of the humanity of Jesus Christ, of what He accomplished and what He endured, but do not expressly place the problem regarding distance. Not even Capreolus [+1444] brings up the problem.

Concerning the view of Cajetan [+1534] it is disputed because it seems that he speaks differently in his Commentary on St. Thomas [Part III, q. 13, a. 2, n. VI; and q. 56, a. 1, ad 3 um, n. II]. In the first place, even though he distinguishes distance according to place and distance according to time, yet universally affirms: 'Because omnipotence is not tied in with certain instruments, places or proximities, therefore he does not relate that God would make use of anything for any miracle whatsoever. For just as He without any instrument could perfect that work, so He can not only accomplish His ends by means of an instrument,

but also by any one whatsoever, and wherever it might exist, and no matter how far away it might be. For there is not restricted or diminished the divine omnipotence to the limits of the instrument which it might assume: rather, the instrument is elevated to the execution of the omnipotence in this or that miracle to which it might be ordained by the omnipotence.

Nonetheless, **'no creature can instrumentally create.** In the second place Cajetan also states: In response to the third objection [cf. III, q.56, a. 1 ad 3 um] notice that the humanity, because it is the **organ conjoined personally** to the Word of God is as the **universal** instrument of God for the performance of miracles, as has been noted above [cf. q 13, a. 2]. This conjoined humanity is determined to be the instrument to this or that miraculous work through some condition. So, that from which He has had to endure, we understand as a power communicated to Him, by some **appropriation**, as the **remissive power over sin**. And from the very revealed fact that He had **resurrected**, in like manner there was communicated to Him that **resurrecting power over the dead**. And this principle holds true over all the **other similar instrumental actions** which were attributed to the humanity of Jesus Christ in an **instrumental** manner, while to God they pertain **principally**.

In this response, Cajetan, with instrumental efficiency having been presupposed, explains how the humanity of Jesus Christ is applied to a variety of effects, such as the **remission of sins** and to the **resurrection**. But, in all this, there is no question of the distance in time or space - nor any question of the opposition between His humanity with all that He did and endured in the past - and His humanity as it now is.

A number of theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries rose up against Cajetan and wrote as though he had denied what Jesus did and endured in the past in order to accomplish **instrumentally** in all time **in perpetuity**. One of these was Dominic Soto [+ 1560], Bartholomew Medina [+ 1580]. Nazarius [+ 1645] who firmly held that St. Thomas had taught that the mysteries of Christ cause our justification **in perpetuity**.

In our time, theologians rather commonly admit that St. Thomas certainly taught the perpetual **instrumental efficacy** of all that Jesus accomplished and endured by Christ in the past. Among these, would be the classic teaching of Fr. Hugon, OP.

B.] Concerning the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ in Particular:

Concerning all that Jesus Christ did and endured, or His individual mysteries, it came to be stated that this is specially to be applied to the **Sacrifice Christ** on the **Cross accomplished once and for all**, where indeed there was consummated the work of the Savior on earth and which constitutes the very core of all the mysteries of Jesus Christ. Since this Sacrifice is the principal work of the Eternal High Priest, it is now sought in what sense is this bloody sacrifice on the Cross would enjoy a **perennial effect** - or, in other words, how would this effect remain for all eternity in heaven.

1. The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, accomplished in a bloody manner on the Cross, is perpetual, i.e., remaining forever as for its consummation, so that it does not need to be renewed:

III, QUESTION 22: OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST

ARTICLE 5: Whether the priesthood of Christ endures for ever?

OBJ 1: It would seem that the priesthood of Christ does not endure for ever. For as stated above (a. 4, r 1,3) **those alone need the effect of the priesthood who have the weakness of sin, which can be expiated by the priest's sacrifice.** But **this will not be for ever**. For in the Saints there will be no weakness, according to Isaiah 60:21: "Thy people shall be all just": while no expiation will be possible for the weakness of sin, since "there is no redemption in hell (Office of the Dead, Response 7). Therefore the priesthood of Christ endures not for ever.

OBJ 2: Further, the priesthood of Christ was made manifest most of all in His passion and death, when "by His own blood He entered into the Holies" (Hebrews 9:12). But the passion and death of Christ will not endure for ever, as stated Romans 6:9: "Christ rising again from the dead, dieth now no more." Therefore the priesthood of Christ will not endure for ever.

OBJ 3: Further, Christ is a priest, not as God, but as man. But at one time Christ was not man, namely during the three days He lay dead. Therefore the priesthood of Christ endures not for ever.

On the contrary, It is written (Psalm 110:4): "**Thou art a priest for ever.**"

I answer that, In the priestly office, we may consider two things: first, the offering of the sacrifice; secondly, the consummation of the sacrifice, consisting in this, that those for whom the sacrifice is offered, obtain the end of the sacrifice.

Now **the end of the sacrifice which Christ offered consisted not in temporal but in eternal good**, which we obtain through His death, according to Hebrews 9:11: "Christ is [Vulgate: being come] a high-priest of the good things to come"; for which reason the priesthood of Christ is said to be eternal. Now this consummation of Christ's sacrifice was **foreshadowed in this, that the high-priest of the Old Law, once a year, entered into the Holy of Holies with the blood** of a he-goat and a calf, as laid down, Leviticus 16:11, and yet he offered up the he-goat and calf not within the Holy of Holies, but without.

In like manner **Christ entered into the Holy of Holies - that is, into heaven - and prepared the way for us, that we might enter by the virtue of His blood, which He shed for us on earth.**

Reply OBJ 1: The **Saints who will be in heaven will not need any further expiation by the priesthood of Christ, but having expiated, they will need consummation through Christ** Himself, on Whom their glory depends, as is written (Apocalypse 21:23): "The glory of God hath enlightened it" - that is, the city of the Saints - "and the Lamb is the lamp thereof."

Reply OBJ 2: Although **Christ's passion and death are not to be repeated, yet the virtue of that Victim endures for ever**, for, as it is written (Hebrews 10:14), "**by one oblation He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.**" Wherefore the reply to the third objection is clear. As to the unity of this sacrifice, it was foreshadowed in the Law in that, **once a year, the high-priest of the Law entered into the Holies**, with a solemn oblation of blood, as set down, Leviticus 16:11. But the figure fell short of the reality in this, that **the victim had not an everlasting virtue, for which reason those sacrifices were renewed every year.**

Just as each and every sacrifice, so also that of Jesus Christ on the Mount of Calvary offered under the two-fold real aspect can be considered **under the aspect of oblation**, or **immolation** - as well as also **under the aspect of consummation, or the fulfillment** of the end intended, which in a special manner consists in **reconciliation** with God.

a.] It is manifest that the **act of oblation, or immolation** by which Jesus Christ **offered himself on the Cross**, took place **once**:

... and He has entered the sanctuary once and for all taking with Him not the blood of goats and bull calves, but His own blood, having won an eternal redemption for us... [Heb 9:12]

... and He does not have to offer Himself again and again, like the high priest going into the sanctuary year after year with the blood that is not His own, or else He would have had to suffer over and over again since the world began, now at the end of the last age, to do away with sin by sacrificing Himself ... [vv. 25, 26] .

The **act of oblation** comprehends both the **internal act** and the **external manifestation** of this at the same time. Jesus Christ, the Merciful High Priest, offered both **by the internal act [of religion, obedience and charity]** both by the **external action**, as a sign of His **internal oblation**, by **freely** undergoing His Passion and Death:

Reply OBJ 2: Christ's Passion was **the offering of a sacrifice**, inasmuch as He endured death **of His own free-will out of charity**; but in so far as He suffered **from His persecutors it was not a sacrifice**, but a most grievous sin. [**III, q. 47, a. 4, ad 2 um**].

He offered His Sacrifice as a **Wayfarer** and the **internal** and **external** act formally considered, in so far as they **constitute the bloody sacrifice in the time of the Passion**, in themselves, were **passing**. Certainly, the **internal action**, or the **Sacrificial Mind which He had from His Incarnation, remained** even though this **internal act was not conjoined to the external act**. In other words, **the symbolic sign is not the formal part of the sacrifice of the Cross**. Moreover, the remaining **internal act** does not remain that of **Jesus, the Wayfarer only**, but after Christ's Resurrection, **this internal sacrificial mind-set was a continuing as that of Jesus as Comprehensor only**.

b.] The sacrifice of Jesus Christ offered **once and for all** on the Cross endures **in perpetuity in its consummation**. The consummation of the sacrifice consists in this:

On the contrary, It is written (Psalm 110:4): "**Thou art a priest for ever.**"

I answer that, In the priestly office, we may consider two things: **first, the offering of the sacrifice**; secondly, **the consummation of the sacrifice**, consisting in this, that those for whom the sacrifice is offered, **obtain the end of the sacrifice**.

Now **the end of the sacrifice which Christ offered consisted not in temporal but in eternal good**, which we obtain through His death, according to Hebrews 9:11: "Christ is [Vulgate: being come] a high-priest of the good things to come"; for which reason **the priesthood of Christ is said to be eternal**.

Now this **consummation** of Christ's sacrifice was foreshadowed in this, that the high-priest of the Old Law, once a year, entered into the Holy of Holies with the blood of a he-goat and a calf, as laid down, Leviticus 16:11, and yet he offered up the he-goat and calf not within the Holy of Holies, but without. **In like manner Christ entered into the Holy of Holies - that is, into heaven - and prepared the way for us, that we might enter by the virtue of His blood, which He shed for us on earth. [III, q. 22, a. 5 c].**

Those goods promised in the OT were temporal goods ... But **Christ is the Pontiff of future goods ... through His Pontificate we are introduced into the future goods ...** In like manner, in the old law **figurative realities** were dispensed ... Therefore, thus through future goods there can be understood either the **celestial goods**, and this with respect to the NT; or **spiritual goods** with regard to the OT which was the **figure** of these. [**Comm. Ad Heb. C. 9, lect. 3 a**]. So, for the '**end of the sacrifice**' we can understand **grace** and **glory**, either **reconciliation** or **union** with God, even that **beginning** or that which is **consummated**.

The Sacrifice, therefore, offered on the Cross, as His perfect act of worship due to God according to the divine precept, was most acceptable to God and of infinite value, was sufficient and never to be repeated: *... By virtue of that one single offering, He has achieved the eternal perfection of all whom He is sanctifying...* [Heb 10:14]. This remains **the sacrifice offered once and for all, in its perpetual virtue**, by which it can **sanctify all** for whom it was **offered** once and for all:

Reply OBJ 2: The slaying of the Man Christ may be referred to **a twofold will**. First, to the will of **those who slew Him**: and in this respect He was not a victim: for the slayers of Christ are not accounted as offering a sacrifice to God, but as guilty of **a great crime**: a similitude of which was borne by the wicked sacrifices of the Gentiles, in which they offered up men to idols. **Secondly**, the **slaying of Christ may be considered in reference to the will of the Sufferer, Who freely offered Himself to suffering. In this respect He is a victim**, and in this He differs from the sacrifices of the Gentiles.

(The reply to the third objection is wanting in the original manuscripts, but it may be gathered from the above.) (Some editions, however, give the

following reply:) Reply OBJ 3: The fact that **Christ's manhood was holy from its beginning** does not prevent that same manhood, when it was **offered to God in the Passion**, being sanctified in a new way - namely, as a victim actually offered then. For it acquired then **the actual holiness of a victim, from the charity which it had from the beginning, and from the grace of union sanctifying it absolutely**. [III, q. 22, a. 5 ad 2 um] .

What he means by the expression: through that virtue remaining in eternity... - the Holy Doctor explains:

III, QUESTION 48: OF THE EFFICIENCY OF CHRIST'S PASSION

(In Six Articles)

We now have to consider Christ's Passion as to its effect; first of all, as to the manner in which it was brought about; and, secondly, as to the effect in itself. Under the first heading there are **six points for inquiry**: (1) Whether Christ's Passion brought about our salvation by way of merit? (2) Whether it was by way of atonement? (3) Whether it was by way of sacrifice? (4) Whether it was by way of redemption? (5) Whether it is **proper to Christ** to be the Redeemer? (6) Whether (the Passion) secured man's salvation efficiently?

The Holy Doctor does not distinguish in the Passion of Christ the historical circumstances from the salvific act, or from the **perennial, or 'supra-temporal' mystery of salvation** - in so far as today there are some who attribute to the passion concretely understood, a kind of **eternal virtuality** with regard to the working out of our salvation. St. Thomas distinguishes the various aspects of this **virtuality**, or the diverse modes of acting, as the modality of **merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, redemption** and the mode of **efficiency**. However, in so far as this work is **compared to the will of Christ's soul**, He acts by way of **merit** - but, in so far as this is considered in the very flesh of Christ, He acts in the manner of **satisfaction**, in so far as through this, we are liberated from the weight of **penalty**. However, He acts in the manner of **redemption**, in so far as through this we are liberated from the servitude of **fault**; And he acts in the manner of **sacrifice**, in so far as through this, **we are reconciled to God**:

Reply OBJ 3: **Christ's Passion**, according as it is compared with His **Godhead**, operates in an instrumental manner: but in so far as it is compared with the **will** of Christ's soul it acts in a meritorious manner: considered as being within **Christ's very flesh**, it acts by way of satisfaction, inasmuch as

we are **liberated** by it from the **debt of punishment**; while inasmuch as we **are freed from the servitude of guilt**, it acts by way of **redemption**; but in so far as we are **reconciled** with God it acts by way of **sacrifice**, as shall be shown farther on (Q49). **[III, q. 48, a. 6, ad 3^{um}]**

Therefore, in speaking of the **virtuality of the Passion**, more often the Holy Doctor intends universally **the salvific, or justifying virtuality**, he explicit suggests **one or several of these modalities**:

On the contrary, on Romans 5:14: "After the similitude of the transgression of Adam," etc., the gloss says: "**From the side of Christ asleep on the Cross flowed the sacraments which brought salvation to the Church.**" Consequently, it seems that **the sacraments derive their power from Christ's Passion**.

I answer that, As stated above (a. 1) **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 need 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 (q. 48, aa. 1,2,6; q. 49, aa. 1,3) 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" (Ephesians 5:2).

Wherefore it is manifest that **the sacraments of the Church derive their power especially 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.

Reply OBJ 1: The Word, forasmuch as **He was in the beginning with God, quickens souls as principal agent**; but His **flesh**, and the mysteries accomplished therein, are as **instrumental causes** in the process of giving life to the soul: while in giving life to the body they act not only as instrumental causes, but also **to a certain extent** as **exemplars**, as we stated above (q. 56, a. 1, ad 3um).

Reply OBJ 2: **Christ dwells in us "by faith"** (Ephesians 3:17). Consequently, **by faith Christ's power is united to us**. Now **the power of blotting out sin belongs in a special way to His Passion**. And therefore men are delivered from sin **especially by faith in His Passion**, according to Romans 3:25: "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood." Therefore **the power of the sacraments which is ordained unto the remission of sins is derived principally from faith in Christ's Passion**.

Reply OBJ 3: Justification is ascribed to the Resurrection by reason of the term **whither**, which is **newness of life through grace**. But it is ascribed to the Passion by reason of the term **whence**, i.e. in **regard to the forgiveness of sin**. [III, q. 62, a. 5].



On the contrary, It is written (Galatians 4:9): "Turn you again to the weak and needy elements?" i.e. "to the Law," says the gloss, "which is called weak, because it does not justify perfectly." But **grace justifies perfectly**. Therefore the sacraments of the Old Law did not confer 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 Galatians 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 (a. 5), **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**.

Reply OBJ 1: The Fathers of old had faith in the future Passion of Christ, which, **inasmuch as it was apprehended by the mind, was able to justify them**. But we have faith in the past Passion of Christ, which is able to justify, also **by the real use of sacramental things** as stated above.

Reply OBJ 2: That **sanctification was but a figure**: for **they were said to be sanctified forasmuch as they gave themselves up to the Divine worship** according to the rite of the Old Law, which was wholly ordained to the foreshadowing of Christ's Passion.

Reply OBJ 3: There have been many opinions about Circumcision. For, according to some, Circumcision conferred no grace, but only remitted sin. But this is impossible; because man is not justified from sin save by grace, according to Romans 3:24: "Being justified freely by His grace."

Wherefore others said that by Circumcision grace is conferred, **as to the privative effects of sin**, but not as to its positive effects. But this also appears to be false, because by Circumcision, children received the faculty of obtaining glory, which is the ultimate positive effect of grace. Moreover, as regards the order of the formal cause, positive effects are naturally prior to privative effects, though according to the order of the material cause, the reverse is the case: for a form does not exclude privation save by informing the subject.

Hence others say that Circumcision conferred grace also as regards a certain positive effect, i.e. by making man worthy of eternal life, but not so as to repress concupiscence which makes man prone to sin. And so at one time it seemed to me.

But if the matter be considered carefully, this too appears to be untrue; because the very least grace is sufficient to resist any degree of concupiscence, and to merit eternal life. And therefore it seems better to say that **Circumcision was a sign of justifying faith**: wherefore the Apostle says (Romans 4:11) that Abraham "received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the justice of faith." Consequently grace was conferred in Circumcision in so far as it was a sign of Christ's future Passion, as will be made clear further on (q. 70, a. 4). [**III, q. 62, a. 6**].

†

He especially attends to the efficiency of the causality when **he considers the passion as operating in divine virtuality**, even though **he calls the Passion a sacrifice**. St. Thomas presents it this way:

Reply OBJ 1: Although **Christ was a priest, not as God, but as man, yet one and the same was both priest and God**. Wherefore in the Council of Ephesus (Part 3, chapter 1, anathema 10) we read: "If anyone says that the very Word of God did not become **our High-Priest and Apostle**, when He became flesh and a man like us, but altogether another one, the man born of a woman, let him be anathema." Hence in so far as **His human nature operated by virtue of the Divine, that sacrifice was most efficacious for the blotting out of sins**. For this reason Augustine says (De Trinitate iv,14): "So that, since four things are to be observed in every sacrifice - to whom it is offered, by whom it is offered, what is offered, for whom it is offered; the same one true Mediator reconciling us to God by the sacrifice of peace, was one with Him to Whom it was offered, united in Himself those for whom He offered it, at the same time offered it Himself, and was Himself that which He offered." [**III, q. 22, a. 3, ad 1um**].

To operate **in virtue of the Divinity** as such, properly refers to **efficiency, i.e., instrumental causality**:

On the contrary, It is written (1 Corinthians 1:18) that "the word of the cross to them that are saved . . . is the power of God." But God's power brings about our salvation efficiently. Therefore **Christ's Passion on the cross accomplished our salvation efficiently**.

I answer that, There is a twofold efficient agency - namely, the **principal** and the instrumental. Now the **principal efficient cause** of man's salvation is God. But since **Christ's humanity is the instrument of the Godhead**, as stated above (q. 43, a. 2), therefore **all Christ's actions and sufferings operate instrumentally in virtue of His Godhead** for the salvation of men. Consequently, then, Christ's Passion accomplishes man's salvation efficiently. **[III. q. 48. a. 6. c].**

†

On the contrary, our Lord said (John 14:10): "**The Father who abideth in Me, He doth the works.**"

I answer that, as stated in the I, q. 110, a. 4, **true miracles cannot be wrought save by Divine power**: because **God alone can change the order of nature**; and this is what is meant by a miracle. Wherefore Pope Leo says (Ep. 28 ad Fluvial) that, **while there are two natures in Christ, there is "one," viz. the Divine, which shines forth in miracles; and "another," viz. the human, "which submits to insults"; yet "each communicates its actions to the other": in as far as the human nature is the instrument of the Divine action, and the human action receives power from the Divine Nature, as stated above (q. 19, a. 1). **[III. q. 43. a. 2 c].****

Therefore, the **virtuality** of the Host, Victim, once offered is **eternal** in so far as effects are produced for all time **in perpetuity** dependently on God, **on the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ on the Cross**, also as **from the instrument operating as efficient**. Therefore, not only His death as it is unfolding but also **the Death of Jesus Christ, in so far as this Death is considered as a completed fact** even though it is not operated toward our salvation by means of merit, all this is nonetheless **operated by means of efficiency**:

Reply OBJ 2: Though Christ's death, considered in fact did **not affect our salvation by way of merit**, yet it did so by way of **causality**, as stated above.

Reply OBJ 3: Christ's death was indeed corporeal; but **the body was the instrument of the Godhead united to Him, working by Its power, although dead. **[III. q. 50. a. 6. ad 2um. 3 um].****

†

Reply OBJ 2: **Christ's Passion, although corporeal, has yet a spiritual effect from the Godhead united**: and therefore it **secures its efficacy** by spiritual contact

- **namely, by faith and the sacraments of faith**, as the Apostle says (Romans 3:25): "Whom God hath proposed to be a **propitiation, through faith in His blood.**"

i.e. **by faith**, or an act of the soul and by the **sacraments** of the faith or through the use of external realities.

The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ differs from the sacrifices of the Old Law by figures; which have only some **virtuality** for sanctifying, as **figures of the Sacrifice of the Cross** and as the **signs of the faith in the Christ to come**. As a result, these sacrifices had to be annually renewed. However, the Sacrifice of the life of the Lamb who was immolated from the foundation of the world [Rv 13:8] - for past time and the future as well, offered once and for all suffices and does not have to be renewed. Nonetheless, in a different manner is the bloody sacrifice of Christ operates in the OT and in the NT:

On the contrary, It is written (Galatians 4:9): "Turn you again to the weak and needy elements?" i.e. "to the **Law**," says the gloss, "which is called weak, because it **does not justify perfectly.**" But **grace justifies perfectly.** Therefore the sacraments of **the Old Law did not confer 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 Galatians 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 (a. 5), 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**. [III, q. 62, a. 6, c].

Therefore, **the patriarchs in the old Law were justified by faith of the future Passion of Christ**; not through **the sacraments of the faith which have their virtuality in the Passion of Christ**.

Even though it is to be held that according to St. Thomas **the Sacrifice carried out on the Cross in the eternal and divine virtuality of the Eternal Word united efficiently and instrumentally operates in perpetuity**. There is not excluded that **the humanity glorious of Christ** as has already been noted **the resurrection remains as the conjoined instrument of His Divinity**, and so may always operate, as **both efficient and exemplar causality**. Nonetheless it should be properly noted that Jesus Christ, the God-man ordained His Passion, or **His sacrifice on the Cross, toward the salvation of humanity** and His **other mysteries only in so far as these are connected with His Passion**.

2. Concerning the Celestial sacrifice. The sacrifice offered on the Cross remains in its Glorious Consummation in the Heavenly realms.

Jesus Christ, the Great Merciful High Priest continues His priestly office in glory, according to Heb 7:24-25 ... *this One, because He remains forever, can never lose His priesthood. It follows, then, that His power to save is utterly certain, since He is living forever to intercede for all who came to God through Him* ... St. Thomas notes that He intercedes for us, first representing His humanity, which He assumed for us. Likewise, the desire of His most holy soul which He exercised for our salvation, by expressing with which He appeals for us... [**Comm. In Epist. Ad Heb., c. 7, lect 4 a**].

The question arises, though, how did the sacrifice of the Cross remain? There remains always in Christ that **perfect charity**, no longer as a Wayfarer but as a Comprehensor only, by which **He is present to God as most**

accepted by God. Thus, **Heb 10:12** states: **...He on the other hand, has offered one single sacrifice for sins, and then taken His place for ever, at the right hand of God, where He is now waiting until His enemies are made into a footstool for him...** His Oblation, conjoined to His bloody immolation with this has passed ass such **for ever**, with there **remaining His sacrificial mentality** which Christ from the very first instant of His terrestrial life, and which **now pertains to the consummation of sacrifice**.

The external Sacrifice of the Cross in some manner also remains in so far as Christ in perpetuity keeps Himself present to God with the Glorious Scars of His Passion, while supplicating to the Father for us as He offered His kind of death for humanity, He always manifested:

On the contrary, Our Lord said to Thomas (John 20:27): **"Put in thy finger hither, and see My hands; and bring hither thy hand, and put it into My side, and be not faithless but believing."**

I answer that, It was **fitting for Christ's soul at His Resurrection to resume the body with its scars**.

In the first place, **for Christ's own glory**. For Bede says on Luke 24:40 that He kept His scars not from inability to heal them, "but to wear them as an everlasting trophy of His victory." Hence Augustine says (De Civitate Dei xxii): "Perhaps in that kingdom we shall see on the bodies of the Martyrs the traces of the wounds which they bore for Christ's name: because it will not be a deformity, but a dignity in them; and a certain kind of beauty will shine in them, in the body, though not of the body."

Secondly, to **confirm the hearts of the disciples as to "the faith in His Resurrection"** (Bede, on Luke 24:40).

Thirdly, "that when He pleads for us with the Father, **He may always show the manner of death He endured for us**" (Bede, on Luke 24:40).

Fourthly, "that He **may convince those redeemed in His blood, how mercifully they have been helped, as He exposes before them the traces of the same death**" (Bede, on Luke 24:40). Lastly, "that in the Judgment-day He may upbraid them with their just condemnation" (Bede, on Luke 24:40).

Hence, as Augustine says (De Symbolo ii): **"Christ knew why He kept the scars in His body. For, as He showed them to Thomas who would not believe except he handled and saw them, so will He show His wounds to His enemies, so that He who is the Truth may convict them, saying: Behold the**

man whom you crucified; see the wounds you inflicted; recognize the side you pierced, since it was opened by you and for you, yet you would not enter." [**III, q. 54, a. 4, c**]⁵

Therefore, we read [Rv 5:6]: ... *Then I saw standing between the Throne with its four animals and the circle of the elders, a Lamb that seemed to have been sacrificed...*

With this '**celestial sacrifice**', in which there is consummated that of the Cross, **both the blessed and the militants are associated in different ways**: the Blessed, in their indefectible by which they render glory to Jesus Christ the Great High Priest and Victim, while they participate in His glory. **They have already been made conform to Him according to a certain redundancy of His beatitude.** They are associated to the **Oblation of Jesus Christ**, or to **His life-long, perennial sacrificial Mind-set** by **adhering to God in the Beatific Vision** and in their **confirmed charity that cannot be lost in glory**. The Blessed in glory are already constituted in their terminal state and they **perpetually, for all eternity, exhibit their mind-set of eternal internal sacrifice**: ... *They sang a New Hymn: You are worthy to take the scroll and break the seals of it because you were sacrificed and with your blood you bought men for God of every race, language, people and nation, and made them a line of kings and priests to serve our God and to rule the world ...* [Rv 5:9, f.].

There is no longer required any external sacrifice, not only because there has already taken place the **eternal consummation** of the salvific sacrifice, because truly distinct is the condition of the Blessed in heaven and that of the Wayfarers still on their earthly pilgrimage. **In the heavenly life the sensible signs of the internal oblation are not required** for the recognition and manifestation of this, but **they are only there as rays of the glory of the soul in a glorified body**. And in this manner as in the body of Jesus Christ, **the Stigmata of His Passion are found also of the martyrs**:

...These are the people who have been through the great persecution, because they have washed their robes white again in the Blood of the Lamb ... [cf. Rv 7:14].

Wayfarers are associated with **the Glorious Christ** in so far as He infuses **grace** into them, or **the seed of glory**, so that **they will be**

⁵ Translators' Note: this is p. 43 of the original Latin text.

assimilated to the suffering and compassionate Christ Whom they might reach according to this insight of St. Paul: ... ***And if we are children we are heirs as well: heirs of God and coheirs with Christ, sharing His sufferings so as to share His glory....*** [Rm 8:17].

Furthermore **Jesus Christ, the Merciful High Priest, and Victim, our Pontiff and the Head of our grace,** by consummating His Salvific Sacrifice on the Cross, willed to **associate us to His Oblation**, or **communicate His Sacrifice to the Church**, by instituting authoritatively **as God**, and **instrumentally in His humanity**, the Most Holy Eucharist, the Sacrament and Sacrifice, toward which our reflection now turns.

†
†††
†

CHAPTER III

THE EXERCISE OF THE ETERNAL PRIESTHOOD

IN HIS SACRAMENTAL SACRIFICE

Presentation

The Sacramental Order is understood as that complexity of visible signs, or of sacred symbols, by which the faithful are configured to Jesus Christ and are associated with Him in this life. This is so that with Jesus As Eternal High Priest, they might constitute one Mystical Body which is the Roman Catholic Church:

Reply OBJ 3: The apostles and their successors are God's vicars in governing the Church which is built on faith and the sacraments of faith. Wherefore, just as **they may not institute another Church**, so neither may they deliver another faith, **nor institute other sacraments**: on the contrary, **the Church is said to be built up with the sacraments "which flowed from the side of Christ while hanging on the Cross."** [III, q. 64, a. 2, ad 3 um].

†

On the contrary, on Romans 5:14: "After the similitude of the transgression of Adam," etc., the gloss says: "**From the side of Christ asleep on the Cross flowed the sacraments which brought salvation to the Church.**" Consequently, it seems that the sacraments derive their power from Christ's Passion. [III, q. 62, a. 5].

The Sacraments of the New Life instituted by Jesus Christ [the God-Man] figure the mystery of grace, and they truly contain this mystery and communicate it to us **efficiently**. They are signs of a sacred reality, or of the mystery of grace, and are not only 'signs' only but they contain the mystery of grace and communicate this to us in an **efficient** manner. They do not bring about all that they figure; for they do not bring about the cause of our sanctification, which is the Passion of Christ, which they contain in some manner, since they do act in the virtuality of the Passion – nor, do they the ultimate end of our sanctification which is eternal life, but they directly bring about the form of our sanctification, i.e., which consists in grace and the virtues:

On the contrary, In the Sacrament of the Altar, two things are signified, viz. **Christ's true body, and Christ's mystical body**; as Augustine says (Liber Responsionum Prosperi).

I answer that, As stated above (A2) **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.****

Reply OBJ 1: There is a sign ambiguous and the occasion of deception, when it signifies many things not ordained to one another. But **when it signifies many things inasmuch as, through being mutually ordained**, they form one thing, then the sign is not ambiguous but certain: thus this word man signifies the soul and body inasmuch as together they form the human nature. In this way a sacrament signifies the three things aforesaid, inasmuch as by being in a certain order they are one thing.

Reply OBJ 2: Since **a sacrament signifies that which sanctifies**, it must need signify the effect, which is implied in the sanctifying cause as such.

Reply OBJ 3: It is enough for a sacrament that it signifies that perfection which consists in the form, nor is it necessary that it should signify only that perfection which is the end. [III, q. 30, a. 3]

Some of these also bring about the **character of conformity** with Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest, so that all the sanctified, together with Him and through Him we might render to God a worthy Liturgy to God in charity:

On the contrary, Some define character thus: **"A character is a distinctive mark printed in a man's rational soul by the eternal Character, whereby the created trinity is sealed with the likeness of the creating and re-creating Trinity, and distinguishing him from those who are not so enlivened, according to the state of faith."** But the **eternal Character is Christ Himself**, according to Hebrews 1:3: "Who being the brightness of His

glory and the figure," or character, "of His substance." It seems, therefore, that the character should properly be attributed to Christ.

I answer that, As has been made clear above (a. 1), 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 Ezekiel 9:4 "Mark Thou upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and mourn"; and Apocalypse 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.

Reply OBJ 1: The Apostle speaks there of that **sealing** by which a man is **assigned to future glory, and which is effected by grace**. Now grace is attributed to the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as it is through love that God gives us something gratis, which is the very nature of grace: while the Holy Ghost is love. Wherefore it is written (1 Corinthians 12:4): "There are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit."

Reply OBJ 2: **The sacramental character** is a thing as regards the exterior sacrament, and a sacrament in regard to the ultimate effect. Consequently, something can be attributed to a character in two ways.

First, if the character be considered as a sacrament: and thus it is **a sign of the invisible grace** which is conferred in the sacrament.

Secondly, if it be considered as a character. And thus it is **a sign conferring on a man a likeness to some principal person** in whom is vested the authority over that to which he is assigned: thus soldiers who are assigned to military service, are marked with their leader's sign, by which they are, in a fashion, likened to him. And in this way **those who are deputed to**

the Christian worship, of which Christ is the author, receive a character by which they are likened to Christ. Consequently, properly speaking, this is Christ's character.

Reply OBJ 3: **A character distinguishes one from another**, in relation to some particular end, to which he, who receives the character is ordained: as has been stated concerning the military character (a. 1) by which a soldier of the king is distinguished from the enemy's soldier in relation to the battle. In like manner **the character of the faithful is that by which the faithful of Christ are distinguished from the servants of the devil, either in relation to eternal life, or in relation to the worship of the Church that now is.** Of these the former is the result of charity and grace, as the objection runs; while the latter results from the sacramental character. Wherefore the "character of the beast" may be understood by opposition, to mean either the obstinate malice for which some are assigned to eternal punishment, or the profession of an unlawful form of worship. **[III. q. 63, a. 3].**

Therefore, two-fold is the aspect of the sacraments I so far as they constitute union with Jesus Christ the High Priest in His Mystical Body:

a.] according to the sacramental grace by which in Him we are renewed through grace in so far one's individual and social life postulates. of sin and defects and by the increase of grace in so far as one's social and individual life demands.

b.] according to the cult of the Christian religion which is the scope of the sacramental order:

On the contrary, Those **sacraments in which a character is imprinted, are not reiterated**, because a **character is indelible**, as stated above (a. 5): whereas some sacraments are reiterated, for instance, penance and matrimony. Therefore not all the sacraments imprint a character.

I answer that, As stated above (q. 62, aa. 1,5), 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 (De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia 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 (q. 65, a. 3).

Consequently, **these three sacraments imprint a character, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, and order**.

Reply OBJ 1: **Every sacrament makes man of the a participator in Christ's Priesthood, from the fact that it confers on him some effect thereof**. But every sacrament does not depute a man to do or receive something pertaining to the worship of the priesthood of Christ: while **it is just this that is required for a sacrament to imprint a character**.

Reply OBJ 2: **Man is sanctified by each of the sacraments, since sanctity means immunity from sin, which is the effect of grace**. But in a special way **some sacraments, which imprint a character, bestow on man a certain consecration**, thus **deputing him to the Divine worship**: just as **inanimate things are said to be consecrated forasmuch as they are deputed to Divine worship**.

Reply OBJ 3: Although a character is a reality and a sacrament, **it does not follow that whatever is a reality and a sacrament, is also a character**. With regard to the other sacraments we shall explain further on what is the reality and what is the sacrament. **[III, q. 63, a. 1 c]**.

Most especially that Sacrament which is '**the end and the consummation of all the Sacraments - the most Holy Eucharist**' - which is at one and the same time, the **Sacrament** and the **Sacrifice** of the Church:

III. QUESTION 65: OF THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS

ARTICLE 3: Whether the Eucharist is the greatest of the sacraments?

OBJ 1: It seems that the Eucharist is not the principal of the sacraments. For the common good is of more account than the good of the individual (Ethica Nicomachea i,2). But Matrimony is ordained to the common good of the human race by means of generation: whereas the sacrament of the Eucharist is ordained to the private good of the recipient. Therefore it is not the greatest of the sacraments.

OBJ 2: Further, those sacraments, seemingly, are greater, which are conferred by a greater minister. But the sacraments of Confirmation and Order are conferred by a bishop only, who is a greater minister than a mere minister such as a priest, by whom the sacraments of the Eucharist is conferred. Therefore those sacraments are greater.

OBJ 3: Further, those sacraments are greater that have the greater power. But some of the sacraments imprint a character, viz. Baptism, Confirmation and Order; whereas the Eucharist does not. Therefore those sacraments are greater.

OBJ 4: Further, that seems to be greater, on which others depend without its depending on them. But the Eucharist depends on Baptism: since no one can receive the Eucharist except he has been baptized. Therefore Baptism is greater than the Eucharist.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia iii) that "**No one receives hierarchical perfection save by the most God-like Eucharist**." Therefore **this sacrament is greater than all the others and perfects them**.

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 (Q62,A4,r 3, A5). 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 manifested 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 (Ephesians 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 (De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia 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 (a. 2), 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**.

Reply OBJ 1: Matrimony is ordained to the common good as regards the body. But **the common spiritual good of the whole Church is contained substantially in the sacrament itself of the Eucharist**.

Reply OBJ 2: By **Order** and **Confirmation** the faithful of Christ are **deputed to certain special duties**; and this can be done by the prince alone. Consequently the conferring of these sacraments belongs exclusively to a bishop, who is, as it were, a prince in the Church. But **a man is not deputed to any duty by the sacrament of the Eucharist, rather is this sacrament the end of all duties**, as stated above.

Reply OBJ 3: **The sacramental character, as stated above (q. 63, a. 3), is a kind of participation in Christ's priesthood.** Wherefore the sacrament that unites man to Christ Himself, is greater than a sacrament that imprints Christ's character.

Reply OBJ 4: This argument proceeds on the ground of necessity. For thus **Baptism, being of the greatest necessity, is the greatest of the sacraments**, just as order and Confirmation have a certain excellence considered in their administration; and Matrimony by reason of its signification. For there is no reason why a thing should not be greater from a certain point of view which is not greater absolutely speaking.

†

Therefore, the Eucharist pertains supremely to Divine Worship, by means of its very action of worship, while the other sacraments are by means of the agent [Ordo], or the recipient:

On the contrary, Those **sacraments in which a character is imprinted, are not reiterated, because a character is indelible**, as stated above (A5): whereas some sacraments are reiterated, for instance, penance and matrimony. Therefore not all the sacraments imprint a character.

I answer that, As stated above (q. 62, aa. 1,5), 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 (De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia 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 (q. 65, a. 3). Consequently, **these three sacraments imprint a character, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, and order.**

Reply OBJ 1: Every sacrament makes man of the a **participator in Christ's Priesthood**, from the fact that it confers on him some effect thereof. But every sacrament does **not depute a man to do or receive something pertaining to the worship of the priesthood of Christ**: while it is just this that is required for a sacrament to imprint a character.

Reply OBJ 2: **Man is sanctified by each of the sacraments, since sanctity means immunity from sin, which is the effect of grace.** But in a special way some sacraments, which **imprint a character, bestow on man a certain consecration**, thus deputing him to the Divine worship: just as inanimate things are said to be consecrated forasmuch as they are deputed to Divine worship.

Reply OBJ 3: Although a **character** is a reality and a sacrament, it does not follow that whatever is a reality and a sacrament, is also a character. With regard to the other sacraments we shall explain further on what is the reality and what is the sacrament **[III, q. 63, a. 6]**.

†

Although the Eternal Priest would consume his priesthood on earth through all the sacraments, which act **in the virtuality of the Lord's Passion**:

On the contrary, It is written (Galatians 4:9): "Turn you again to the weak and needy elements?" i.e. "to the Law," says the gloss, "which is called weak, because it does not justify perfectly." But **grace justifies perfectly. Therefore the sacraments of the Old Law did not confer 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 Galatians 2:21: "If justice be by the Law, then Christ died in vain."

But **neither can it be said that OT sacraments derived the power of conferring sanctifying grace from Christ's Passion.** For as it was stated

above (a. 5), **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.

Reply OBJ 1: **The Fathers of old had faith in the future Passion of Christ**, which, inasmuch as it was apprehended by the mind, was able to justify them. But we have **faith in the past Passion of Christ, which is able to justify, also by the real use of sacramental things** as stated above.

Reply OBJ 2: **That sanctification was but a figure**: for they were said to be sanctified forasmuch as **they gave themselves up to the Divine worship** according to the rite of the Old Law, which was wholly ordained to the foreshadowing of Christ's Passion.

Reply OBJ 3: There have been many opinions about Circumcision. For, according to some, Circumcision conferred no grace, but only remitted sin. But this is impossible; because man is not justified from sin save by grace, according to Romans 3:24: "Being justified freely by His grace." Wherefore others said that by Circumcision grace is conferred, as to the privative effects of sin, but not as to its positive effects. But this also appears to be false, because by Circumcision, children received the faculty of obtaining glory, which is the ultimate positive effect of grace. Moreover, as regards **the order**

of the formal cause, positive effects are naturally prior to **privative** effects, though according to the order of the material cause, the reverse is the case: for a form does not exclude privation save by informing the subject. Hence others say that Circumcision conferred grace also as regards a certain positive effect, i.e. by making man worthy of eternal life, but not so as to repress concupiscence which makes man prone to sin.

And so at one time it seemed to me. But if the matter be considered carefully, this too appears to be untrue; because **the very least grace is sufficient to resist any degree of concupiscence, and to merit eternal life**. And therefore **it seems better to say that Circumcision was a sign of justifying faith**: wherefore the Apostle says (Romans 4:11) that Abraham "received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the justice of faith." Consequently grace was conferred in Circumcision in so far as it was a sign of Christ's future Passion, as will be made clear further on (q. 70, a. 4). [**III, q. 62, a. 6, c.**].

†

However, **in a most excellent manner the virtuality of the Passion of Christ exercises through this Sacrament-Sacrifice**, especially concerning the reason of **Sacrifice**, in so far as **it renders the Church a participant in the sacramental mystery of His Bloody Sacrifice by means of a genuine and properly authentic sacrifice**. For Christ indeed instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice so that **through It the Church would not only perceive the fruits of the Bloody Sacrifice**, but so that also **by this properly sacrificial oblation it would be associated in perpetuity in the sacrificial oblation of the Eternal High Priest consummated on the Cross** so that the Eucharistic Sacrifice might not be simply a new sacrifice from that which Christ Himself as **the sacramental perpetuation of this**:

Reply OBJ 2: Sins are commemorated in the New Law, not on account of the inefficacy of the priesthood of Christ, as though sins were not sufficiently expiated by Him: but in regard to those who either are not willing to be participators in His sacrifice, such as unbelievers, for whose sins we pray that they be converted; or who, after taking part in this sacrifice, fall away from it by whatsoever kind of sin.

The Sacrifice which is offered every day in the Church is not distinct from that which Christ Himself offered, but is a commemoration thereof. Wherefore Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,20): "Christ Himself both is the **priest** who offers it and the **victim**: the **sacred token** of which He wished to be the daily Sacrifice of the Church." [**III, q. 22, a. 3, ad 2 um**].

Since this is His very own Body it is said that there is offered Himself by Himself [St. Augustine, City of God, 10-20, P. I, 41].

Therefore, the Eucharistic is a mere, or nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross since one and the same is the One offering by the ministry of the priests, and the same Victim present under the species of bread and wine, as the Eucharistic sacrifice, or of the Church, is in some way one with that of the Cross or the **sacramental *perpetuation of this***.

However, the challenging problem is how in the **daily Sacrifice** which is offered all over the world how is it also the Great High and Eternal Priest of Mercy Himself Who is offering it, and He is this Oblation, or Victim, and indeed so that this Sacrifice is His own, and that of the Cross? In this connection there are three matters that need to be examined:

1º The Priest Offering

2º He Victim offered

3º The Unity of the Bloody Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Church.

†
†††
†

Article 1

Concerning the Offering Priest

1^o Concerning the Minister

Since in the sacramental sacrifice there is a priest who in the Name of Jesus Christ and the Church offers the sacrifice, so, in the very first place there is to be considered by what power that visible priest, or minister, exercises the act of Oblation. The OT priests were deputed by God by some external consecration only. By God they were called and instituted either already by the Old Law, indeed through the designation of the God calling them, such as Aaron. They exercised the Priesthood fruitfully based on the foreseen merits of Jesus Christ; yet, they did not act in **His Name or Person, nor in His virtuality**, properly speaking - but merely as figures of the true Eternal Priest who was to come.

As a result, they were not instruments or ministers of Jesus Christ but priests in 'figure', or 'shadows' of the eternal Priest, exercising a figuring Priesthood: ... ***the Law has no more than a reflection of these realities and no finished picture of them...*** [Heb 10:1].

By contrast, the priests of the New Law are not only **deputed by some moral deputation and extrinsic juridical consecration**, but they are **consecrated by an intrinsic consecration** that is such by which **they physically share in the priestly power of the Eternal High Priest of Mercy**, so that they might conduct themselves actively in Worship, especially concerning its principal activity, i.e. the **oblation of the sacrifice**. Through an indelible priestly character impressed on the human soul they are configured to Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest of Mercy, and they are rendered apt that they may an active part in Christian worship, by acting properly in the **name, person and in the virtuality of Jesus Christ**:

On the contrary, Augustine (Paschasius) says (De Corpore et Sanguine Domini xii): "**Within the Catholic Church, in the mystery of the Lord's body and blood, nothing greater is done by a good priest, nothing less by an evil priest, because it is not by the merits of the consecrator that the sacrament is accomplished, but by the Creator's word, and by the power of the Holy Spirit.**"

I answer that, As was said above (aa. 1,3), **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 (Matthew 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 Corinthians 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. [III. q. 82, 1. 5]

†

On the contrary, Isidore says in an Epistle to Ludifred (Decretals, distinction 25): **"It belongs to a priest to consecrate this sacrament of the Lord's body and blood upon God's altar."**

I answer that, As stated above (q. 78, aa. 1,4), **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 (Luke 22:19): **"Do this for a commemoration of Me."** Therefore, it must be said that it **belongs to priests to accomplish this sacrament**.

Reply OBJ 2: A **devout layman** is united with Christ by spiritual union through faith and charity, but not by sacramental power: consequently he has **a spiritual priesthood for offering spiritual sacrifices**, of which it is said (Psalm 1:19): "A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit"; and (Romans 12:1): "Present your bodies a living sacrifice." Hence, too, it is written (1 Peter 2:5): "A holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." [III. q. 82, a. 1 c & ad 2 um].



Reply OBJ 3: The priest, in reciting the prayers of the mass, speaks instead of **the Church, in whose unity he remains**; but **in consecrating the sacrament he speaks as in the person of Christ, Whose place he holds by the power of his orders**. Consequently, if a priest severed from the unity of the Church celebrates mass, **not having lost the power of order, he consecrates Christ's true body and blood**; but because he is severed from the unity of the Church, his prayers have no efficacy. [**III. q. 82, a. 7 ad 3 um**].



On the contrary, Ambrose says (De Sacramentis iv): "**The consecration is accomplished by the words and expressions of the Lord Jesus**. Because, by all the other words spoken, praise is rendered to God, prayer is put up for the people, for kings, and others; but **when the time comes for perfecting the sacrament**, the priest uses no longer his own words, **but the words of Christ**. **Therefore, it is Christ's words that perfect this sacrament**."

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. [III, q. 78, a. 1, c].

†

Reply OBJ 3: For the same reason (Reply OBJ 2) **the priest also bears Christ's image, in Whose person and by Whose power he pronounces the words of consecration**, as is evident from what was said above (q. 82, a. 1,3). And so, in a measure, **the priest and victim are one and the same. [III, q. 83, a. 1 ad 3 um].**

†

On the contrary, Ambrose says in one of his Orations (Oratione 33): "It is a grave matter if we do not approach Thy altar with clean heart and pure hands; but it is graver still if while shunning sins we also fail to offer our sacrifice."

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 Corinthians 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 Maccabees 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."

Reply OBJ 1: The other sacraments are accomplished in being used by the faithful, and therefore he alone is bound to administer them who has undertaken the care of souls. But this sacrament is performed in the consecration of the Eucharist, whereby a sacrifice is offered to God, to which the priest is bound from the order he has received [**III, q. 82, a. 10, c. & ad 1 um**].

Priests therefore have received a **sacramental power**:

Reply OBJ 2: **A devout layman is united with Christ by spiritual union through faith and charity**, but not by sacramental power: consequently he has **a spiritual priesthood for offering spiritual sacrifices**, of which it is said (Psalm 1:19): "A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit"; and (Romans 12:1): "**Present your bodies a living sacrifice.**" Hence, too, it is written (1 Peter 2:5): "**A holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices.**" [**III, q. 82, a. 1, ad 2 um**].

Therefore, they consecrate the matter by pronouncing the very words of Jesus Christ, and so they offer the **sacrifice in the Name, Person and Virtuality of Jesus Christ**. The sacramental power is communicated to the priest in his ordination, and is called **the character of the priestly order**. This is a **ministerial**, or **instrumental power** which priests, instituted by Christ exercise both in act when they pronounce the consecratory words, by which, **in the divine virtuality they have received**, they totally convert the substance of the bread and the wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ - this they do when they offer the sacred sacrifice:

On the contrary, These words are pronounced in the person of Christ, Who says of Himself (John 14:6): "I am the truth."

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 (Tractatus 80 in Joannis): "**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 (q. 85, a. 1).

- 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 (a. 4), 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 Hermenias 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 (q. 77, a. 7).

- 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. [**III, q. 78, a. 5 c**].

†

Therefore, the minister does not act in a **principal manner** as a minister of the Church, **but of Jesus Christ**, whose place he takes by the power of Holy Orders he has received:

Reply OBJ 3: The priest, in reciting the prayers of the mass, speaks instead of the Church, in whose unity he remains; but **in consecrating the sacrament he speaks as in the person of Christ, Whose place he holds by the power of his orders**. Consequently, if a priest severed from the unity of the Church celebrates mass, **not having lost the power of order, he consecrates Christ's true body and blood**; but because he is severed from the unity of the Church, his prayers have no efficacy. [**III, q. 82, a. 7 ad 3 um**].

Therefore, since **the sacrifice consists in the consecration**, it cannot be said that the Church offers the Eucharistic sacrifice unless in so far as she offers this through those members of her who are the ordained ministers of Jesus Christ. In this manner, it is rightly said that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the sacrifice of the Church, or of the Mystical Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head.

The priestly minister, since he **the instrument animated by his rational soul** acts of himself willingly, in pronouncing the words of the consecration, when he is moved **by the divine virtuality** to bringing about the conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ:

Reply OBJ 1: **An inanimate instrument** has no intention regarding the effect; but instead of the intention there is the motion whereby it is **moved by the principal agent**. But an **animate instrument**, such as a minister, is not

only moved, but in a sense moves itself, in so far as by his will he moves his bodily members to act. Consequently, his intention is required, whereby he subjects himself to the principal agent; that is, it is necessary that he intend to do that which Christ and the Church do. [III, q. 64, a. 8 ad 1 um].

†

Reply OBJ 1: Christ is the true God in Divine Person and Nature. Yet because together with unity of person there remains distinction of natures, as stated above (q. 2, aa.1,2), the soul of Christ is not essentially Divine. Hence **it behooves it to be Divine by participation, which is by grace.** [III, q. 7, a. 1 ad 3 um].

†

Reply OBJ 2: It is **proper to an instrument to be moved by the principal agent**, yet diversely, according to the property of its nature. For an inanimate instrument, as an axe or a saw, is moved by the craftsman with only a corporeal movement; but **an instrument animated by a sensitive soul is moved by the sensitive appetite**, as a horse by its rider; and **an instrument animated with a rational soul is moved by its will, as by the command of his lord the servant is moved to act, the servant being like an animate instrument**, as the Philosopher says (Politica i,2,4; Ethica Nicomachea viii,11). And hence it was in this manner that **the human nature of Christ was the instrument of the Godhead, and was moved by its own will.**

†

Therefore, the priestly minister in pronouncing the words of consecration with the intention of doing what Jesus Christ, offers the sacrifice.

Moreover, the Charity and Faith of the priestly Minister are not even of necessity in the sacrament. All that is required of the nature of an instrument is a certain proper activity, because otherwise there would be nothing of the instrument, or nothing would be receptive for the motion and elevation for operating in an instrumental manner:

On the contrary, Augustine says on John 1:33: "He upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit," etc. (Tractatus 5 in Joannis), that "John did not know that our Lord, having the authority of baptizing, would keep it to Himself, but that the ministry would certainly pass to both good and evil men . . . What is a bad minister to thee, where the Lord is good?"

I answer that, As stated above (a. 1), 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 (q. 62, aa. 1,4), **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. [III, q. 64, a. 5, c]**

Furthermore, as has already been seen whenever it is a matter of an instrument of God it does not matter which form, or proper action other than that which God chose to determine. Therefore, surely Charity and Faith are not required of the necessity of the Sacrament but would be, so the minister might not unworthily exercise his office and also so that he might share in the fruits of the sacrament.

There are three requirements in the minister:

- the **Power** [the **Character of Order**];
- the **intention** of doing that which the Church does;
- and to pronounce the words [the form] over the proper matter, which **recite the words in the Person and in the Virtuality of Jesus Christ.**

2º The Principal Offering Celebrant

The Principal Offerer [Celebrant] is the Eternal High Priest Himself, acting through His ministers:

On the contrary, It is the custom of some Churches for **priests newly ordained to co-celebrate with the bishop ordaining them.**

I answer that, As stated above (a. 1), **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 Sacro Altaris Mysterio iv), **the intention of all should be directed to the same instant of the consecration.**

Reply OBJ 1: We do not read of Christ baptizing with the apostles when He committed to them the duty of baptizing; consequently there is no parallel. [**III, q 82. A. 1. c. & ad 1 um**].

When, therefore, the ordained Ministers celebrate, they operate out of that power conferred on them, or through the character impressed upon their soul in an **habitual manner**. However, in order that they might be actually moved by Jesus Christ, Who as God, authoritatively, and in His humanity by the **power of excellence has instituted instrumentally the sacraments and confers the divine virtuality on them**: For according to Jesus in His Divinity, Jesus Christ operates in the sacraments through authority - however, **according to His humanity**, He operates on the interior effects of the sacraments, **meritoriously** and **efficiently**, but **instrumentally**. For it has been said [cf. **III, qq. 48 & 49**] that the Passion of Jesus Christ, which befits Him in His human nature, is the cause of our Justification, both meritoriously and effectively, not indeed in the manner of the Principal Agent or through His Divine Authority, but **through the manner of an instrument**, in so far as His humanity is indeed the instrument of His divinity, as has been noted [cf. **q. 13, aa. 1 & 3**]:

On the contrary, What is proper to God cannot belong to any creature. But it is proper to God to be omnipotent, according to Exodus 15:2,3: "He is my God and I will glorify Him," and further on, "Almighty is His name." Therefore the soul of Christ, as being a creature, has not omnipotence.

I answer that, As was said above (q. 2, a. 1; q. 10, a. 1) **in the mystery of the Incarnation the union in person so took place that there still remained the distinction of natures, each nature still retaining what belonged to it**. Now the active principle of a thing follows its form, which is **the principle of action**. But the form is either **the very nature of the thing**, as in simple things; **or is the constituent of the nature of the thing**; as in such as are composed of matter and form. And it is in this way that omnipotence flows, so to say, from the Divine Nature.

For since **the Divine Nature is the very uncircumscribed Being of God**, as is plain from Dionysius (De Divinis Nominibus v), it has **an active power over everything** that can have the nature of being; and this is to have omnipotence; just as every other thing has an active power over such things as the perfection of its nature extends to; as what is hot gives heat. Therefore since **the soul of Christ is a part of human nature, it cannot possibly have omnipotence**.

On the contrary, It is written (**Hebrews 2:17**) that "**it behooved Him in all things to be made like unto His brethren,**" and especially as regards what belongs to the condition of human nature. But it belongs to the condition of human nature that the health of the body and its nourishment and growth are not subject to the bidding of reason or will, since natural things are subject to God alone Who is the author of nature. Therefore they were not subject in Christ. Therefore Christ's soul was not omnipotent with regard to His own body.

I answer that, As stated above (a. 2), Christ's soul may be viewed in two ways.

First, in its proper nature and power; and in this way, as it was incapable of making exterior bodies swerve from the course and order of nature, so, too, was it incapable of changing its own body from its natural disposition, since the soul, of its own nature, has a determinate relation to its body.

Secondly, Christ's soul may be viewed **as an instrument united in person to God's Word**; and thus every disposition of His own body was wholly subject to His power. Nevertheless, since the power of an action is not properly attributed to the instrument, but to the principal agent, this omnipotence is attributed to the Word of God rather than to Christ's soul. [**III, q. 13, a. 3 c**].

†

But, nevertheless, since the human nature of Jesus Christ is an **instrument conjoined** to the divinity in person, it does have a certain principality and causality with regard to extrinsic instruments such as His Ministers are, as is clear from the teachings of St. Thomas:

On the contrary, **The institutor of anything is he who gives it strength and power**: as in the case of those who institute laws. But **the power of a sacrament is from God alone**, as we have shown above (a. 1; q. 62, a. 1). Therefore God alone can institute a sacrament.

I answer that, As appears from what has been said above (a. 1; q. 62, a. 1), **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. [**III, q. 64, a. 2**].



On the contrary, Augustine (Isidore, Etymologiarum vi) says: "The Divine power in the sacraments works inwardly in producing their salutary effect." Now the Divine power is Christ's as God, not as man. Therefore **Christ produces the inward sacramental effect, not as man but as God.**

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 (q. 48, aa. 1,6; q. 49, a. 1) 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 (q. 13, a. 2,3; q. 19, a. 1).**

- 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 (a. 1). 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 (q. 62, a. 5). And because the power of the Passion is communicated to us by faith, according to Romans 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. [**III, q. 64, a. 3**].

†

By instituting the **Most Holy Eucharist and the Priesthood**, **Jesus Christ by His eternal divine virtuality**, is that by which **He attains all places and times**, by causing efficiently its effect wherever and whenever He chooses, He communicates the priestly power to the Apostles and through them to their successors **in perpetuity**. Just as everything which Jesus accomplished and endured were transitory in themselves - yet, nonetheless, **as instruments of the divinity** they have their **effect in perpetuity**, so also **the words of Institution operate in the infinite virtuality of Jesus Christ**.

In the Last Supper Jesus Christ **in time** offered the sacramental sacrifice and at the same time by commanding His Disciples so that they might offer in commemoration of His Passion, **willed the Eucharistic to be perpetuated by the ordained Ministers in a ministerial manner**. In the **divine virtuality of this will of instituting of the Eternal High Priest**, His ordained Ministers as **His Instruments as both separated and animated**, they consecrate and offer His sacrifice, when they pronounce the words of consecration. His ordained Ministers **formally and primarily operate in accord with the Will of Jesus Christ as Way-farer**, Who as God **authoritatively** - and in His humanity He instituted **instrumentally** the sacraments, and He **conferred on them His virtuality**:

On the contrary, **The institutor of anything is he who gives it strength and power**: as in the case of those who institute laws. But the power of a sacrament is from God alone, as we have shown above (A1; Q62,A1). Therefore God alone can institute a sacrament.

I answer that, As appears from what has been said above (a. 1; q. 62, a. 1), **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. [**III, q. 64, a. 2**].

†

On the contrary, Augustine (Isidore, Etymologiarum vi) says: "**The Divine power in the sacraments works inwardly in producing their salutary effect**." Now the Divine power is Christ's as God, not as man. Therefore Christ produces the inward sacramental effect, not as man but as God.

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 (q. 48, aa. 1,6; q. 49, a. 1) 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 (q. 13, aa. 2,3; q. 19, a. 1).

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 (a. 1). 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 (q. 62, a. 5). And because the power of the Passion is communicated to us by faith, according to Romans 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. [**III, q. 64, a. 3**].

†

On the contrary, These words are pronounced in the person of Christ, Who says of Himself (John 14:6): "I am the truth."

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 (Tractatus 80 in Joannis): "**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 (q. 85, a. 1).

- 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 (a. 4), 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 Hermenias 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** (q. 77, a. 7). 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.

Indeed it can be said that even now Jesus Christ in glory is in act offering the Eucharistic sacrifice, not by a new action, but due to His permanent will. But it suffices that in the Last Supper, Jesus Christ willed that His Priesthood would remain in perpetuity so that by Him, in whatever time and place there might be celebrated in His Name and with His virtuality. ⁶

The Eternal High Priest of Mercy Himself - has offered Himself through Himself in the Last Supper under the species of Bread and Wine, with His view on His imminent bloody Oblation which He had willed **to perpetuate sacramentally** through His ministers under a **representative, commemorative and applicative** ritual of **the sacrifice of the Cross**, so that He Himself would remain as the Principal Celebrant **everywhere and always in perpetuity**.

Therefore, since we pronounce the words of consecration by fulfilling the precept of Jesus Christ: ***Do this in memory of Me!*** - we offer the sacrifice actually **in the Person and in the virtuality of Jesus Christ** - who, as Eternal High Priest of Mercy in the Last Supper not only for that particular timeframe - but, for always, and in this manner he proffered supra-temporally the consecratory words.

†
†††
†

⁶ Cf. also p. 43 of Fr. Matthijs' Latin text.

Article 2

The Perpetual Host

All of the Sacraments of the New Law are in some way **signs of the Passion of Jesus Christ in Whose virtuality they produce instrumentally the hidden salutary effect:**

Reply OBJ 3: Although after the consecration this proposition is false: "The substance of the bread is something," still **that into which the substance of the bread is changed, is something, and consequently the substance of the bread is not annihilated.** [III, q. 73, a. 3 ad 3um].

†

On the contrary, The Apostle says (1 Corinthians 5:7,8): "Christ our Pasch is sacrificed; therefore let us feast . . . with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

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" (Wisdom 16:21), 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 Exodus 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.** From this the answer to the Objections is manifest.



On the contrary, Hilary says (De Trinitate viii): "There is no room for doubt regarding the truth of Christ's body and blood; for now by our Lord's own declaring and by our faith His flesh is truly food, and His blood is truly drink. And Ambrose says (De Sacramentis vi): "As the Lord Jesus Christ is God's true Son so is it Christ's true flesh which we take, and His true blood which we drink."

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 Luke 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 Savior'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 Hebrews 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 (De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia 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 (Ethica Nicomachea ix), He promises us His bodily presence as a reward, saying (Matthew 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 (John 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 John 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. [**III, q. 75, a. 1 c**].

†

Reply OBJ 2: There is no deception in this sacrament; for the accidents which are discerned by the senses are truly present. But the intellect, whose proper object is **substance** as is said in De Anima iii, is preserved by faith from deception. And this serves as answer to the third argument; because **faith is not contrary to the senses, but concerns things to which sense does not reach**. [**III, q. 75, a. 5 ad 2 um**].

†

Council of Trent, Session 22, c. 2

And since in this divine sacrifice, which is celebrated in the Mass, that same **Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner**, who on the altar of the Cross '**once** offered Himself' in a bloody manner [Heb 9:27], the Holy Synod teaches this is truly propitiatory [can. 3], and has this effect, that if contrite and penitent we approach God with a sincere heart and right faith, with fear and reverence, 'we obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable aid' [Heb 4:16]. For appeased by this oblation, the Lord, granting the grace and gift of penitence, pardons crimes and even great sins. For it is one and the same Victim, the same one now offering by the ministry of the priests as He Who then offered Himself on the Cross, the manner of offering alone being different. [Denz. 940].

Hence, the question: how can there be one and the same host on the altar and on the Cross? Two points need to be examined:

1^o How does Christ become present sacramentally?

2^o How can there always be always the same Host?

1^o Jesus Christ becomes present really in the Sacrifice of the Mass - formally as having suffered, i.e. with respect to His Passion with an eternal virtuality.

According to the doctrine of the Magisterium of the Church, Jesus Christ becomes really present under the species of bread and wine through the mysterious conversion of the substance of the bread and wine, which conversion is aptly called *transubstantiation*. The term of the conversion which is Christ being present according to **His sacramental being** ought to be determined according to the signification of the Sacrament by Christ in the Last Supper instituted in memory of His Passion. Moreover, this signification appears from the very rite by which it becomes the consecration of a two fold matter separately through the very words of Jesus Christ by which their signification is specified.

The matter of the Sacrament is two-fold, the bread and wine, the substance of which is converted into the substance of the Body and into the substance of the Blood of Jesus Christ, and that so that under the species of bread there would be had of itself, in the strength of the Sacrament, the substance of the Body and under the species of the wine there is had the substance of the Blood of the Lord. *Substance* is understood to be matter and form - the form moreover is that which gives corporeal being, not in so far as it gives animated being in this particular soul:

Reply OBJ 2: The soul is the form of the body, giving it the whole order of perfect being, i.e. **being, corporeal being, and animated being**, and so on. Therefore **the form of the bread is changed into the form of Christ's body, according as the latter gives corporeal being, but not according as it bestows animated being.** [III, q. 75, a. 6, ad 2^{um}].

There is the substance of the Body and Blood through the manner by which substance of dimensions under which there It is contained, and all is in every part of the species, also with the integral host remaining, because the whole nature of the substance is under each part of the dimensions under which it is contained - as the whole nature of air is under each part of the air:

On the contrary, Augustine says in a sermon (Gregory, Sacramentarium): **"Each receives Christ the Lord, Who is entire under every morsel, nor is He less in each portion, but bestows Himself entire under each."**

I answer that, As was observed above (a. 1, ad 3^{um}), 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.

Reply OBJ 2: The determinate distance of parts in an organic body is **based upon its dimensive quantity**; but **the nature of substance precedes even dimensive quantity**. And since **the conversion of the substance of the bread is terminated at the substance of the body of Christ, and since according to the manner of substance the body of Christ is properly and directly in this sacrament**; such distance of parts is indeed in Christ's true body, which, however, is not compared to this sacrament according to such distance, but **according to the manner of its substance**, as stated above (a. 1, ad 3^{um}). [**III, q. 76, a. 3 & ad 2^{um}**].

Since the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine is terminated into the substance of the Body and the Blood, there does not appear the Body and the Blood according to the distance of their parts in this

Sacrament, but according to the manner of its substance, according to the manner of which properly and directly Jesus Christ is in this Sacrament.

For indeed the entire Christ is present according to all intrinsic realities through a real concomitance, even though not so in the strength of the Sacrament, and so the whole Christ is present according to this sacramental being. He is not present according to what is along-side extrinsically, i.e. in so far as He is in this, or that place, on the Cross, in the Tomb, or in heaven. Nor is it moved of itself, according to its sacramental being, **locally**, since **it is not of itself in a place**, nor does it of itself receive from any outside agent. Therefore, neither is it measured by time, according to 'before' and 'after' in comparison to either some heavenly or terrestrial motion. By accident, it is, however, it is in time and place according to its species.

In the strength of the Sacrament, under the species of bread is His Body - and under the species of wine is His Blood - however not [unless by real concomitance] the Body under the species of wine, or the Blood under the species of the bread:

Reply OBJ 1: Because the change of the bread and wine is **not terminated at the Godhead or the soul of Christ**, it follows as a consequence that the Godhead or the soul of Christ is in this sacrament not by the power of the sacrament, but from real concomitance. For since the Godhead never set aside the assumed body, **wherever the body of Christ is, there, of necessity, must the Godhead be**; and therefore **it is necessary for the Godhead to be in this sacrament concomitantly with His body**. Hence we read in the profession of faith at Ephesus (Part 1, cap. 26): "We are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, not as taking common flesh, nor as of a holy man united to the Word in dignity, but the truly life-giving flesh of the Word Himself." On the other hand, His soul was truly separated from His body, as stated above (q. 50, a. 5). And therefore had **this sacrament been celebrated during those three days when He was dead, the soul of Christ would not have been there, neither by the power of the sacrament, nor from real concomitance**. But since "Christ rising from the dead dieth now no more" (Romans 6:9), His soul is always really united with His body.

And therefore **in this sacrament the body indeed of Christ is present by the power of the sacrament, but His soul from real concomitance**. [III, q. 76, a. 1, ad 1^{um}].

On the contrary, The gloss on 1 Corinthians 11:25, commenting on the word Chalice, says that "under each species," namely, of the bread and wine, "the same is received"; and thus it seems that **Christ is entire under each species.**

I answer that, After what we have said above (a. 1), 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 (a. 1, ad 1^{um}) **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. [III, q. 76, a. 2 c].**

†

On the contrary, it is impossible for the same thing to be in motion and at rest, else contradictories would be verified of the same subject. But **Christ's body is at rest in heaven. Therefore it is not movably in this sacrament.**

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 (a. 5).

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. [**III. q. 76. a. 6 c**].

Therefore, the substance of the Body and the Blood according to real concomitance are under both species with an **intrinsic glory**. **In the strength of the Sacrament**, therefore, **Christ would not be present as glorious** [although as present, He becomes glorious] but **as one Who has suffered**, because of itself **He is rendered present in the strength of the Sacrament** - and the Blood separate from the Body since **His Passion principally consists in the outpouring of His Blood, or in the separation of blood and body**. Moreover Christ as having suffered is rendered present in the strength of the sacrament, in so far as **by the divine virtue of the Passion He has worked out instrumentally the salvation of the world** [both by reason of the sacrament, as well as by reason of the sacramental sacrifice]. **The divine virtuality of the Passion** which is present in every sacrament, **in the Eucharist it is present principally and universally**, in so far as in Christ having suffered, as sacramentally present.

Therefore, it is thus clear that the term of conversion on the strength of the sacrament is Jesus Christ having suffered with the **virtuality** of His Passion for the achieving of redemption by the application of the merits and satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

This principally appears from the meaning of the words, or from the form in virtue of which there takes place this wondrous conversion: For in that sacrament the conversion terminates in that which is signified through the form [cf. IV Sent. d. 10, a. 2]. Just as the matter is two-fold, the form is likewise two-fold and separately there is signified the Body of the Blood because this Sacrament is thus understood as being the memorial of the Passion of Jesus Christ in which the Body is separated from the Blood: in the form of the consecration there is mention of its out-pouring:

Reply OBJ 1: Although **the whole Christ is under each species**, yet it is so not without purpose. For **in the first place this serves to represent Christ's**

Passion, in which the blood was separated from the body; hence in the form for the consecration of the blood mention is made of its shedding. Secondly, it is in keeping with the use of this sacrament, **that Christ's body be shown apart to the faithful as food, and the blood as drink**. Thirdly, it is in keeping with its effect, in which sense it was stated above (q. 74, a. 1) that "**the body is offered for the salvation of the body, and the blood for the salvation of the soul.**" [III, 76, a. 2, ad 1 um].

†

On the contrary, The Church, instructed by the apostles, uses this form.

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 Luke 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 (A2) 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 Hebrews 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 Romans 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 Hebrews 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."

Reply OBJ 2: As was said above (ad 1 um; q. 76, a. 2, ad 1 um), **the blood consecrated apart expressly represents Christ's Passion**, and therefore mention is made of the fruits of the Passion in the consecration of the blood rather than in that of the body, since the body is the subject of the Passion. This is also pointed out in our Lord's saying, "which shall be delivered up for you," as if to say, "which shall undergo the Passion for you." [**III, q. 78, a. 3 & ad 2 um**].

†

On the contrary, Ambrose says (De Sacramentis iv): "**If there be such might in the word of the Lord Jesus that things non-existent came into being, how much more efficacious is it to make things existing to continue, and to be changed into something else?** And so, what was bread before consecration is now the body of Christ after consecration, because Christ's word changes a creature into something different."

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 (q. 62, a. 1), 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 (Q65,A3), 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 (q. 62, aa. 3,4).** 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 (q. 48, a. 6; q. 56, a. 1, ad 3 um).

Reply OBJ 1: When **the bread is said to be changed into Christ's body solely by the power of the Holy Ghost, the instrumental power which lies in the form of this sacrament is not excluded:** just as when we say that the smith alone makes a knife we do not deny the power of the hammer.

Reply OBJ 2: **No creature can work miracles as the chief agent.** Yet it can do so **instrumentally, just as the touch of Christ's hand healed the leper.** And in this fashion **Christ's words change the bread into His body.** But in Christ's conception, whereby His body was fashioned, it was impossible for anything derived from His body to have the instrumental power of forming that very body. Likewise in creation there was no term wherein the instrumental action of a creature could be received. Consequently there is no comparison. [**III, q. 78, a. 3. C, ad 1 um ad 2 um**].

†

The Ritual of the Consecration there of the two-fold matter through the two-fold form is a representation of the Passion of Christ Jesus in which the Blood is poured out, or separated from His Body:

On the contrary, Our Lord says (John 6:52): "The bread which I will give, is My flesh for the life of the world." **But the spiritual life is the effect of grace.** Therefore 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 John 1:17: "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," so also, **by coming sacramentally into man causes the life of grace, according to John 6:58: "He that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me."** Hence Cyril says on Luke 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 (q. 74, a. 1; q. 76, a.2, ad 1 um). 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" (John 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 (Matthew 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 Sacramentis v): "This is the bread of everlasting life, which supports the substance of our soul." And Chrysostom says (Hom. 46 in Joannis): "When we desire it, He lets us feel Him, and eat Him, and embrace Him." And hence our Lord says (John 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 (Tractatus 26 in Joannis): "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 (Tractatus 26 in Joannis): "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. [**III, q. 78, a. 1**].



The Sacrament is **representative** and **commemorative** of the Passion of Jesus Christ, and not as the 'sacrament alone', or as a **mere visible sign** – but also as **the reality and the sacrament** in so far as by the strength of the Sacrament, the Body alone is placed under the species of bread - and only Blood under the species of the wine. **For the Ritual is the sacred rite and the sacred image, signifying and containing the sacred reality.**

Furthermore to this sacred rite pertains the causality of the Passion, by this very sacred rite is signified and exercised. For by the words of the forms there is within it the effective power:

On the contrary, Ambrose says (De Sacramentis iv): "If there be such might in the word of the Lord Jesus that things non-existent came into being, **how much more efficacious is it to make things existing to continue, and to be changed into something else?** And so, what was bread before consecration is now the body of Christ after consecration, because Christ's word changes a creature into something different."

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 (q. 62, a. 1), 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 (q. 65, a. 3), 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 (Q62,AA3,4). 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 (q. 48, a. 6; q. 56, a. 1, rad 3 um). [**III, q. 78, a. 4 c**].



Truly, therefore, **under a two-fold aspect** it can be said that **Jesus Christ is immolated** in this sacrament [sacrifice], according to the sacred ritual as the Holy Doctor exposes:

III, QUESTION 83: OF THE RITE OF THIS SACRAMENT

ARTICLE 1: Whether Christ is sacrificed in this sacrament?

OBJ 1: It seems that Christ is not sacrificed in the celebration of this sacrament. For it is written (Hebrews 10:14) that "**Christ by one oblation hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.**" But that oblation was His oblation. Therefore Christ is not sacrificed in the celebration of this sacrament.

OBJ 2: Further, Christ's sacrifice was made upon the cross, whereon "He delivered Himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweetness," as is said in Ephesians 5:2. But Christ is not crucified in the celebration of this mystery. Therefore, neither is He sacrificed.

OBJ 3: Further, as Augustine says (De Trinitate iv), in Christ's sacrifice the priest and the victim are one and the same. But in the celebration of this sacrament the priest and the victim are not the same. Therefore, the celebration of this sacrament is not a sacrifice of Christ.

On the contrary, Augustine says in the Liber Sententiarum Prosperi (Ep. 98): "**Christ was sacrificed once in Himself, and yet He is sacrificed daily in the Sacrament.**"

I answer that, The celebration of this sacrament is called a sacrifice for two reasons. First, because, as Augustine says (Ad Simplicianum 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 (**q. 79, a. 1**), **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 Hebrews 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 (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**.

Reply OBJ 1: As Ambrose says (commenting on Hebrews 10:1), "**there is but one victim,**" namely that which Christ offered, and which we offer, "**and not many victims, because Christ was offered but once: and this latter sacrifice is the pattern of the former.** For, just as what is offered everywhere is one body, and not many bodies, so also is it but one sacrifice."

Reply OBJ 2: As the celebration of this sacrament is **an image representing Christ's Passion**, so **the altar is representative of the cross itself**, upon which Christ was sacrificed in His proper species.

Reply OBJ 3: For the same reason (Reply OBJ 2) **the priest also bears Christ's image, in Whose person and by Whose power he pronounces the words of consecration**, as is evident from what was said above (q. 82, aa. 1,3). And so, in a measure, the priest and victim are one and the same.

For, by the two-fold consecration by which the Passion of Jesus Christ is signified or represented by means of an image. Jesus Christ is rendered present as a Victim, in as actually being immolated sacramentally. This occurs in so far as under the species of bread and under the species of wine, there are placed separately by the virtuality of the Sacrament the Body and Blood by the virtuality of the Sacrament as a Victim – as these

were once immolated in a bloody manner on the Cross. In this sense is the thought of St. Thomas to be understood when he states:

Hence in one of the Sunday Secrets (cf. q. 79, a. 1 - Ninth Sunday after Pentecost) we say: " **Whenever the commemoration of this sacrifice is celebrated, the work of our redemption is enacted.**"



III QUESTION 79: OF THE EFFECTS OF THIS SACRAMENT

ARTICLE 1: Whether grace is bestowed through this sacrament?

OBJ 1: It seems that grace is not bestowed through this sacrament. For this sacrament is spiritual nourishment. But nourishment is only given to the living. Therefore since the spiritual life is the effect of grace, this sacrament belongs only to one in the state of grace. Therefore grace is not bestowed through this sacrament for it to be had in the first instance. In like manner neither is it given so as grace may be increased, because spiritual growth belongs to the sacrament of Confirmation, as stated above (q. 72, a. 1). Consequently, grace is not bestowed through this sacrament.

OBJ 2: Further, this sacrament is given as a spiritual refreshment. But spiritual refreshment seems to belong to the use of grace rather than to its bestowal. Therefore it seems that grace is not given through this sacrament.

OBJ 3: Further, as was said above (q. 74, a. 1), "Christ's body is offered up in this sacrament for the salvation of the body, and His blood for that of the soul." Now it is not the body which is the subject of grace, but the soul, as was shown in the I-II, , q. 110, a. 4. Therefore grace is not bestowed through this sacrament, at least so far as the body is concerned.

On the contrary, Our Lord says (John 6:52): "The bread which I will give, is My flesh for the life of the world." But **the spiritual life is the effect of grace. Therefore 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 John 1:17: "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," so also, by coming sacramentally into man causes the life of grace, according to John 6:58: "He that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me." Hence Cyril says on Luke 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 (q. 74, a. 1; q. 76, a. 2, ad 1um). 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" (John 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 (Matthew 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 Sacramentis v): "This is the bread of everlasting life, which supports the substance of our soul." And Chrysostom says (Hom. 46 in Joannis): "When we desire it, He lets us feel Him, and eat Him, and embrace Him." And hence our Lord says (John 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 (Tractatus 26 in Joannis): "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 (Tractatus 26 in Joannis): **"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.

Reply OBJ 1: This sacrament has of itself the power of bestowing grace; nor does anyone possess grace before receiving this sacrament except from some desire thereof; from his own desire, as in the case of the adult. Or from the Church's desire in the case of children, as stated above (q. 73, A a. 3). Hence it is due to the efficacy of its power, that even from desire thereof a man procures grace whereby he is enabled to lead the spiritual life. It remains, then, that when the sacrament itself is really received, grace is increased, and the spiritual life perfected: yet in different fashion from the sacrament of

Confirmation, in which **grace is increased and perfected for resisting the outward assaults of Christ's enemies**. But by this sacrament grace receives increase, and **the spiritual life is perfected, so that man may stand perfect in himself by union with God**.

Reply OBJ 2: This sacrament confers grace spiritually together with the virtue of charity. Hence Damascene (De Fide Orthodoxa iv) compares this sacrament to the burning coal which Isaias saw (Isaiah 6:6): "For a live ember is not simply wood, but wood united to fire; so also the bread of communion is not simple bread but bread united with the Godhead." But as Gregory observes in a Homily for Pentecost, "**God's love is never idle; for, wherever it is it does great works**." And consequently through this sacrament, as far as its power is concerned, not only is the habit of grace and of virtue bestowed, but it is furthermore aroused to act, according to 2 Corinthians 5:14: "The charity of Christ presseth us." Hence it is that the soul is spiritually nourished through the power of this sacrament, by being spiritually gladdened, and as it were inebriated with the sweetness of the Divine goodness, according to Canticle 5:1: "Eat, O friends, and drink, and be inebriated, my dearly beloved."

Reply OBJ 3: Because the sacraments operate according to the similitude by which they signify, **therefore by way of assimilation** it is said that in this sacrament "the body is offered for the salvation of the body, and the blood for the salvation of the soul," although each works for the salvation of both, since the entire Christ is under each, as stated above (q. 76, a. 2). And although the body is not the immediate subject of grace, still the effect of grace flows into the body while in the present life we present "our [Vulgate: your] members" as "instruments of justice unto God" (Romans 6:13), and in the life to come our body will share in the incorruption and the glory of the soul. **[III, q. 79, a. 1]**.



III, QUESTION 83: OF THE RITE OF THIS SACRAMENT

ARTICLE 1: Whether Christ is sacrificed in this sacrament?

OBJ 1: It seems that Christ is not sacrificed in the celebration of this sacrament. For it is written (Hebrews 10:14) that "Christ by one oblation hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." But that oblation was His oblation. Therefore Christ is not sacrificed in the celebration of this sacrament.

OBJ 2: Further, Christ's sacrifice was made upon the cross, whereon "He delivered Himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odor of

sweetness," as is said in Ephesians 5:2. But Christ is not crucified in the celebration of this mystery. Therefore, neither is He sacrificed.

OBJ 3: Further, as Augustine says (De Trinitate iv), in Christ's sacrifice the priest and the victim are one and the same. But in the celebration of this sacrament the priest and the victim are not the same. Therefore, the celebration of this sacrament is not a sacrifice of Christ.

On the contrary, Augustine says in the Liber Sententiarum Prosperi (Ep. 98): "Christ was sacrificed once in Himself, and yet He is sacrificed daily in the Sacrament."

I answer that, The celebration of **this sacrament is called a sacrifice for two reasons.**

- First, because, as Augustine says (Ad Simplicianum 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 (q. 79,A1), **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 Hebrews 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 (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.

Reply OBJ 1: As Ambrose says (commenting on Hebrews 10:1), **"there is but one victim,"** namely that which Christ offered, and which we offer, "and not many victims, because Christ was offered but once: and this latter sacrifice is the pattern of the former. For, just as what is offered everywhere is one body, and not many bodies, so also is it but one sacrifice."

Reply OBJ 2: As the celebration of this sacrament is an image representing Christ's Passion, so the altar is representative of the cross itself, upon which Christ was sacrificed in His proper species.

Reply OBJ 3: For the same reason (Reply OBJ 2) the priest also bears Christ's image, in Whose person and by Whose power he pronounces the words of consecration, as is evident from what was said above (Q82,AA1,3). And so, in a measure, the priest and victim are one and the same.

[III. q. 83. a. 1].

†

Just as on the Cross He was a Victim immolated sacramentally for the achieving of objective redemption [by merit and a certain efficacy] – so, too, in the Sacrament He is immolated sacramentally so that in the same divine virtuality of the Passion, the Work of Redemption is distributed in its efficacy in the Church, by the communication of its fruits.

These both aspects of immolation are found in **the immolation of the Cross and the Altar**: both are the immolation of the **victim** and the work of **redemption**. According to the first aspect, the sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the Cross is communicated to the Church so that this **through the ministers of the Eternal High Priest of Mercy and in His virtuality** might offer **this same victim** for the bringing about of the eternal salvation. According to the other aspect there is communicated to the Church that it might receive this as the fruit of the Bloody Passion through this sacramental oblation or immolation and through communion with it. And so it is that under **both aspects, authentic in the New Law**, the bloody sacrifice of Christ is communicated to the Faithful under the species of Bread and Wine:

... Reply OBJ 2: Two things may be considered in Christ's priesthood: namely, **the offering made by Christ**, and **(our) partaking thereof**. As to the actual offering, the priesthood of Christ was more distinctly foreshadowed by the priesthood of the Law, **by reason of the shedding of blood**, than by the priesthood of Melchisedech in which there was no blood-shedding.

But if we consider **the participation of this sacrifice and the effect thereof**, wherein **the excellence of Christ's priesthood over the priesthood of the Law principally consists**, then the former was more distinctly foreshadowed by the priesthood of Melchisedech, who offered bread and wine, signifying, as Augustine says (Tractatus 26 in Joannis)

ecclesiastical unity, which is established by our taking part in the sacrifice of Christ (Q79,A1). Wherefore also in the New Law the true sacrifice of Christ is presented to the faithful under the form of bread and wine. [**III, q. 22, a. 6, ad 2 um**].

From this usage of the sacrament, or from its reception, it appears that Jesus Christ is rendered present in the Most Holy Eucharist as having suffered by virtue of His Passion and Death. For there is completed the sacrifice in the sacred Banquet in which Jesus Christ is received, i.e., the Body and Blood as the food and drink or as the nourishment for complete restoration. Hence, just as the one matter without the other [by reason of the re-presentation of the Lord's Passion], so also at least the celebrating Priest ought to receive both species, keeping in mind this teaching of St. Thomas:

Reply OBJ 2: The perfection of this sacrament does not lie in the use of the faithful, **but in the consecration of the matter**. And hence there is nothing derogatory to the perfection of this sacrament; if the people receive the body without the blood, **provided that the priest who consecrates receive both**.

Reply OBJ 3: Our Lord's Passion is represented in the very consecration of this sacrament, in which the body ought not to be consecrated without the blood. But **the body can be received by the people without the blood**: nor is this detrimental to the sacrament. Because the priest both offers and consumes the blood on behalf of all; and Christ is fully contained under either species, as was shown above (q. 76, a. 2). [**III, q. 80, a. 12, ad 2 um & 3 um**].

Therefore, Jesus Christ Who had suffered, by virtue of His Passion and Death, is present under the species of bread and wine. Hence, the Faithful, through sacramental communion [or also, and through a spiritual communion] become participants in the Bloody sacrifice of Jesus Christ through the unbloody Eucharistic Sacrifice which is offered, as St. Thomas notes:

Reply OBJ 2: Two things may be considered in Christ's priesthood: namely, **the offering made by Christ**, and **(our) partaking thereof**.

As to the actual offering, the priesthood of Christ was more distinctly foreshadowed by the priesthood of the Law, **by reason of the shedding of blood**, than by the priesthood of Melchisedech in which there was no blood-shedding.

But if we consider the participation of this sacrifice and the effect thereof, wherein the excellence of Christ's priesthood over the priesthood of the Law principally consists, then the former was more distinctly foreshadowed by the priesthood of Melchisedech, **who offered bread and wine**, signifying, as Augustine says (Tractatus 26 in Joannis) **ecclesiastical unity, which is established by our taking part in the sacrifice of Christ** (q. 79, a. 1). Wherefore also in the New Law the true sacrifice of Christ is presented to the faithful under the form of bread and wine. [III, Q. 22, a. 6 ad 2^{um}].



It needs to be pointed out that the faithful become participants in the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ also in so far as the Minister of Jesus Christ and of the Church, **in the name of all the members of the Mystical Body offers the sacrifice**, or in so far **the Faithful in union with the ministerial oblation of the Priest offer their Spiritual Hosts** - or, at least, in so far as **the Eucharistic Sacrifice is offered for them**:

On the contrary, Prayer is made for many others during the celebration of this sacrament; which would serve no purpose were the sacrament not beneficial to others. **Therefore, this sacrament is beneficial not merely to them who receive it.**

I answer that, As stated above (a. 3), 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" (Ephesians 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 (Matthew 26:28, with Luke 22:20): "Which for you," i.e. who receive it, "and for many," i.e. others, "shall be shed unto remission of sins."

Reply OBJ 2: **As Christ's Passion benefits all, for the forgiveness of sin and the attaining of grace and glory, whereas it produces no effect except in those who are united with Christ's Passion through faith and charity, so likewise this sacrifice, which is the memorial of our Lord's Passion, has no effect except in those who are united with this sacrament through faith and charity.** Hence Augustine says to Renatus (De Anima et ejus origine i): "Who may offer Christ's body except for them who are Christ's members?" Hence in the Canon of the Mass no prayer is made for them who are outside the pale of the Church. But it benefits them who are members, more or less, according to the measure of their devotion. [**III, q. 79, a. 7 c & ad 2 um**]



Reply OBJ 2: **A devout layman is united with Christ by spiritual union through faith and charity, but not by sacramental power: consequently he has a spiritual priesthood for offering spiritual sacrifices**, of which it is said (Psalm 1:19): "**A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit**"; and (Romans 12:1): "Present your bodies a living sacrifice." Hence, too, it is written (1 Peter 2:5): "A holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." [**III, q. 82, a. 1 ad 2 um**].

From all that has been said above concerning the meaning of the Eucharistic Sacrifice instituted by Jesus Christ during the Last Supper [as a Sacrifice and a Sacrament, strictly so called] it is clear that according to the Sacred Ritual and usage, Jesus Christ becomes present in the Consecration itself as 'having suffered', or under the aspect of a **Victim**, according to its sacramental being with respect to the Bloody Sacrifice, of which the Most Holy Eucharist is a sacred representation, or a sacred image, as a Memorial and the Communication of the Fruits of this Sacrifice offered once and for all on the Cross.

2º Jesus Christ, in the sacrifice of the Mass is rendered present as a Perpetual Victim of the One Oblation of the Eternal High Priest sacramentally perpetuated in the ministry of Priests.

The same Priest-Victim, Who on the Cross with a bloody immolation **by His one and the same Will, chose to offer Himself** for the salvation of all, **chose a sacramental perpetuity** and therefore, one that was unbloody, of His once and for all bloody sacrifice, through His application of the merits offered as a memorial of all this. **One and the same Host 'oblated', or**

immolated once and for all by Christ in Himself, is offered by Him sacramentally – or, is **immolated by His ministers** - as Thomas notes:

On the contrary, Augustine says in the Liber Sententiarum Prosperi (Ep. 98): "Christ was **sacrificed once in Himself**, and yet He is **sacrificed daily in the Sacrament**." [III, q. 83, a. 1, 'Sed contra'].

By the Consecration, confected by Himself at the Last Supper, the Eternal Priest instituted the **sacramental sacrifice**, by commanding it to His Disciples – and to their successors - so that they, too, would offer it by consecrating: Do this in Memory of Me! Thus, **authoritatively as God**, and **instrumentally as man, or by His divine virtuality**, He willed that His Sacrifice might be perpetuated according to His sacramental Being – St. Thomas quotes Augustine in his view:

Reply OBJ 2: Sins are commemorated in the New Law, not on account of the inefficacy of the priesthood of Christ, as though sins were not sufficiently expiated by Him: but in regard to those who either are not willing to be participators in His sacrifice, such as unbelievers, for whose sins we pray that they be converted; or who, after taking part in this sacrifice, fall away from it by whatsoever kind of sin. **The Sacrifice which is offered every day in the Church is not distinct from that which Christ Himself offered, but is a commemoration thereof.** Wherefore Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,20): "Christ Himself both is the priest who offers it and the victim: the sacred token of which He wished to be the **daily** Sacrifice of the Church." [III, q. 22, a. 3, ad 2^{um}; IV Sent. d. 8, q. 1, a. d. 4].

†

That oblation, or immolation, which **daily is confected in the Name of and in the virtuality of the Eternal High Priest of Mercy offering Himself** by the ministry of priests under the species of bread and wine, is **not simply any new immolation**, or some new sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Rather **it is the sacramental perpetuation of this one and the same sacrifice**. For it is One and the Same Principal celebrating Priest being offered through His ministers and **He is the same Host, with only the manner of offering that is different**.

'In the NT there is not repeated the sacrifice or the Oblation, but the **immolation perseveres** now as a **unique sacrifice always 'oblated'**, and in the manner of persevering **repetition** does intervene - not in the reality of Himself who is 'oblated', nor even He Himself. What is repeated is not so

much His manner that concurs within the sacrifice in and of itself, but **on account of His Oblation on the Cross that is to be commemorated in an unbloody manner**. It needs to be kept in mind that a repetition of this manner is not against the doctrine of the Document to the Hebrews. The words of Heb infer that if indeed His oblation were to be repeated as the sacrifice of the NT, it would be necessary for Christ to suffer often. Therefore, concerning the repetition of this once and for all sacrifice, the Document shows itself to speak, not about the repetition of this manner of the Sacrifice itself was it instituted by the Lord.⁷

The Sacrifice is not repeated. But there is repeated the unbloody manner instituted by Jesus Christ by which **the same Eternal High Priest of Mercy offers Himself in perpetuity through His Ministers**. This ministerial oblation on the part of the ministers, is multiplied and in this manner there **is multiplied the effect of the sacrifice and the Sacrament**. But the Oblation itself which Jesus Christ Himself willed to be **perpetuated sacramentally** is one and the same.

‘Take note that one would err in this should it be estimated that the Sacrifice of the Altar is somehow a different sacrifice from that Sacrifice which Jesus Christ offered on the Cross. The fact is that in truth this is one and the same as it is one and the **same Body of Christ** and **that same Blood of Christ** on the **altar** and on the **Cross** and that **now perdures in heaven**. The difference, though is in the manner of offering this once and for all sacrifice for on the Cross the sacrifice is offered **corporally**, while on the altar it is offered **spiritually** – on the Cross, the oblation is made in the reality of death, now on **the altar it is offered in the mystery of death**.’⁸

For it is one and the same Host on the Cross in a bloody manner, and the same is offered on the altar, **sacramentally**, or as offered, confected by the same Eternal High Priest of Mercy as the Principal Offerer, not by any other Oblation, but with the same will perpetuated ministerially in the mystery of death, in the sacramental mystery, and therefore, in an unbloody manner. This is a **re-presentation, a commemoration, and an application**

⁷ Cajetan, Tom. III, Tr. X, De Sacrif. Missae contra Lutherum, c. 6, ad 2. 1558.

⁸ Cajetan, Theological Writings. The Instruction of the Nuntio concerning the Libellus on the Supper of the Lord, or concerning those Present-Day. C. 9, French edition. Fr. F. von Gunten, OP, at Athaneum of the ANGELICUM, 1962. Errors in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, 1962

of the Sacrifice confected in a bloody manner on the Cross. In the power of the Consecration which now actually takes place in **the divine virtuality of the Eternal High Priest of Mercy**, the same **Victim** once immolated on the Cross in a bloody manner is now rendered present as an **immolating** under the species of Bread and Wine now as the Body and Blood, separated in the power of the sacrament. These are presented under their species **in the manner of substance with the virtuality of the ever-lasting passion.** For the Reality and the sacrament is **the Christ Who has suffered**, or **the Christ Who had offered Himself to God the Father as an Oblation and Host for us** [IV Sent., d. 8, q. 1, a. 2; III Sent. q. 2, ad 6 um].

For indeed there is no change in Jesus Christ Himself as He resides quietly in Heaven and is rendered present according to His sacramental being, and of Himself not in time or place, although He is in both time and species according to His species, i.e. under visible signs. The marvelous conversion of **the substance of the bread and wine presents the Glorious Christ [in His intrinsic glory] according to a real concomitance** – while **in the virtuality of the Sacrament there appears in the Body and the Blood of Christ consecrated separately, or the Christ Who has suffered.** For indeed He is the same Priest and Host, Victim:

Reply OBJ 3: For the same reason (Reply OBJ 2) **the priest also bears Christ's image, in Whose person and by Whose power he pronounces the words of consecration**, as is evident from what was said above (q. 82, aa. 1,3). And so, in a measure, **the priest and victim are one and the same.** [**III, q. 83, a. 1, ad 3 um**].

This is the Holy Doctor's view, for it is not in that manner by which He offered Himself at the Last Supper - or that by which He suffered on the Cross. But rather it is through the ministry of the Priests so that notwithstanding them all, Jesus Christ is truly the Principal Offering Priest.

†
†††
†

Article 3

The Unity of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross and on the Altar

Not a few of the theologians of the post-Tridentine era consider the definition of the Council of Trent according to which **the Eucharistic sacrifice is a true and proper sacrifice**. In this they show they are thinking that as far as the very underlying reason for a genuine and proper sacrifice there is a required a certain real immolation, a destruction, or mutation of the victim. Thus, they principally have tried to show truly a certain real change takes place in the Victim in the Sacrifice of the Mass. This happens either in the immensely more reduced state which Christ would have had under the species, or because He is present in the manner of food - or because He would be immolated truly at least by the strength of the words. Furthermore, concerning the presence of the sacrificial act of Jesus Christ in the Mass they have not yet expressly stated.

Almost universally having rejected any real change in the Eucharistic Jesus Christ, even in the strength of the words alone, the opinion regarding the mystical change under some other species, as proposed by Ludovicus Billot, SJ - this view was accepted by many theologians was more in harmony to the ancient tradition concerning **sacramental sacrifice**. According to Billot, however, the Sacrifice of the Altar is truly absolute, distinct in number and species from His Bloody Sacrifice, or it is said to be truly 'other', even though 'one in order' in so far as it represents, commemorates, and applies that sacrifice of the Cross. He stated in these words: 'indeed the sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrifice of the Cross are not the same but two different realities. In these instances the Sacrifice is not only numerically diverse but also specifically. For indeed since Sacrifice consists in offering, considering the diverse nature of the offering, it is necessary that the sacrifice itself be diversified.' For indeed the Mass is offered by the principal and supreme High Priest, Jesus Christ, Who in the Last Supper handed over this office to the Apostolic Hierarchy of administering on earth His Priesthood and of sacrificing in His Name the duty of sacrificing until the end of time' The sacrificial act of Jesus Christ is seen to be merely **virtually present from its institution onward**.

Maurice de la Taille goes further stating that for the very reason of sacrifice that there would be required the immolation of the victim according to itself, distinguishes **oblation** and **immolation**, defining sacrifice in general

as the oblation of the victim, either being offered here and now, or having been immolated long ago, or as yet to be immolated. This theologian holds that by the institution of Jesus Christ, the Church offers the victim once immolated in a bloody manner on the Cross. In opposition to Billot, he points out, and not without reason, that the sacramental sacrifice in this view would be totally void, since immolation would occur only in a sign. He held that the unity of the sacrifice of the Mass and of the Cross is noted in the victim Who is **offered by Jesus Christ on the Cross and by the Church in the Mass**. Jesus Christ does not offer the sacrifice of the Mass other than because He instituted it, but properly speaking, it is the Church offering the Mass.

In a clearer manner than that of Billot, **A. Vonier, OSB** expounded his views on the sacramental sacrifice. The Sacrifice of the Altar not only contains Christ under the figure of immolation under an alien species, but **Christ as having suffered as both 'reality and sacrament.'** This is an authentic sacrifice because He hands over His Body and Blood separately and sacramentally present and so represents sacramentally the death of Jesus Christ on the Cross, historically past. As far as the act of oblation is concerned, he states that in the Eucharistic sacrifice, both Christ and the Church offer it, because the Priest offers **in the Name of the Church and through His priestly character, in the Name of Jesus Christ**. Moreover the unity of each sacrifice is realized authentically in the **sacramental representation** which pertains essentially to the Eucharistic sacrifice. This author does not explain how the oblation of Jesus Christ is present in the Priest offering other than solely by his sacramental character.

According to E. Doronzo, OMI the sacramental representation in so far as Billot and also Vonier explain this, is insufficient because he thinks that for an authentic sacrifice there is required a genuine immolation of the victim. As a result, he proposed his original view according to which the physical immolation of Jesus Christ on the Cross and His Oblation are present in the Mass. Not physically but in some objective intentional manner, as, e.g., the image is the object itself which it represents. The mystical separation of the Body and the Blood which in the virtuality of the transubstantiation is realized objectively and in an intentional manner is that of the Cross itself, and so the unity of each sacrifice, he believes, is perfectly served. It is to be noted that the transubstantiation is not had as the terminus of the offering, as **the real separation in Jesus Christ according to His physical being**, and

not just in an intentional manner. Furthermore, if, as the author maintains that for sacrifice there is required at least the equivalent destruction of the victim, there does **not** appear how this sufficiently would be maintained in a mere objective intentional destruction of the victim.

The next generation of theologians rather commonly adhered to the views expressed concerning **the properly sacramental immolation** which Billot and especially Vonier exposed. However, they also more expressly considered the question concerning the presence of the sacrificial act of Jesus Christ, and they maintained that according to the traditional doctrine, Jesus Christ not only virtually but also actually, offers the sacrifice of the Altar, by the very fact that the elicited act of oblation on the Cross remains in the Heavenly Christ and this concurs instrumentally in each and every transubstantiation. In this regard, Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange⁹ wrote: 'Indeed already on earth Jesus Christ through the Beatific Vision and also in another manner through His infused knowledge, foresaw each and every sacrifice of the Mass which would be offered through His ministers until the end of the world; and that **He already on earth willed all of these and offered them to His Father**. This volition and oblation, **just as the beatific vision and beatific love, continues on in Him, without any interruption**, and therefore without any multiplication of acts in Him, and now without any further suffering and further merit because Jesus Christ is no longer a wayfarer, but a Comprehensor.'

As far as the unity of each sacrifice, they all hold that **both that of the Cross and that of the Altar are one and the same regarding substance**, because numerically **the Victim is numerically the same** - and is **immolated on the Cross in a bloody manner, and on the altar in an unbloody manner**, and because **the internal act is the principal one, it is one sacrifice**. Jesus Christ, the Eternal High Priest of Mercy is **the Principal Offerer, with His internal sacrificial act** offers Himself as a bloody sign on the Cross, and moreover **with this same internal act now** as an unbloody sign in the Mass, i.e., **with the commemorative sign of the Passion**.

In like manner, L. Monden, SJ, noted: At the Last Supper, as at the Mass, the sign in **which the interior act of Jesus Christ** goes on to express itself, is no longer this real event of the Cross, but a new historical and sensible appeal, **a complete symbolic act and is therefore a sacrifice. The Mass is**

⁹ The Eucharist, on the Sacrifice of the Mass, 1942, p. 292.

therefore the sacrificial act of Jesus Christ Who just as He expressed Himself on Calvary in His sensible sacrificial gesture of His real death, **expresses Himself now in the commemorative sacrificial gesture of the Priest**, and accomplished by means of this symbolic gesture **the real symbol of His Passion**.

According to this view, **the Sacrifice of the Cross and that of the Altar, are one according to the internal act**, yet simply speaking, they are different realities, because the bloody expression of the Cross is not present in the Mass other than as in an external, commemorative symbol.

Dom E. Casel, OSB [1947], on the other hand, and his school present the authentic identity of both sacrifices according to their so-called 'mysteric doctrine.' Dom Casel did not intend to promote a new theory neither in any speculation, but, in a positive manner, he did expose the traditional teaching of the Church, according to the testimonies of the Fathers and the liturgical documents. The word *mystery* - as he noted - does not mean primarily some teaching, but rather **the manifestation of the Deity in the work of salvation** which is carried out in **the mystery of the Incarnate Word of the Savior**. This mystery in which the individual mysteries of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ are contained [and principal among these is that of the Passion] historically achieved is not historically renewed, but in so far as it is **a salvific action elevated above all times and places, it is extended to all human beings through the Mystery of the Church, or in the mystery of her Worship**, and indeed, under the sign of the sacred ritual. In all the sacraments [as indeed in the sacramentals of the Church] **the mystery of Jesus Christ or the salvific activity is present in an objective manner, and this takes place according to its perpetuity wherever the sacred ritual is celebrated**. In this ritual there is not only had the *representation* according to the ordinary meaning of this term, but rather there is **present principally the mystery of salvation, re-presented**, i.e., **its presence accomplished objectively**, and so its commemoration is to be understood in an objective manner.

In a different way, moreover, is there had the presence of the work of salvation in the various sacraments. And so, **in an objective manner in Baptism there is the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ** and not only some vague salvific virtuality, but the very mystery itself and even though not in the same manner as in the Most Holy Eucharist. The sacrifice of the

Cross offered once and for all becomes present in the Mystery of Worship which is accomplished in the Mass, so that **the sacrifice of the Mass is neither new, nor something other**, but is rather the **re-presentation** [a presence that is accomplished] of **the sacrifice of the Cross**. Jesus Christ Who not only historically but **in a supra-temporal manner offered Himself on the Cross, now in virtue of the transubstantiation becomes present with His oblation on the Cross** accomplished in the way already described, and so **offers Himself in the mystery of the Liturgical Ritual**.

As a result, the sacrifice of the Cross and that of the Altar are one and the same entirely, specifically and numerically, in so far as **the sacrifice of the Altar is the very sacrifice of the Cross according to its perpetuity as the salvific work, mysterically communicated to the Church**, as **the Sacrifice of the whole Mystical Body**.

According to this last view, to be further developed from now on here, **Jesus Christ alone offers Himself and only the Church is associated to Christ, co-offers Him through Himself through her Priestly Ministers**. The Ministers according to Fr. Casel indeed **accomplish the consecration in the divine virtuality of which they render Christ present with His oblation** but properly they themselves do not make this offering, but only **in the Name of the Church**, to which Christ communicates His Sacrifice, His Ministers co-offer His Sacrifice. **These Ministers are the necessary condition in order to render present Jesus Christ with His Oblation**.

The Doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas concerning the Unity of the sacrifice of the Cross and of the Altar.

By comparing the sacrifice of the Cross and that of the Altar there appears immediately that these are not distinguished specifically, but 'quasi'-specifically. Sacrifice, as has been seen, in so far as it is an act of a special virtue, namely, of **religion** and is not divided into further species properly so called, since it is essentially a special symbolic act [interior, and externally manifested] for recognizing and professing His absolute divine dominion as well as our total subject to the supreme God of Goodness. Hence, one and the same is the end of every sacrifice properly so called, which end nonetheless implies a plurality of aspects - because it is necessary that **God be worshipped** by reason of His singular and supreme Majesty, **to give thanks** to the Principle of all good and to **implore further benefits** and to exhibit **satisfaction for sin** [**P**etition, **A**doration, **R**epARATION, **T**hanksgiving].

Therefore, a sacrifice properly so called is at the same time **latreutical**, **eucharistic**, **impetratory** and **propitiatory** or is revealed in these three categories: **holocaust**, **sacrifice for sin**, and a **peace Host**. All these aspects therefore, or 'quasi'- species are present in the sacrifice of the altar, although it be commonly named 'eucharistic'; for it is not 'something other' from the sacrifice of the Cross but the memorial of this, and there is achieved in it the Passion of Jesus Christ for all the effects of the Passion:

On the contrary, The Church, instructed by the apostles, uses this form.

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 Luke 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 (A2) 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 Hebrews 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 Romans 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 Hebrews 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." [**III. q. 78, a. 3 c**].

†

On the contrary, Our Lord says (John 6:52): "The bread which I will give, is My flesh for the life of the world." But **the spiritual life is the effect of grace. Therefore 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 John 1:17: "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," so also, by coming sacramentally into man causes the life of grace, according to John 6:58: "He that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me." Hence Cyril says on Luke 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 (q. 74, a. 1; q. 76, a. 2, ad 1 um). 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" (John 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 (Matthew 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 Sacramentis v): "This is the bread of everlasting life, which supports the substance of our soul." And Chrysostom says (Hom. 46 in Joannis): "When we desire it, He lets us feel Him, and eat Him, and embrace Him." And hence our Lord says (John 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 (Tractatus 26 in Joannis): "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 (Tractatus 26 in Joannis): "**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. [**III, q. 79, a. 1, c.**].

Neither are these distinguished according to their matter, or the reality 'oblated' which is not simply different realities, since it is the Body and the Blood of Jesus Christ, in virtue of the sacrament and the whole Christ according to a real concomitance. It should be held as Ambrose taught: the Host is one and the same, , i.e., that which Jesus Christ offered, and the one which we offer - these are not many simply because Jesus Christ offered Himself once and for all. St. Thomas quotes this:

Reply OBJ 1: As Ambrose says (commenting on Hebrews 10:1), "**there is but one victim,**" namely **that which Christ offered, and which we offer, "and not many victims, because Christ was offered but once:** and this latter sacrifice is the pattern of the former. For, **just as what is offered everywhere is one body, and not many bodies, so also is it but one sacrifice.**" [**III, q. 83, a. 1, ad 1 um.**].

†

Reply OBJ 5: The word **mystery** is inserted, not in order to exclude reality, but **to show that the reality is hidden**, because **Christ's blood is in this sacrament in a hidden manner, and His Passion was dimly foreshadowed in the Old Testament.** [**III, q. 78, a. 3 ad 5 um.**].

The Host is one and the same, the difference being that while He was present on the Cross, this was visible whereas in the Eucharistic sacrifice is present in a hidden manner according to His Sacramental Being.

As far as the manner by which the sacrificial act takes place it is to be noted that this distinction between the bloody manner and the unbloody manner, as this is presented by theologians in the secondary division of Sacrifice it is taken there absolutely in one order of realities, so that there be some distinction regarding the manner of sacrifice. Thus it is that Christ

would be able to offer Himself in an unbloody manner according to His natural or physical being rather than in a bloody manner, or in both manners. Thus there is no opposition between the bloody oblation on the Cross, and the very manner of offering it. Cajetan notes: 'Therefore, the bloody and unbloody Host, Victim, of the New Testament, is One from the point of view of the Reality that is offered and from the aspect of the manner of offering.'

Thus, indeed there can be diversity: the reason being here that this manner, i.e. to be immolated in an unbloody manner it is not instituted according to itself as a disparate manner of immolating, but throughout it is ordered toward the bloody oblation on the Cross as a consequence it is understood among the wise and penetrating believers, that where a reality is one only in relationship to another one there it is one as long as this holds true. As a further consequence it cannot be stated properly speaking, that two sacrifices, or two Hosts, or two Victims, or two oblations, or two immolations, and with whatever other name you might think up what there is in the NT, from the fact that that is revealed there **Jesus Christ as the Bloody Host and Victim on the Cross, and the Unbloody Host and Victim on the altar**. But, the revealed fact that there is **only one Host, Victim**, offered [*oblatam*] once and for all on the Cross, a **persevering immolation** now daily, repeated, renewed, [represented] from the institution of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist.'

The difference, therefore, goes this way that this is an bloody manner on the Cross and **the perpetuity of this in the sacramental mystery**, as noted above.

Concerning the strength of this oblation: In the Old Law the sacrifices had the value solely from the faith of those offering it [*ex opere operantis*], i.e., from their faith and devotion. This would imply a faith in the coming Savior, the sacrifices of Whom in the Old Law, as especially that of the Paschal Lamb, were but figures as revealed in Hebrews [10:1, ff.]: **Since the Law has no more than a *reflection* of these realities and finished picture of them, it is quite incapable of bringing the worshippers perfection with the same sacrifices repeatedly offered year after year...**

St. Thomas offers his thought:

On the contrary, The Apostle says (1 Corinthians 5:7,8): "**Christ our Pasch is sacrificed; therefore let us feast . . . with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.**"

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" (Wisdom 16:21), 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 Exodus 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**. From this the answer to the Objections is manifest. [**III, q. 73, a. 6 c.**].

†

In the New Law, the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross has infinite efficacy by the very virtuality of the Eternal High Priest offering Himself, and the Sacrifice of the Mass from the very fact of its being offered [*ex opere operato*], it enjoys infinite value, for the simple reason that **it is the sacrifice**

of Jesus Christ, which is achieved through this sacramental sacrifice: ... *Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed; let us celebrate the Feast by getting rid of all the old yeast of evil and wickedness, having only the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth...* [I Co 5:7]:

On the contrary, In that case no other punishment would have to be enjoined; just as none is imposed upon the newly baptized.

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 (q. 76, aa. 1,2). 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 (Mark 12:43; Luke 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.

Therefore, the Sacrifice of the Cross and of the Mass are one and the same in so far as this latter is the **sacramental perpetuation** of the Sacrifice of the Cross according to this principle of tradition handed on by St. Thomas:

On the contrary, Augustine says in the Liber Sententiarum Prosperi (Ep. 98): "**Christ was sacrificed once in Himself, and yet He is sacrificed daily in the Sacrament.**" [III, q. 83, a. 1, Sed Contra].

Reply OBJ 2: Sins are commemorated in the New Law, not on account of the inefficacy of the priesthood of Christ, as though sins were not sufficiently expiated by Him: but in regard to those who either are not willing to be participators in His sacrifice, such as unbelievers, for whose sins we pray that they be converted; or who, after taking part in this sacrifice, fall away from it by whatsoever kind of sin. **The Sacrifice which is offered every day in the Church is not distinct from that which Christ Himself offered, but is a commemoration thereof.** Wherefore Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,20): "Christ Himself both is the priest who offers it and the victim: the sacred token of which He wished to be the daily Sacrifice of the Church." [III, q. 22, a. 3, ad 2^{um}].



This sacrifice, offered once and for all on the Cross, is handed on according to itself as the bloody oblation accomplished on the Mount of Calvary, but out of the Will of the Incarnate Word instituting this, **it is perpetuated in the Church under the sacred Liturgy, or in a sacramental manner from divine virtuality.** For:

it is **always the same Principal High Priest**, i.e., the Eternal High Priest of Mercy, Who in the Last Supper, on the very night that He was betrayed, **by offering Himself** in total orientation toward the sacrifice of the Cross, willed **authoritatively** as God, and **ministerially** [by His power of excellence] and might as man might **render the Church as participant in His bloody Sacrifice, in the Mystery of the Most Holy Eucharist;**

- it is **always the same perpetual Host, Victim**, i.e., the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which **by the virtuality of the sacrament**, these are confectioned as an **immolation** under the species of bread and wine;

- it is **always the same oblation of the Eternal High Priest of Mercy**, communicated to the Church whenever this is confectioned by the ministry of priests who serve as ministers of Jesus Christ, offer **instrumentally in the name, person and virtuality** of Jesus Christ.

Therefore, the bloody sacrifice is present in an unbloody manner in the Sacrifice of every Mass.

It should indeed be noted that the **Consecration**, by which **Oblation** is confected, or **the sacramental immolation of Jesus Christ**, ought to be considered both from the part of the consecrating minister as well as from the part of the term of the Consecration, i.e., the **Victim** Who is sacramentally offered [*oblata*] or immolated. The act of the **Oblation** is confected by the **Minister of Jesus Christ, in the virtuality of his power of sacred order**, and in the **strength of his instrumental virtuality** by which he is **actually** moved **in the words of Jesus Christ** that he is to pronounce:

Reply OBJ 1: The sacramental power is in several things, and not merely in one: thus the power of Baptism lies both in the words and in the water. **Accordingly the consecrating power is not merely in the words**, but **likewise in the power delivered to the priest in his consecration and ordination**, when the bishop says to him: "Receive the power of offering up the Sacrifice in the Church for the living as well as for the dead." For **instrumental power lies in several instruments through which the chief agent acts**. [*III. q. 82, a. 1, ad 1 um*].

By consecrating, the Minister offers the Sacrifice and Jesus Christ does so thorough him. This Consecration has its term in the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ which according to His sacramental Being and therefore, **in the virtuality of the sacrament** are confected **separately** although through a real concomitance and these are realized under both species. **Through transubstantiation the whole Christ** becomes present [without any change of Himself] through the manner of substance through all that is intrinsic to Him which are actually within Him, at least through that real concomitance if not by virtue of the Sacrament.

In this manner, i.e., through real concomitance there is rendered present also **that permanent act of Oblation in Jesus Christ** not indeed in that sacred triduum of His death if during that time the sacrament should have been celebrated which nonetheless would have been a genuine sacrifice, offered [*oblatum*] by the Eternal High Priest of Mercy through His sacred Ministers. Therefore, this **Act of Oblation ought to be taken formally** from the part of **the minister acting in the divine virtuality of Jesus Christ**, and not on the part of the Host, or Victim, i.e., non from the aspect of the term of the transubstantiation, by which He is not present in the

virtuality of the sacrament, nor necessarily would it always be present through any real concomitance.

For this reason, there should be rejected that explanation of Casel and many others who followed him, who place that act of Christ's oblation on the Cross in the **temporary** manner explained above, that would be rendered present in the strength of the transubstantiation, from the aspect of the term, i.e., from the aspect of the Host, Victim. Furthermore, in no way is it clear in this view why **the oblation of Jesus Christ on the Cross as a supra-temporal salvific act** would be rendered present in the Sacrament in so far as Jesus Christ becomes present there in a **non-temporally by manner of the substance**.

Jesus Christ is actually existing according to all the realities intrinsic to Him beyond all locality, and beyond all time, i.e., **by way of substance** - becomes present in the space and the time **of the species**. As a result, the past Passion in so far as this is present in the Christ Who suffered, as past and yet which **is beyond all time**, becomes present.

Therefore, indeed, it might be concluded that all in the most Holy Eucharist, that which at any and in all times had been in Jesus Christ, and indeed as these can be present to us as **an object of contemplation**, as there might be the more supremely worshipped the **memory of His Passion**.

Nor should it be said with Doronzo that the Passion of Christ accomplished on the Cross this might be objectively and intentionally rendered present almost as the **term of the transubstantiation**, while truly this **terminus in the virtuality of the sacrament is the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ**, as both reality and sacrament, or the same Victim Who on the Cross in a bloody manner was **immolated** and now is *in mystery*, in an unbloody manner under the species of bread and wine. For it is true that the **'sacrament'** and **'reality and sacrament'** are **totally related to the sacrifice of the Cross in the commemoration of this according to the institution of Christ**. These are the image of the sacrifice, but the Eucharistic sacrifice formally consists in oblation now made as the immolation of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. It is in so far as by virtue of the sacrament these are **confected separately under the species of bread and wine**, in which at the same time **the immolation on the Cross and the State of Host, Victim are figured**. For this reason **the sacrifice is absolute properly said**

according to itself, and at the same time, **transcendentally related to the sacrifice of the Cross** and the **memorial of the Passion of the Jesus Christ**.

As a result there should not be admitted that **the sacrifice of the altar and that of the Cross** by that reason are **one because the internal act** of the Eternal High Priest of Mercy would **only be the same in perpetuity**, when the **external act**, or **the symbolic visible expression of it**, i.e., the bloody immolation on the Cross and **the immolation by the species would be diversified although this last might represent the other**.

The Bloody sacrifice not partially but is **totally communicated to the Church in the commemorative sacrifice** according to these words offered above:

Reply OBJ 2: Sins are commemorated in the New Law, not on account of the inefficacy of the priesthood of Christ, as though sins were not sufficiently expiated by Him: but **in regard to those who either are not willing to be participators in His sacrifice, such as unbelievers, for whose sins we pray that they be converted; or who, after taking part in this sacrifice, fall away from it by whatsoever kind of sin. The Sacrifice which is offered every day in the Church is not distinct from that which Christ Himself offered, but is a commemoration thereof.** Wherefore Augustine says (De Civitate Dei x,20): "**Christ Himself both is the priest who offers it and the victim: the sacred token of which He wished to be the daily Sacrifice of the Church.**" [III, q. 22, a. 3, ad 2^{um}].

†

These are simply not numerically distinct sacrifices, neither according to the symbolic manifestation of the species, which are the **figure of the Passion and the State of Victim**. Pius XII noted in *Mediator Dei*: **the immolation through the bloody death by His free will was effected. Moreover, on the altar because of the glorious state of His human nature, this will no longer be overcome [cf. Rm 6:9], and therefore, the shedding of the Blood is just not possible**; nonetheless, from the counsel of the divine Wisdom of our Redeemer the sacrificing through external signs which are indications of death is shown in some way by looking on the One they have pierced. Furthermore through the transubstantiation of the bread into the Body, and of the wine into the Blood of Jesus Christ there is brought about that His Body truly is present as is His Blood: the Eucharistic species under which He is present, **figure the bloody separation of His Body and Blood.**'

The bloody immolation occurs by the transubstantiation itself by which the body and the blood in the virtuality of the sacrament, are confected.

†
†††
†

CONCLUSION

[1] Therefore, **the Priest offering is one and the same**, i.e., the Eternal High Priest of Mercy, Who chose to communicate His Bloody Sacrifice in an unbloody manner to His Spouse, i.e., the Church, through His ministers.

[2] Numerically, **there is one and the same Host, Victim**, i.e., Jesus Christ Who becomes present not formally glorious, nor either as suffering, or dying, nor as already dead, but 'as One Who had suffered' i.e., as a **perpetual Host, Victim**, in that by the very words of the Consecration the Body and the Blood, as 'reality and sacrament', that are confected separately **in a commemorative manner from the Institution of Jesus Christ**.

[3] **The same numerically is the oblation** of the Eternal High Priest of Mercy perpetuated by the ministry of the Priests who **everywhere** on earth and **in all times**, and **in the name person and virtuality of the one and the same Supreme High Priest of Mercy, they always offer the same Victim, Host**.

[4] It is not required that Jesus Christ would have to renew the will of offering Himself by the ministry of His priests but it suffices that **that same will by which He offered Himself once and for all on Calvary for His bloody immolation unto the remission of sins, He likewise willed to make His Church the participant of His oblation and of its fruits**.

[5] It is in this manner that Jesus Christ **actually** offers the sacrifice of **each** Mass in so far as **His ministers consecrate and offer in his eternally divine virtuality**:

Reply OBJ 2: Although Christ's passion and death are not to be repeated, **yet the virtue of that Victim endures for ever**, for, as it is written (Hebrews 10:14), **"by one oblation He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."** Wherefore the reply to the third objection is clear.

As to **the unity of this sacrifice**, it was **foreshadowed** in the Law in that, once a year, the high-priest of the Law entered into the Holies, with a solemn oblation of blood, as set down, Leviticus 16:11. But the **figure** fell short of the reality in this, that the victim had not an everlasting virtue, **for which reason those sacrifices were renewed every year**. [III, q. 22, a. 5, ad 2^{um}].

[5] The single sacramental sacrifices **numerically** differ one from the other in so far as these are offered by different ministers, or by the same minister but in different places and times. Nonetheless, **what is not repeated is the ‘once-and-for-all’ oblation of Jesus Christ – but, the unbloody sacramental manner of offering these Masses is what is repeated.**

[6] Since the Passion of Jesus Christ, or **the Sacrifice He offered on the Cross is the perpetual font of our sanctification**, we all offer thanks to the eternal High Priest of Mercy. He willed **to associate us with the entire Holy Church in His bloody sacrifice through His unbloody most Holy Eucharistic Sacrifice.** This is accomplished **so that so that we might be purified and sanctified by His precious Blood** and so that we might be enabled to **render in perpetuity** a worthy Worship to His Eternal Father.

†
†††
†