

## QUESTION 76

### The Manner in which Christ Exists in This Sacrament

Next we have to consider the manner in which Christ exists in this sacrament. And on this topic there are eight questions: (1) Does the whole Christ exist under this sacrament? (2) Does the whole Christ exist under both of the sacrament's appearances? (3) Does the whole Christ exist under each part of the appearances? (4) Do the full dimensions of the body of Christ exist in this sacrament? (5) Does Christ's body exist in this sacrament as in a place (*sit localiter*)? (6) After the consecration, does the whole body of Christ move with the movement of the host or chalice? (7) Can the body of Christ under this sacrament be seen by any eye? (8) Does the real body of Christ remain in this sacrament when it miraculously appears under the appearances of a boy or of flesh?

#### Article 1

##### Is the whole Christ contained under this sacrament?

It seems not to be the case that the whole Christ is contained under this sacrament (*non totus Christus contineatur sub hoc sacramento*):

**Objection 1:** Christ begins to exist in this sacrament through the conversion of the bread and wine. But it is clear that the bread and wine cannot be converted either into Christ's divinity or into His soul. Therefore, since, as was established above (q. 2, a. 5, and q. 5, aa. 1-3), Christ consists of three substances, viz., His divinity, His soul, and His body, it seems not to be the case that the whole Christ exists in this sacrament.

**Objection 2:** As was explained above (q. 74, a. 1), Christ exists in this sacrament insofar as the sacrament is fitting as a meal for the faithful consisting of food and drink. But in John 6:56 our Lord says, "My flesh is true food and my blood is true drink." Therefore, it is only the body and blood of Christ that are contained in this sacrament. But there are many other parts of Christ's body, e.g., the nerves and bones and other things of this sort. Therefore, it is not the case that the whole Christ is contained under this sacrament.

**Objection 3:** A body of a greater quantity cannot be contained as a whole under a measure that has a lesser quantity. But the measure of the consecrated bread and wine is much less than the proper measure of Christ's body. Therefore, it cannot be the case that the whole Christ exists under this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** In *De Officio* Ambrose says, "Christ exists in this sacrament."

**I respond:** It is altogether necessary to profess, in accord with the Catholic Faith, that the whole Christ exists in this sacrament. However, that there are two ways in which something of Christ exists in this sacrament: (a) in one way, as it were, *by the power of the sacrament*; (b) in a second way, *by virtue of a natural concomitance*:

(a) What exists under the appearances of this sacrament *by the power of the sacrament* is that which the preexistent substance of the bread and wine is *directly* converted into, insofar as this is signified by the words of the form—and it is the words of the form that are effective in this sacrament, as they are in the other sacraments—viz., when it is said, 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood'.

(b) What exists in this sacrament *by natural concomitance* is that which is conjoined in reality to what the conversion in question terminates in. For if two things are conjoined in reality, then wherever the one exists in reality, the other has to exist as well, since it is only by the soul's operation that things which are conjoined in reality are distinguished from one another.

**Reply to objection 1:** Since the conversion of the bread and wine is not terminated in the divinity of Christ or in His soul, it follows that Christ's *divinity* and His *soul* exist in this sacrament not by the

power of the sacrament, but by a real concomitance.

For since the divinity never put down the assumed body, Christ's divinity has to exist wherever His body is. And that is why Christ's divinity has to exist in this sacrament as concomitant with His body. Hence, in the profession of faith from Ephesus we read, "We are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ—not in the sense of receiving flesh in general or the flesh of a holy man conjoined to the Word according to a oneness of dignity, but in the sense of receiving the truly life-giving flesh made proper to the Word Himself."

On the other hand, as was explained above (q. 50, a. 5), the soul was separated in reality from the body. And so if this sacrament had been celebrated during the triduum of Christ's death, His soul would not have been there either by the power of the sacrament or by a real concomitance. But because, as Romans 6:9 puts it, "Christ, having risen from the dead, now dies no more, His soul is always united to His body in reality. And that is why in this sacrament Christ's body exists, to be sure, by the power of the sacrament, whereas His soul exists in this sacrament because of a real concomitance.

**Reply to objection 2:** As regards the appearances of the bread, what is contained under this sacrament by the power of the sacrament is not only the flesh, but the whole body of Christ, including the bones and nerves and other things of this sort. And this is clear from the form of this sacrament, in which it is said not 'This is my flesh', but 'This is my body'. And so when in John 6:56 our Lord says, "My flesh is true food," the word 'flesh' is being used there for the whole body. For according to human custom, this seems to be more accommodated to eating, given that men commonly feed upon the flesh of animals and not on their bones or other things of this sort.

**Reply to objection 3:** As has been explained (q. 75, a. 5), once the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ or of the wine into His blood has taken place, the accidents of both the bread and the wine remain. From this it is clear that the dimensions of the bread or wine are not converted into the dimensions of Christ's body; instead, it is the substance that is converted into the substance. And so it is the *substance* of Christ's body or of His blood that exists in this sacrament by the power of the sacrament and not the *dimensions* of Christ's body or blood. Hence, it is clear that the body of Christ exists in this sacrament in the manner of a *substance* and not in the manner of [the *accident* of] quantity. But the proper totality of the substance is contained indifferently in a small or a large quantity, just as the whole nature of air is contained in a large or small instance of air, and just as the whole nature of a man is contained in a large man or a small man. Hence, the whole substance of the body and blood of Christ is contained in this sacrament after the consecration, in the same way that the substance of bread and wine was contained there before the consecration.

## Article 2

### Is the whole Christ contained under both sets of this sacrament's appearances?

It seems not to be the case that the whole Christ is contained under both sets of this sacrament's appearances (*non sub utraque specie huius sacramenti totus Christus contineatur*):

**Objection 1:** This sacrament is ordered toward the salvation of the faithful not by the power of its appearances, but by the power of what is contained under the appearances; for the appearances existed even before the consecration, and it is because of the consecration that the power of this sacrament exists. Therefore, if nothing is contained under the one set of appearances that is not contained under the other, and if the whole Christ is contained under both, it seems that one or the other set of appearances is superfluous in this sacrament.

**Objection 2:** It was explained above (a. 1, ad 1) that all the other parts of the body, e.g., the bones,

nerves, and other things of this sort, are contained under the name ‘flesh’. But as is clear from Aristotle in *De Animalibus*, the blood is one of the parts of a human body. Therefore, if Christ’s blood is contained under the appearances of bread, just as the other parts of the body are contained there, then the blood should not be consecrated separately, just as the other parts of the body are not consecrated separately, either.

**Objection 3:** What has once come into being cannot come into being again. But Christ’s body has already begun to exist in this sacrament through the consecration of the bread. Therefore, it cannot be the case that it begins to exist again through the consecration of the wine. And so Christ’s body will not be contained under the appearances of wine and, as a result, neither will the whole Christ be contained under the appearances of wine. Therefore, it is not the case that the whole Christ is contained under both sets of appearances.

**But contrary to this:** A Gloss on 1 Corinthians 11:25 (“... the cup ...”) says, “Under both sets of appearances”—viz., of the bread and of the wine—“the same thing is consumed.” And so it seems that the whole Christ exists under both sets of appearances.

**I respond:** On the basis of what has been said above (a. 1), it should be held with utmost certainty that the whole Christ exists under both sets of the sacrament’s appearances, though in different ways. For the body of Christ does, to be sure, exist under the appearances of bread by the power of the sacrament, whereas the blood exists under those appearances by a real concomitance, in the way explained above concerning Christ’s soul and His divinity. On the other hand, Christ’s blood does, to be sure, exist under the appearances of wine by the power of the sacrament, whereas His body exists under those appearances by a real concomitance in the way that His soul and divinity do. For Christ’s blood is not now separated from His body as it was during the time of His passion and death. Hence, if this sacrament had been celebrated during that time, Christ’s body would have existed without the blood, and the blood would have existed under the appearances of wine without the body, just as it did in reality.

**Reply to objection 1:** Even though the whole Christ exists under both sets of appearances, this is nonetheless not in vain:

First of all, this is able to *represent Christ’s passion*, during which His blood was separated from His body. Hence, even in the formula for the consecration of the blood mention is made of its being poured out.

Second, this is fitting for *the use of this sacrament*, in order that they might be shown separately to the faithful, the body for food and the blood for drink.

Third, with respect to *the effect*, since as was explained above (q. 74, a. 1), “the flesh of Christ is offered under the appearances of bread for the health of the body, whereas the blood is offered under the appearances of wine for the health of the soul” (Ambrose).

**Reply to objection 2:** In Christ’s passion, which this sacrament is the memorial of, the different parts of the body were not separated from one another in the way that the blood was; instead, the body remained intact—this in accord with Exodus 12:46 (“You shall not break a bone of its body”). And that is why in this sacrament the blood is consecrated separately from the body, whereas the other parts of the body are not consecrated separately from one another.

**Reply to objection 3:** As has been explained, Christ’s body exists under the appearances of wine not by the power of the sacrament, but by a natural concomitance. And so after the consecration of the wine Christ’s body does not exist there in its own right, but instead exists there concomitantly.

### Article 3

#### Does the whole Christ exist under each part of the appearances of bread and wine?

It seems not to be the case that the whole Christ exists under each part of the appearances of bread and wine (*non sit totus Christus sub qualibet parte specierum panis vel vini*):

**Objection 1:** The appearances can be divided *ad infinitum*. Therefore, if the whole Christ existed under each part of the aforementioned appearances, it would follow that He exists infinitely many times in this sacrament. But this is absurd, since the infinite is incompatible not only with nature, but also with grace.

**Objection 2:** Since Christ's body is organic, it has parts that are spaced determinately far from one another; for it belongs to the nature of an organic body for the individual parts to be spaced determinately far from one another, in the way that one eye is spaced determinately far from the other, and in the way that an eye is spaced determinately far from an ear. But this would not be the case if the whole Christ existed under each part of the appearances; for it would have to be the case that each part existed under each part, so that where the one part existed, the other would exist as well. Therefore, it cannot be the case that the whole Christ exists under each part of the host or under each part of the wine contained in the chalice.

**Objection 3:** Christ's body always retains the real nature of a body and is never changed into a spirit. But, as is clear from the *Categories*, it belongs to the nature of a body to be a quantity that has position. But it belongs to the nature of this quantity that its diverse parts exist in diverse parts of its place. Therefore, it cannot be the case, it seems, that the whole Christ exists under each part of the appearances.

**But contrary to this:** In a certain sermon Augustine says, "Each one receives Christ the Lord, and He is whole in each portion; nor is He made smaller by the individual portions, but instead He proffers Himself as complete in each portion."

**I respond:** As is clear from what has been said above (a. 1, ad 3), since the substance of Christ's body exists in this sacrament by the power of the sacrament, whereas its dimensive quantity exists by virtue of a real concomitance, Christ's body exists in this sacrament in the manner of a *substance*, i.e., in the manner in which a substance exists *under its dimensions*, and not in the manner of the *dimensions*, i.e., in the manner in which the dimensive quantity of a body exists *under the quantity of its dimensive place*. Now it is obvious that the whole nature of a substance exists under every part of the dimensions under which it is contained; for instance, the whole nature of air exists under each part of the air, and the whole nature of bread exists under each part of the bread—and this regardless of whether the dimensions are *divided in actuality*, as when the air is divided or when the bread is cut—or, again, whether they are actually undivided, but *divisible in potentiality*.

And that is why it is clear that the whole Christ exists under each part of the appearances of the bread—even when the host remains unbroken and not just when it is broken. The latter is claimed by some who use the example of an image that appears in a whole mirror; the image appears as one in an unbroken mirror, but after the mirror has been broken, single images appear in each of the parts. However, this example is not altogether similar. For the multiplication of images of this sort occurs in the broken mirror because of the diverse reflections in the different parts of the mirror, whereas in the present case there is a single consecration because of which Christ's body exists in the sacrament.

**Reply to objection 1:** Number follows upon division. And so as long as the quantity remains undivided, it is not the case that the substance of a given thing exists many times under its proper dimensions; nor is it the case that Christ's body exists many times under the dimensions of the bread. And, as a result, neither does it exist infinitely many times; instead, it exists as many times as the number of parts into which it is divided.

**Reply to objection 2:** The determinate spacing of the parts in an organic body is based on its dimensive quantity, whereas the nature itself of the substance is prior even to its dimensive quantity. And since the conversion of the substance of the bread terminates directly in the *substance* of Christ's body, in the manner of which the body of Christ properly and directly exists in this sacrament, such a spacing of parts exists, to be sure, in Christ's real body itself, but, as has been explained, it is related to this sacrament not in accord with that spacing, but in accord with the *mode of substance itself*.

**Reply to objection 3:** This argument goes through with respect to the nature that a body has with respect to its dimensive quantity. But it has been explained that Christ's body is related to this sacrament not by reason of its *dimensive quantity*, but by reason of its *substance*.

#### Article 4

##### Does the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body exist in this sacrament?

It seems not to be the case that the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body exists in this sacrament (*non tota quantitas dimensiva corporis Christi sit in hoc sacramento*):

**Objection 1:** It has been explained (a. 3) that Christ's whole body is contained under each part of the consecrated host. But no dimensive quantity is totally contained both in a given whole and also in each part of that whole. Therefore, it is impossible for the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body to be contained in this sacrament.

**Objection 2:** As is clear from the Philosopher in *Metaphysics* 3, it is impossible for two dimensive quantities to be coincident, even if one of them is separated and the other exists in a natural body. But in this sacrament the quantity of the bread remains, as is apparent to the senses. Therefore, the dimensive quantity of Christ's body does not exist there.

**Objection 3:** If two unequal dimensive quantities are placed next to one another, the larger one extends beyond the smaller one. But the dimensive quantity of Christ's body is much larger than the dimensive quantity of the consecrated host—and this in every dimension. Therefore, if, in this sacrament, the dimensive quantity of the body of Christ existed along with the dimensive quantity of the host, then the dimensive quantity of Christ's body would extend beyond the quantity of the host—and yet the dimensive quantity of the host does not exist without the substance of Christ's body. Therefore, the substance of Christ's body will in this sacrament exist even beyond the appearances of the bread. But this is absurd, since, as has been explained (a. 2), the substance of Christ's body does not exist in this sacrament except because of the consecration of the bread. Therefore, it is impossible for the whole quantity of Christ's body to exist in this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** The dimensive quantity of a body is not separated in *esse* from its substance. But as was established above (aa. 1 and 3), the whole substance of Christ's body exists in this sacrament. Therefore, the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body exists in this sacrament.

**I respond:** As was explained above (a. 1), there are two ways in which something belonging to Christ exists in this sacrament: (a) in one way, by the power of the sacrament, and (b) in a second way, by a natural concomitance.

To be sure, it is not by the power of the sacrament that the dimensive quantity of Christ's body exists in this sacrament. For what exists in this sacrament by the power of the sacrament is what the conversion *directly* terminates in. But the conversion that is effected in this sacrament terminates directly in the *substance* of Christ's body and *not* in its *dimensions*. This is clear from the fact that the dimensive quantity of the bread remains after the consecration has taken place, and that it is only the substance of the bread that passes away.

However, because the substance of Christ's body is not in reality stripped of its dimensive quantity or of its other accidents, it follows that the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body, along with all its other accidents, exists in this sacrament by virtue of a real concomitance.

**Reply to objection 1:** Each thing's mode of existing is determined in accord with what is *necessary* to that mode (*secundum illud quod est ei per se*) and not in accord with what is *incidental* to it (*non secundum illud quod est ei per accidens*); for instance, a body exists in sight in accord with its being white and not in accord with its being sweet, even if that same body is both white and sweet. Hence, the sweetness exists in sight in accord with the mode of whiteness and not in accord with the mode of sweetness.

Therefore, since it is the *substance* of Christ's body that exists on the altar by the power of the sacrament, whereas its dimensive quantity exists there concomitantly and, as it were, incidentally (*per accidens*), it follows that the dimensive quantity of Christ's body exists in this sacrament not in accord with its proper mode of existence, viz., being a whole in the whole and a part in each part, but instead with the mode of a *substance*, the nature of which is to be a whole in the whole and a whole in each part.

**Reply to objection 2:** Two dimensive quantities cannot naturally be coincident in the same place, in the sense that each exists in accord with the proper mode of a dimensive quantity. But in this sacrament the dimensive quantity of the bread exists in its proper mode, viz., in accord with a sort of commensuration, but not the dimensive quantity of Christ's body, which, as has been said, exists there instead in the mode of a *substance*.

**Reply to objection 3:** The dimensive quantity of Christ's body does not exist in this sacrament in accord with the mode of commensuration, which is proper to a quantity and to which it pertains that a greater quantity extends beyond a lesser quantity. Instead, the dimensive quantity of Christ's body exists there in the way already explained.

## Article 5

### Does Christ's body exist in this sacrament as in a place?

It seems that Christ's body exists in this sacrament as in a place (*corpus Christi sit in hoc sacramento sicut in loco*):

**Objection 1:** To exist in something definitively or circumscriptively (*definitive vel circumscriptive*) is part of what it is to exist in a place. But Christ's body seems to exist *definitively* in this sacrament, since it exists where the appearances of the bread and wine are in such a way that it does not exist in any other place on the altar. Again, it likewise seems to exist *circumscriptively* there, since it is contained by the surface of the consecrated host in such a way that it neither exceeds it nor is exceeded by it. Therefore, Christ's body exists in this sacrament as in a place.

**Objection 2:** The place of the appearances of the bread is not empty or vacuous, since nature does not tolerate a vacuum. And, as has been established (q. 75, a. 2), the substance of the bread does not exist there, but instead only Christ's body exists there. Therefore, Christ's body fills that place. But everything that fills a given place exists in that place locally (*est in eo localiter*). Therefore, Christ's body exists locally in this sacrament.

**Objection 3:** As has been explained (a. 4), in this sacrament Christ's body exists with its dimensive quantity and with all its accidents. But *being in a place* is an accident of a body, and this is why *where* is counted among the nine genera of accidents. Therefore, Christ's body exists locally in this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** As is clear from the Philosopher in *Physics* 4, a place and that which is located in the place have to be equal (*oportet locum et locatum esse aequalia*). But the place where this

sacrament exists is much smaller than Christ's body. Therefore, Christ's body does not exist in this sacrament as in a place.

**I respond:** As has already been explained (a. 1, ad 3 and a. 3), in this sacrament Christ's body exists not in its proper mode of *dimensive quantity*, but instead exists in the mode of a *substance*. But each body exists in a place in the mode of dimensive quantity, viz., insofar as it is commensurate with the place in accord with its dimensive quantity. Hence, it follows that Christ's body exists in this sacrament *not as in a place*, but in the mode of a *substance*, i.e., in the mode in which a substance is contained by its dimensions.

For in this sacrament the substance of Christ's body succeeds the substance of the bread. Hence, just as the substance of the bread existed under its own dimensions in the mode of a substance and not locally, neither does the substance of Christ's body exist under its own dimensions locally. Yet the substance of Christ's body is not the subject of [the bread's] dimensions in the way that the substance of the bread was. The reason why the bread was in that place locally by reason of its dimensions was that it was related to the place by the mediation of its own dimensions. By contrast, the substance of Christ's body is related to that place by the mediation of something else's dimensions, with the result that, conversely, the proper dimensions of Christ's body are related to that place by the mediation of their substance. But this is contrary to the notion of a located body. Hence, there is no way in which Christ's body exists locally in this sacrament.

**Reply to objection 1:** Christ's body does not exist in this sacrament *definitively* because in that case it would not exist anywhere other than on *this* altar where *this* sacrament is being confected—even though it in fact exists both (a) in heaven with its own proper appearance and (b) on many other altars under the appearances of the sacrament.

Similarly, it is likewise clear that Christ's body does not exist in this sacrament *circumscriptively*, because, as has been pointed out, it does not exist there in a way that is commensurate with its own proper quantity.

Now the fact that Christ's body does not exist outside of the surface of the sacrament and that it does not exist on any other part of the altar has nothing to do with its existing there definitively or circumscriptively, but instead has to do with its having begun to exist there through the consecration and conversion of the bread and wine. This has already been explained above (a. 1 and q. 75, aa. 2-6).

**Reply to objection 2:** That place in which the body of Christ exists is not empty or vacuous. And yet it is not properly speaking filled by the substance of Christ's body, which, as has been explained, does not exist there locally. Instead, that place is filled by the sacramental appearances, which have to fill the place either (a) because of the nature of their dimensions or, at the very least, (b) miraculously, just as they miraculously subsist in the mode of a substance.

**Reply to objection 3:** As was explained above (a. 4), the accidents of Christ's body exist in this sacrament in accord with a real concomitance. And so those accidents of Christ's body that are *intrinsic to it* exist in this sacrament. But *being in a place* is an accident in relation to an *extrinsic* container. And so it is not necessary for Christ to exist in this sacrament as in a place.

## Article 6

### Does Christ's body exist with changeability in this sacrament?

It seems that Christ's body exists with changeability in this sacrament (*corpus Christi sit mobiliter in hoc sacramento*):

**Objection 1:** In *Topics 2* the Philosopher says, "When we move, the things that are in us

move”—something that is true even of the spiritual substance of the soul. But as was established above (q. 74, a. 1), Christ exists in this sacrament. Therefore, He moves when the sacrament is moved.

**Objection 2:** The reality should correspond to its prefigurement. But concerning the paschal lamb, which was a prefigurement of this sacrament, “none of it remained until the morning,” as was commanded in Exodus 12:10. Therefore, even if this sacrament were reserved for the next day, the body of Christ would not exist there. And so Christ’s body does not exist with unchangeability in this sacrament.

**Objection 3:** If Christ’s body were to remain under this sacrament even to the next day, then by parity of reasoning it would remain through all subsequent time; for one cannot claim that it ceases to exist there when the appearances cease, since the existence of Christ’s body does not depend on those appearances. But Christ does not remain under this sacrament for the totality of future time. Therefore, it seems that immediately upon the next day, or after some short interval of time, He ceases to exist under this sacrament. And so it seems that He exists with changeability in this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** It is impossible for the same thing to be moved and to be at rest, since in that case contradictories would be true of the same thing. But Christ’s body resides at rest in heaven. Therefore, He does not exist with changeability in this sacrament.

**I respond:** When something is one in [underlying] subject and multiple with respect to *esse*, nothing prevents it from being changed in one respect and remaining unchanged in another respect. For instance, it is one thing for a body to be white and another thing for it to be large, and so it can be changed with respect to whiteness and remain unchanged with respect to size.

Now for Christ to exist in His own right is not the same thing as His existing under the sacrament, since by the very fact that we say that He exists under the sacrament, what is signified is a sort of relation to this sacrament on His part. Therefore, in accord with this sort of *esse*, Christ is moved with respect to place not in His own right but only incidentally (*non movetur Christus per se secundum locum sed solum per accidens*). For, as was explained above (a. 5), Christ does not exist in this sacrament as in a place, and what does not exist in a place is moved in place not in its own right, but only with the movement of that in which it exists.

Similarly, neither is He changed in His own right by any other sort of mutation with respect to the *esse* that He has in this sacrament, e.g., with respect to His ceasing to exist under this sacrament. For that which has indefectible being in its own right cannot be a principle of failure (*deficiendi principium*); instead, when something else fails, it ceases to exist in thing. For instance, God, whose being is indefectible and immortal, ceases to exist in a corruptible creature because the corruptible creature ceases to exist. And in this sense, since Christ has indefectible and incorruptible *esse*, He ceases to exist under the sacrament not because He Himself ceases to exist, or, again, as is clear from what has been said, because of a local motion on His part, but solely because the appearances of this sacrament cease to exist.

Hence, it is clear that Christ, speaking of Him in His own right (*per se loquendo*), exists with unchangeability in this sacrament.

**Reply to objection 1:** This argument goes through for incidental movement (*de motu per accidens*) by which the things that exist in us are moved when we move. However, there is a difference between those things that can exist in a place in their own right, such as corporeal things, and things that cannot exist in a place in their own right, such as forms and spiritual substances. We can trace back to this latter mode the fact that we claim that Christ is moved incidentally (*per accidens*) in accord with the existence that He has in this sacrament, in which He does not exist as in a place.

**Reply to objection 2:** Some seem to have been moved by this argument to claim that Christ’s body does not remain under this sacrament if it is reserved until the next day. In opposition to them Cyril says, “Some are insane enough to claim that the mystical blessing ceases to sanctify if any of what is left of it remains until the next day. For the consecrated body of Christ will not change; instead, the power of the blessing, along with the life-giving grace, exists in it continually.” In the same way, all other consecrations

endure unchangeably as long as the things that have been consecrated remain; that is why the consecrations are not repeated.

Moreover, even though the reality should correspond to the prefiguration, the prefiguration nonetheless cannot be equal to it.

**Reply to objection 3:** The body of Christ remains in this sacrament not only until the next day, but also into the future for as long as the sacramental appearances remain. When those appearances cease to exist, then the body of Christ ceases to exist under them—not because the body of Christ is dependent on those appearances, but because the relation of Christ’s body to the appearances has been removed. It is in this same way that God ceases to be the Lord of a creature which ceases to exist.

### Article 7

#### Can Christ’s body as it exists in this sacrament be seen by any eye, at least by a glorified eye?

It seems that Christ’s body as it exists in this sacrament can be seen by some eye, at least by a glorified eye (*corpus Christi prout est in hoc sacramento possit videri ab aliquo oculo, saltem glorificato*):

**Objection 1:** It is because of the sacramental appearances enveloping Christ’s body that our eye is prevented from seeing it as it exists in this sacrament. But a glorified eye cannot be prevented by anything from seeing each body as it is. Therefore, a glorified eye can see the Christ’s body as it exists in this sacrament.

**Objection 2:** As Philippians 3:21 puts it, the glorious bodies of the saints will be “configured to the body of Christ’s glory.” But Christ’s eye sees Himself as He exists in this sacrament. Therefore, by parity of reasoning, every other glorified eye is able to see Him.

**Objection 3:** As Luke 20:36 explains, in the resurrection the saints will be “equal to the angels.” But the angels see Christ’s body as it exists in this sacrament, since even the demons are found to show respect (*reverentiam exhibere*) for this sacrament and to fear it. Therefore, by parity of reasoning, a glorified eye can see Christ’s body as it exists in this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** No one and the same existing thing can be seen simultaneously by the same individual under different appearances. But a glorified eye always sees Christ as He exists in His own appearance—this according to Isaiah 33:17 (“They will see the king in his beauty”). Therefore, it seems that it does not see Christ as He exists under the appearances of this sacrament.

**I respond:** There are two sorts of eyes, viz., (a) one *corporeal*, which is properly called an eye, and (b) the other *intellectual*, which is called an eye because of a likeness.

Now no *corporeal* eye can see Christ’s body as it exists in this sacrament:

First of all, because a visible body alters the medium by its accidents. But the accidents of Christ’s body exist in this sacrament by the mediation of the substance, with the result that the accidents of Christ’s body do not have an immediate relation either to the sacrament or to the bodies that surround the sacrament. And so they cannot alter the medium in such a way as to be able to be seen by any corporeal eye.

Second, because, as was explained above (a. 1, ad 3 and a. 3), Christ’s body exists in this sacrament in the mode of a substance. But a substance *as such* is not visible to the bodily eye and does not fall under any sensory power or under the imagination; instead, it falls only under the intellect, the object of which, as *De Anima* 3 explains, is “what a the thing is” (*cuius objectum est quod quid est*). And so, properly speaking, Christ’s body, in accord with the mode of existing that it has in this sacrament, is perceptible by

neither the senses nor the imagination, but only by the intellect, which is called a ‘spiritual eye’.

However, it is perceived in different ways by different intellects. For since the mode of being by which Christ exists in this sacrament is completely supernatural, it can be seen in its own right by a supernatural intellect, viz., the divine intellect, and, as a result, it can be seen by the beatified intellect of either an angel or a man—an intellect, which, because of its participation in the clarity of the divine intellect, sees those things that are supernatural through its vision of the divine essence. However, it can be seen by a man’s intellect in this life (*ab intellectu hominis viatoris*) only through faith, just as is the case with other supernatural realities. But not even an angelic intellect is sufficient to see this by its natural powers. Hence, the demons cannot through their intellect see Christ in this sacrament except through faith, which they do not assent to with their will, but are instead won over to by the evidentness of the signs; as James 2:19 puts it, “The demons believe, and they tremble.”

**Reply to objection 1:** Our corporeal eye is prevented by the sacramental appearances from seeing Christ’s body existing under them, not only (a) in the manner of a covering, in the way that we are prevented from seeing what is hidden by some sort of corporeal veil, but also (b) because it is through the mediation of the appearances, and *not through the mediation of its own proper accidents*, that Christ’s body has a relation to the medium that surrounds this sacrament.

**Reply to objection 2:** Christ’s own corporeal eye sees Himself existing under the sacrament, but it cannot see the very mode of being by which it exists under the sacrament; the latter is something that pertains to His intellect.

Nor is there a likeness to any other glorified eye, since the very eye of Christ exists under this sacrament, and no other glorified eye is conformed to Him in that way.

**Reply to objection 3:** A good or bad angel cannot see anything with a corporeal eye, but can instead see only with an intellectual eye. Hence, as is clear from what has been said, the arguments are not similar to one another.

## Article 8

### When in this sacrament either flesh or a boy miraculously appears, is it truly the body of Christ that exists there?

It seems that when in this sacrament either flesh or a boy miraculously appears, it is not truly the body of Christ that exists there:

**Objection 1:** As has been explained (a, 6), Christ’s body ceases to exist under the sacrament when the sacramental appearances cease to exist. But when flesh or a boy appear, the sacramental species cease to exist. Therefore, Christ’s body does not truly exist there.

**Objection 2:** Wherever Christ’s body is, it is there either (a) under His own proper appearance or (b) under the appearances of the sacrament. But when apparitions of the sort under discussion occur, it is clear that Christ is not there under His own proper appearance, since what is contained in this sacrament is the whole Christ, who remains complete in the form with which He ascended into heaven—and yet what miraculously appears in this sacrament is sometimes seen as a little piece of flesh and sometimes as a small boy. It is likewise clear that He is not there under the appearances of the sacrament, which are the appearances of bread and wine. Therefore, it seems that Christ’s body is not there in any way at all.

**Objection 3:** As was explained above (a. 1 and q. 75, aa. 2-6), Christ’s body begins to exist in this sacrament through the consecration and the conversion. But the flesh or blood that appears miraculously is not consecrated or converted into the true body or blood of Christ. Therefore, it is not the case that the body and blood of Christ exists under the appearances in question.

**But contrary to this:** When such an apparition occurs, the same reverence that was previously shown is shown to what appears. But this would not be done if Christ, to whom we show the reverence of adoration (*reverentiam latriae exhibemus*), were not really present there. Therefore, even when such an apparition occurs, Christ exists under the sacrament.

**I respond:** There are two ways in which an apparition occurs of the sort in which flesh or blood—or even a boy—is sometimes seen in this sacrament:

Sometimes this occurs *on the part of those who are seeing* and whose eyes are altered as if they were clearing seeing the flesh or blood or boy exteriorly, even though no change has been made on the part of the sacrament. And this seems to happen when either (a) it is seen by one individual under the appearances of flesh or of a boy, whereas it is seen by others, as before, under the appearances of bread, or (b) it is seen by one and the same individual for an hour under the appearances of flesh or a boy and later on under the appearances of bread. Nor does this have anything to do with deceit, as happens with magicians' tricks; for the appearances in question are formed by God in the eye as figures of some reality, viz., in order that Christ's body might truly be made manifest under this sacrament, in the same way that Christ appeared without deceit to the disciples who were going to Emmaus. For in *De Quaestionibus Evangelii* Augustine says, "When a pretense of ours is traced back to some signification, it is not a lie, but is instead the figure of a truth." And because in this mode of apparition no change takes place on the part of the sacrament, it is clear that Christ does not cease to exist under this sacrament when the apparition takes place.

By contrast, sometimes the sort of apparition in question happens not just by means of a change in those who see it, but also by means of an appearance that is seen to really exist exteriorly. And this seems to be the case when the apparition is seen by everyone under such-and-such appearances, and when it remains that way not just for an hour but for a long time.

Some claim that in this sort of case there is a proper appearance of Christ's body—and this despite the fact that what is seen in that place is not the whole Christ, but some part of His flesh, or else despite the fact that what is seen has the appearance not of a young man, but of a boy. For it lies within the power of a glorified body to be seen by a non-glorified eye either as a whole or in part, and either with its own proper appearance or with some strange appearance. This will be explained below (*Supplement*, q. 85, aa. 2-3).

But this does not seem to be right. First of all, because Christ's body can be seen with its proper appearance only in one place in which it is definitively contained. Hence, as long as it is seen with its proper appearance in heaven and adored there, it not seen in with its proper appearance in this sacrament. Second, because a glorified body, which appears as it wishes to, may disappear after the apparition, in the way that Luke 24:41 reports that our Lord "vanished from the sight of the disciples." But what is seen in this sacrament under the appearances of flesh remains for a long time. Indeed, one reads of its being sometimes enclosed and, by the order of many bishops, preserved in a pyx—something that would be impious to think about Christ under His proper appearance.

And so one should reply that, as long as the dimensions that previously existed remain, a certain change is miraculously made with respect to the other accidents, e.g., shape, color, and others of this sort, with the result that flesh or blood, or even a boy, is seen. And as was said above, this is not deceitful, since it is made into the shape of a reality, viz., in order to show through this miraculous apparition that the body and blood of Christ truly exist in this sacrament.

And so it is clear that as long as the dimensions remain—where the dimensions are, as will be explained below (q. 77, a. 2), the foundation of the other accidents—Christ's body truly remains in this sacrament.

**Reply to objection 1:** As has been explained, when an apparition of the sort under discussion takes place, sometimes the sacramental appearances remain totally the same in their own right, whereas

sometimes they remain the same with respect to what is most important in them.

**Reply to objection 2:** As has been explained, in apparitions of the sort in question, it is not the proper appearance of Christ that is seen. Instead, either the appearances are miraculously formed in the eyes of those who are watching, or else the appearances are miraculously formed within the sacramental dimensions themselves.

**Reply to objection 3:** As has been explained, the dimensions of the consecrated bread and wine remain the same, while a change is miraculously made within those dimensions with respect to the other accidents.