

QUESTION 78

The Form of This Sacrament

Next we have to consider the form (*forma*) of this sacrament. And on this topic there are six questions: (1) What is the form of this sacrament? (2) Is the form for the consecration of the bread appropriate? (3) Is the form for the consecration of the blood appropriate? (4) What is the power of each form? (5) Are the locutions true? (6) How does the one form relate to the other?

Article 1

Is the form of this sacrament “This is my body” and “This is the chalice of my blood”?

It seems that the form of this sacrament is not “This is my body” and “This is the chalice of my blood” (*haec non sit forma huius sacramenti, hoc est corpus meum, et, hic est calix sanguinis mei*):

Objection 1: The words in question seem to belong to the form of the sacrament by which Christ consecrated His body and blood. But as Matthew 26:26 has it, Christ first blessed the bread He had taken and then said, “Take and eat: This is my body.” And He acted similarly with respect to the chalice. Therefore, the words cited above are not the [whole] form of this sacrament.

Objection 2: Eusebius of Emesa says, “The invisible priest converts visible creatures into His own body by saying, ‘Take and eat: this is my body.’” Therefore, this whole locution seems to belong to the form of the sacrament. And the same line of reasoning holds for the words that pertain to the blood.

Objection 3: In the form of baptism the person of the minister is expressed along with his action when it is said, “I baptize you ...” But in the words under discussion there is no mention of the minister or of his action. Therefore, these words are not an appropriate form for a sacrament.

Objection 4: The form of a sacrament is sufficient for bringing the sacrament to completion, and that is why the sacrament of baptism can sometimes be brought to completion with only the words of the form being pronounced and all the other words being omitted. Therefore, if the words in question are the form of this sacrament, it seems that the sacrament could sometimes be brought to completion with only those words being pronounced and all the other words that are said in the Mass omitted. And yet this seems to be false, because if all the other words were omitted, then the words in question would be taken as coming from the priest who pronounced them, and yet the bread and wine are not converted into *his* body and blood. Therefore, it is not the case that the words in question are the form of this sacrament.

But contrary to this: In *De Sacramentis* Ambrose says, “The consecration is effected by the words and utterances (*verbis et sermonibus*) of the Lord Jesus. For through all the other things that are said, praise is rendered to God and petitionary prayer is made (*oratione petitur*) for the people, for their rulers, and for others. But when the sacrament is confected, the priest no longer uses his own words but instead uses the utterances of Christ. Therefore, it is the words of Christ that confect this sacrament.”

I respond: This sacrament differs from the other sacraments in two ways:

First of all, with respect to the fact that this sacrament is brought to completion in the *consecration* of the matter, whereas the other sacraments are brought to completion in the *use* of the consecrated matter.

Second, because in the other sacraments the consecration of the matter consists only in a certain blessing by which the consecrated matter receives as an instrumental cause (*instrumentaliter*) a certain spiritual power which, through the minister, who is a living instrument, can proceed to inanimate instruments. By contrast, in this sacrament the consecration of the matter consists in a miraculous conversion of the substance that can be brought to completion by God alone. Hence, in bringing this sacrament to completion, the minister has no act other than pronouncing the words.

And it is because the form has to be appropriate to the reality that the form of this sacrament differs

from the forms of the other sacraments in two ways:

First of all, because the forms of the other sacraments signify the *use* of the matter, e.g., being baptized or being signed, whereas the form of this sacrament implies only the *consecration* of the matter, which consists in the transubstantiation, viz., when it is said, “This is my body” or “This is the chalice of my blood.”

Second, because the forms of the other sacraments are pronounced in the person of the minister—either (a) in the mode of exercising the action, as when it is said, “I baptize you” or “I confirm you,” or (b) in the mode of giving a command, as when in the sacrament of holy orders it is said, “Receive the power ...,” or (c) in the mode of praying, as when in the sacrament of extreme unction it is said, “Through this anointing and our intercession ...” By contrast, the form of this sacrament is pronounced in the person of Christ Himself speaking, in order that one might be given to understand that the minister, in bringing this sacrament to completion, is doing nothing but pronouncing the words of Christ.

Reply to objection 1: There are many opinions concerning this matter:

Some have claimed that Christ, who had the power of excellence in the case of the sacraments, brought this sacrament to completion without any form of words, and that afterwards He spoke the words under which others later performed the consecration. This sounds like the words of Pope Innocent III when he says, “One can reasonably claim that Christ confected [this sacrament] by His divine power and that afterwards He pronounced the form under which those who came after Him do the blessing.” But explicitly opposed to this are the words of the Gospel, in which it is reported that Christ did the blessing and that this blessing was made with certain words. Hence, the passage quoted from Innocent is said more as an opinion than as a determination (*opinative magis dicta quam determinative*).

Some have claimed that this blessing was made with certain other words that are unknown to us. But this position cannot stand, either. For the blessing that belongs to the consecration is now brought to completion through the recitation of the things that were done at that time. Hence, if the consecration was not done with those words at that time, then it would not be done now with those words.

And so others have claimed that the blessing was made with the same words with which it is now made, but that Christ pronounced those words twice—once in secret, in order to consecrate, and once out loud, in order to instruct. But, once again, this cannot stand. For the priest consecrates by pronouncing these words not as they were said by Christ in a secret benediction, but as they were pronounced in public. Hence, since the words would not have force except because they were spoken aloud by Christ, it seems that Christ also consecrated by speaking them openly.

And so, as is clear from Augustine in *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, others have claimed that the evangelists did not always preserve the same ordering in relating how things were done. Hence, it should be understood that the ordering of the things done can be expressed as follows: “Taking the bread, He blessed it saying, ‘This is my body’, and then He broke it and gave it to His disciples.” But the same sense can be had with the unchanged words of the Gospel. For the participle ‘saying’ implies a concomitance of the words spoken with those that go before. And it is not necessary for this concomitance to be thought of solely with respect to the last word that is pronounced, as if Christ had pronounce those words when He gave it to His disciples. Instead, the concomitance can be thought of with respect to everything that had gone before, so that the sense would be this: “While He was blessing and breaking and giving it to His disciples, He said these words, “Take and eat ...”

Reply to objection 2: With the words “Take and eat” one understands the *use* of the consecrated matter, which, as was established above (q. 74, a. 7), is not necessary for this sacrament. And that is why those words do not belong to the substance of the form.

However, since the use of the consecrated matter involves a sort of completion of the sacrament—just as an entity’s action is not its *first* perfection, but is instead its *second* perfection—so all

of the words together express the *total* completion or perfection of this sacrament. And this is the sense in which Eusebius understood the sacrament to be confected by those words, with respect to both its first and second completion or perfection.

Reply to objection 3: In the sacrament of baptism the minister exercises an act which pertains to the use of the matter and which is of the essence of the sacrament—something that is not the case with this sacrament. And so the two lines of reasoning are not similar.

Reply to objection 4: Some have claimed that this sacrament cannot be brought to completion with the words in question pronounced and the other words omitted—especially those found in the canon of the Mass. But this claim is clearly false, both (a) in light of the passage from Ambrose cited above, and also (b) because the canon of the Mass is not the same for everyone or for all times, but instead there are different canons set forth by different people.

Hence, one should reply that if a priest pronounced just the words in question with the intention of confecting this sacrament, then the sacrament would be brought to completion, since the intention would bring it about that the words are understood as being pronounced by the person of Christ, even if they were recited along with the preceding words. However, the priest would be committing a grave sin if he confected the sacrament in this way, since he would not be observing the rite of the Church.

Nor is this case similar to that of baptism, which is a sacrament of necessity, whereas *spiritual eating* can, as Augustine explains, make up for the absence of this sacrament.

Article 2

Is “This is my body” an appropriate form for the consecration of the bread?

It seems that “This is my body” is not an appropriate form for the consecration of the bread (*haec non sit conveniens forma consecrationis panis, hoc est corpus meum*):

Objection 1: A sacrament’s effect should be expressed by its form. But the effect which is brought about in the consecration of the bread is the conversion of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ, and this conversion is expressed better by the verb ‘is coming to be’ (*fit*) than by the verb ‘is’. Therefore, in the form of the consecration one should say, “This is coming to be my body.”

Objection 2: In *De Sacramentis* Ambrose says, “The word of Christ confects this sacrament. Which word of Christ? The one by which all things were made: the Lord commanded, and the heavens and the earth were made.” Therefore, the form of this sacrament would likewise be more appropriate if it were expressed with an imperative verb: “Let this be my body!”

Objection 3: That which is converted is conveyed by the subject of the locution in question, just as the terminus of the conversion is conveyed by the predicate. But just as that into which the conversion is made is determinate, since the conversion is not made into anything other than Christ’s body, so, too, that which is converted is determinate, since nothing is converted into Christ’s body other than the bread. Therefore, just as the name is posited on the part of the predicate, so the name ‘bread’ should be posited on the part of the subject, so that what is said is, “This bread is my body.”

Objection 4: Just as that in which the conversion is terminated has a determinate nature, since it is a body, so, too, it belongs to a determinate person. Therefore, in order to make the person determinate, it should be said, “This is the body of Christ.”

Objection 5: Nothing should be put into the words of the form that does not belong to the form’s substance. Therefore, in certain books the conjunction ‘for’, which does not belong to the substance of the form, is inappropriately added.

But contrary to this: As is clear from Matthew 26:26, our Lord used this form in consecrating.

I respond: This is an appropriate form for the consecration of the bread. For it has been explained (a. 1) that this consecration consists in the conversion of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ. But it is necessary for the form of a sacrament to signify what is being effected in that sacrament. Hence, the form of the consecration of the bread should signify the very conversion of the bread into Christ's body. Now in this conversion there are three things to consider, viz., (a) the *conversion itself*, (b) its *terminus a quo*, and (c) its *terminus ad quem*:

The *conversion itself* can be considered in two ways: in one way, as *coming to be* (*ut in fieri*), and in a second way, as *having come to be* (*ut in facto esse*). Now in the form in question, the conversion should be signified not as *coming to be*, but as *having come to be*. First of all, because, as was established above (q. 75. a. 7), this conversion is not successive, but is instead instantaneous, and in changes of this sort, *coming to be* is nothing other than *having come to be*. Second, because sacramental forms are related to signifying the effect of a sacrament in the way that the forms of artifacts are related to representing the effect of the art. But the form of an artifact is a likeness of the last effect toward which the artist's intention is directed, in the way that the form of the art in the mind of the builder is *principally* the form of the house built and, *as a consequence*, the building of the house. Hence, in the form under discussion, the conversion should be expressed as *having come to be*, toward which the intention is directed.

And since the conversion itself is expressed in the form [of the consecration] as *having come to be*, it is necessary for the extremes of the conversion to be signified as being related to the conversion's *having come to be*. Now the *terminus in quem* has the proper nature of its own substance, but the *terminus a quo* does not remain with its own substance, but remains only through its accidents, by which it is subject to the sensory power and can be made determinate with respect to the sensory power. Hence, the *terminus a quo* of the conversion is appropriately expressed by a demonstrative pronoun referring to the accidents, which can be sensed and which remain. On the other hand, the *terminus ad quem* is expressed by a name signifying the nature of that into which the conversion is made, and this, as has been explained (q. 76, a. 12), is the whole body of Christ and not just His flesh. Hence, the most appropriate form of all is "This is my body."

Reply to objection 1: As has been explained, it is not *coming to be* that is the ultimate effect of this consecration, but *having come to be*. And so it is that this should instead be expressed in the form.

Reply to objection 2: The word of God that operated in the creation of things also operates in this consecration, though in a different way.

For this word operates sacramentally, i.e., in accord with the power of a signification. And so in the case of this word the ultimate effect of the consecration has to be signified by a substantival verb in the present tense and in the indicative mode.

By contrast, in the creation of things the word of God operates solely as an efficient cause and its efficient causality occurs through the command of God's wisdom. And so in creation the word of the Lord is expressed by a verb in the imperative mode—this according to Genesis 1:3 ("Let there be light, and light was made").

Reply to objection 3: In the conversion's very *having come to be* the *terminus a quo* does not retain the nature of its substance in the way that the *terminus ad quem* does. And so the cases are unlike one another.

Reply to objection 4: As has been explained, the person of Christ, by whose person this form is uttered, is sufficiently expressed by the pronoun 'my', which includes a pointing toward the primary person, i.e., the person of the speaker.

Reply to objection 5: The conjunction 'for' (*enim*) is added to the form according to a Roman custom derived from the blessed apostle Peter—and this for sake of continuity with the preceding words. And so it does not belong to the form, just as the preceding words do not belong to the form, either.

Article 3

**Is this an appropriate form for the consecration of the wine:
“This is the chalice of my blood, the blood of the new and eternal covenant,
the mystery of faith, which will be poured out
for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins”?**

It seems that this is not an appropriate form for the consecration of the wine: “This is the chalice of my blood, the blood of the new and eternal covenant, the mystery of faith, which will be poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins” (*haec non sit conveniens forma consecrationis vini: hic est calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*):

Objection 1: As is clear from what was said above (q. 76, aa. 1-2), just as the bread is converted into Christ’s body by the power of the consecration, so, too, the wine is converted into Christ’s blood. But in the form of the consecration of the bread, Christ’s body is put into the nominative case (*in recto*) and nothing else is added. Therefore, it is inappropriate in the form under discussion to put Christ’s blood into an oblique case and to add ‘the chalice’ in the nominative case, when it is said, “This is the chalice of my blood.”

Objection 2: The words that are pronounced in the consecration of the bread have no more efficacy than the words that are pronounced in the consecration of the wine, since both are the words of Christ. But as soon as “This is my body” is said, the consecration of the bread has been brought to completion. Therefore, as soon as “This is the chalice of my blood” has been said, the consecration of the wine has been brought to completion. And so the words that follow do not seem to belong to the substance of the form, especially given that they have to do with the properties of this sacrament.

Objection 3: The new covenant or testament (*testamentum novum*) seems to involve interior inspiration, as is clear from the fact that in Hebrews 8:8-10 the Apostle cites the words found in Jeremiah 31:31-33, “I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel ... I will put my laws into their minds.” But this sacrament is carried out exteriorly and visibly. Therefore, it is inappropriate for the form of the sacrament to say “new covenant.”

Objection 4: ‘New’ bespeaks something such that the beginning of its existence is recent. By contrast, what is eternal does not have a beginning of its existence. Therefore, it is inappropriate to say “new and eternal,” since it seems to imply a contradiction.

Objection 5: Occasions of error should be removed from men—this according to Isaiah 57:14 (“Take away stumbling-blocks from the path of my people”). But some have erred by thinking that the body and blood of Christ exist only mystically in this sacrament. Therefore, it is inappropriate for “the mystery of faith” to be put into the form in question.

Objection 6: As was explained above (q. 73, a. 3, ad 3 and q. 74, q. 4, obj. 3), just as baptism is the sacrament of faith, so the Eucharist is the sacrament of charity. Therefore, “charity” rather than “faith” should have been put into this form.

Objection 7: This whole sacrament, with respect to both the body and the blood, is a memorial of our Lord’s passion—this according to 1 Corinthians 11:26 (“As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you announce the death of the Lord”). Therefore, it is not the case that mention should have been made of Christ’s passion and of its fruits in the form for the consecration of the blood rather than in the form for the consecration of the body—especially in light of the fact that in Luke 22:19 our Lord said, “This is my body, which will be given up for you.”

Objection 8: As was established above (q. 48, a. 2 and q. 49, a. 3), Christ’s passion profited

everyone as regards its *sufficiency* and many as regards its *efficacy*. Therefore, it should have been said that the blood was going to be poured out “for all” or “for many,” without adding “for you.”

Objection 9: The words by which this sacrament is confected have efficacy because of Christ’s institution. But none of the evangelists records that Christ said all of these words. Therefore, the form of the consecration of the wine is inappropriate.

But contrary to this: The Church, instructed by the apostles, uses this form in the consecration of the wine.

I respond: There are two opinions concerning this form:

Some have claimed that what belongs to the substance of this form is only the locution “This is the chalice of my blood,” and not those things that follow. But this seems wrong, because the things that follow are a certain determination of the predicate, viz., the blood of Christ. Hence, they pertain to the integrity of the locution.

And for this reason there are others who make the sounder claim that all the words that follow belong to the substance of the form, up to what follows later, “As often as you do this ...”, which belongs to *the use* of this sacrament and so does not belong to the substance of the form. And hence it is that the priest, in the same rite and manner, i.e., by holding the chalice in his hands, speaks all these words. In Luke 26:20 the words that follow upon the first words are also interposed, when it is said, “This chalice is the new covenant in my blood.”

Therefore, one should reply that all of the aforementioned words belong to the substance of the form, but that (a) what is signified by the first words, “This is the chalice of my blood,” is the conversion itself of the wine into the blood—in the way this was explained above (a. 2) for the form of the consecration of the bread—whereas (b) the words that follow signify the power of the blood that was poured out in the passion, a power which operates in this sacrament. This power is ordered toward three things:

First of all, and principally, it is ordered toward *our attaining an eternal inheritance*—this according to Hebrews 10:19 (“We have the assurance of entering into the holies by the blood of Christ”). And to signify this, it is said “... of the new and eternal covenant.”

Second, it is ordered toward *the justice of grace, which is through faith*—this according to Romans 3:25-26 (“... whom God has set forth as a propitiation in His blood through faith ... so that He Himself is just and He makes just him who has faith in Jesus Christ”). And what is added in this regard is “... the mystery of faith.”

Third, it is ordered toward *removing impediments to the two previous ends, viz., sins*—this according to Hebrews 9:14 (“The blood of Christ will clean our consciences from the works of death,” i.e., from sins). And what is added in this regard is “... which will be poured out for you and for many others for the remission of sins.”

Reply to objection 1: When it is said, “This is the chalice of my blood,” this is a figure of speech, and there are two ways in which it can be understood:

In one way, as an instance of *metonymy*, since the container is being posited for what it contains, so that its sense is, “This is my blood contained in the chalice.” The chalice is alluded to because Christ’s blood is consecrated in this sacrament insofar as it is a drink for the faithful—something that is not implied in the notion of blood—and so this had to be signified by a vessel accommodated to this use.

In a second way, it can be understood as an instance of metaphor, insofar as, by a likeness, what is understood through the chalice is Christ’s passion, which, like a chalice, is inebriating—this according to Lamentations 3:15 (“He has filled me with bitterness, he has inebriated me with wormwood”). Hence, in Matthew 26:39 our Lord calls the passion His chalice when He says, “Let this chalice pass from me,” so that the sense is, “This is the chalice of my passion.” This is alluded to by the blood’s being consecrated separately from the body, since it was through the passion that the blood was separated from the body.

Reply to objection 2: It is because the blood as separately consecrated explicitly represents Christ's passion that it is better that to mention the *effect* of the passion in the consecration of the blood rather than in the consecration of the body, which is the *subject* of the passion—a point that is likewise signified by what our Lord says [about His body], viz., "... which will be given up for you," as if to say, "... which will be subjected to the passion for you."

Reply to objection 3: A covenant or testament (*testamentum*) is an arrangement for an inheritance. Now God has arranged that a heavenly inheritance should be given to men through the power of the blood of Jesus Christ, since, as Hebrews 9:16 says, "Where there is a testament, the death of the testator must intervene."

Now there are two ways in which Christ's blood has been exhibited to men:

First of all, *in prefiguration (in figura)*, which belongs to the old covenant. And that is why, in the same place (Hebrews 9:16), the Apostle concludes, "Hence, neither was the first covenant dedicated without blood." This is clear from the fact that, as Exodus 24:7-8 reports, "After every commandment of the Law had been read aloud by Moses, he sprinkled all the people saying: 'This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord has enjoined upon you'."

Second, Christ's blood has been exhibited *in reality (in rei veritate)*, and this belongs to the new covenant. And this is what the Apostle begins with in the same place (Hebrews 9:15): "The reason why Christ is the mediator of a new covenant is that, with His death interceding, they who have been called to an eternal inheritance receive a new promise." The reason why it is said to be "the blood of the new covenant" is that it is exhibited no longer in a figure, but in reality. Hence, it is added, "... which will be poured out for you."

On the other hand, the interior inspiration proceeds from the power of the blood insofar as we are made just by Christ's passion.

Reply to objection 4: This covenant or testament is *new* by reason of its being exhibited. On the other hand, it is called *eternal* both (a) by reason of God's eternal preordination, and (b) by reason of the eternal inheritance that is arranged by this covenant. Also, the very person of Christ, by whose blood this covenant is arranged, is eternal.

Reply to objection 5: "The mystery" is posited here not, to be sure, in order to exclude the truth of the reality, but in order to exhibit its hiddenness. For the very blood of Christ exists in a hidden way in this sacrament, and Christ's passion was itself prefigured in a hidden way in the old covenant.

Reply to objection 6: The Eucharist is called the sacrament of faith in the sense of being an *object* of faith, since it is held by faith alone that Christ's blood exists in reality in this sacrament. In addition, Christ's passion makes one just through faith.

Now baptism is called the sacrament of faith because it is a sort of *profession* of faith, whereas the Eucharist is, as it were, the figurative and efficacious sacrament of charity.

Reply to objection 7: As has been explained (ad 2), the blood as consecrated separately from the body explicitly represents Christ's passion. And that is why it is in the consecration of the blood, rather than in the consecration of the body, that mention is made of Christ's passion and of its fruits.

Reply to objection 8: The blood of Christ's passion had efficacy not only in the case of the chosen Jews, to whom the blood of the old covenant had been shown, but also in the case of the gentiles; not only in the case of the priests who confect the sacrament or of the others who consume it, but also in the case of those for whom it is offered. And that is why our Lord says pointedly, "... for you Jews and for many," viz., the gentiles—or, alternatively, "... for you who are consuming it and for the many for whom it is offered."

Reply to objection 9: The evangelists did not intend to hand down the sacramental forms, which, as Dionysius explains at the end of *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, had to be kept secret in the primitive Church. They intended, instead, to write the story of Christ. And yet almost all these words can be taken

from different places in the Scriptures. For instance, “This the chalice ...” is found in Luke 22:20 and in 1 Corinthians 11:25. Again, Matthew 26:28 has “This is my blood, belonging to the new covenant, which will be poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.” What is added, viz., “eternal” and, again, “the mystery of faith,” is from that which was handed down from our Lord and which came to the Church through the apostles—this according to 1 Corinthians 11:23 (“I received from the Lord what I have also handed down to you”).

Article 4

Does any created power to effect the consecration exist in the previously discussed words of the forms?

It seems that no created power to effect the consecration exists in the previously discussed words of the forms (*praedictis verbis formarum non insit aliqua vis creata effectiva consecrationis*):

Objection 1: In *De Fide Orthodoxa* 4 Damascene says, “The conversion of the bread into the body of Christ is effected by the power of the Holy Spirit alone.” But the power of the Holy Spirit is an uncreated power. Therefore, this sacrament is not effected by any created power that belongs to the words in question.

Objection 2: As was established in the First Part (*ST* 1, q, 110, a. 4), miraculous works are effected by God’s power alone and not by any created power. But the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in no less a miraculous work than the creation of things or even the formation of Christ’s body in the womb of the virgin, neither of which could have been effected by a created power. Therefore, this sacrament is not consecrated by any created power that belongs to the words that are spoken.

Objection 3: The previously discussed words are not simple entities but are composed of many things; again, they are pronounced successively and not all at once. But as was explained above (q. 75, a. 7), the previously discussed conversion is effected in an instant, and so it has to be effected by a simple power. Therefore, it is not effected by the power of the words in question.

But contrary to this: In *De Sacramentis* Ambrose says, “If such great power exists in the word of the Lord Jesus that what did not exist begins to exist, how much more productive is it for there to be things that did exist and are changed into something else? And so what was bread before the consecration is now the body of Christ after the consecration, because the word of Christ changes a creature.”

I respond: Some have claimed that there is no created power either (a) in the previously discussed words to contribute causally to transubstantiation (*ad transubstantionem faciendam*), or, again, (b) in the other forms belonging to the sacraments, or even in the sacraments themselves, to induce the effects of the sacraments. But, as was explained above (q. 72, a. 1), this claim is contrary to what the saints have said and detracts from the dignity of the sacraments of the New Law.

Hence, since, as was explained above (q. 75, a. 3), this sacrament has more dignity than the others, it follows that in the formal words of this sacrament there exists a certain created power to contribute causally to the conversion that belongs to this sacrament (*quaedam virtus creata ad conversionem huius sacramenti faciendam*). Still, this power is *instrumental*, as with the other sacraments, in the way explained above (q. 62, aa. 3-4). For since these words are uttered in the person of Christ, by His mandate they receive their instrumental power from Christ—in the same way that, as was explained above (48, a. 6 and q.56, a.1, ad 3), the rest of His words and deeds have an instrumental salvific power.

Reply to objection 1: When it is claimed that it is by the power of the Holy Spirit alone that the bread is converted into the body of Christ, this does not exclude the instrumental power that exists in

form of this sacrament—just as, when it is said that the blacksmith alone makes the knife, this does not exclude the power of the hammer.

Reply to objection 2: No creature can perform miraculous works as a *principal* agent, but it can do these things as an *instrumental* agent, in the way that the very touch of Christ's hand healed the leper. And it is in this way that His words convert the bread into the body of Christ.

By contrast, in the case of *the conception of Christ's body* by which Christ's body was formed, it was not possible for something proceeding from Christ's body to have an instrumental power for the formation of that body itself. Likewise, in *creation* there was no terminus in which the instrumental action of a creature could be terminated. Hence, [these last two cases] are not like [the first case].

Reply to objection 3: The previously discussed words, by which the consecration is effected, operate sacramentally. Hence, the power to convert which exists in the forms of these sacraments follows the signification, which is terminated in the utterance of the last word. And so at the last instant of the pronounciation of the words, those words acquire the power in question, though in relation to the preceding words. And this power is simple by reason of what is signified, even though there is* a sort of composition in the words themselves when they are pronounced exteriorly.

Article 5

Are the previously discussed locutions true?

It seems that the previously discussed locutions are not true (*praedictae locutiones non sunt verae*):

Objection 1: When it is said, "This is my body," 'this' points to a substance (*est demonstrativum substantiae*). But according to what was said above (a. 1, and a. 4, ad 3, and q. 75, aa. 2 and 7), when the pronoun 'this' is uttered, the substance of the bread still exists, since the transubstantiation is effected at the end of the utterance of the words. But 'The bread is the body of Christ' is false. Therefore, "This is my body" is likewise false.

Objection 2: The pronoun 'this' points to what is sensed. But the sensory appearances which exist in this sacrament are neither the body of Christ itself nor the accidents of the body of Christ. Therefore, the locution "This is my body" cannot be true.

Objection 3: As was explained above (a. 4, ad 3), it is by their signification that the words in question effect the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ. But an efficient cause is understood as prior to its effect (*causa effectiva praeintelligitur effectui*). Therefore, the signification of these words is understood as prior to the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ. But before the conversion, 'This is my body' is false. Therefore, it should be judged to be false absolutely speaking. And the same argument applies to the locution "This is the chalice of my blood, etc."

But contrary to this: These words are uttered in the person of Christ, who in John 14:16 says of Himself, "I am the truth."

I respond: On this topic there have been many opinions:

Some have claimed that in the locution, "This is my body," the word 'this' involves an act of pointing as something *conceptualized* and not an act of pointing as something *exercised*, since the whole of this locution is being taken *materially* [as something that is quoted] (*tota ista locutio sumiter materialiter*); for the priest recites, "Christ said, 'This is my body'."

But this cannot stand. For according to this claim, the words would not be applied to the corporeal matter that is present, and so the sacrament would not be brought to completion. For in *Super Ioannem* Augustine says, "The word draws close to the element and the sacrament is effected." And because of this, the difficulty posed by our present question is completely sidestepped, since the very same

arguments remain with respect to the first utterance by which Christ pronounced these words. For it is obvious that the words were in that instance being taken as signifying realities and were not being taken materially (*quod non materialiter sed significative sumebantur*). And so one should reply that even when the words are being uttered by a priest, they are being taken to signify realities and are not being taken merely materially (*significative et non tantum materialiter accipiuntur*). Nor is there a problem with the fact that the priest utters the words as a recitation, as if they were being spoken by Christ. For because of Christ's infinite power, just as by contact with His flesh a regenerative power reaches not only those waters which touched Christ, but all waters everywhere on earth through all future ages, so, too, by the fact that these words were uttered by Christ Himself, they acquire the power to consecrate when they are uttered by any priest whatsoever—just as if Christ were pronouncing them at the present time.

And so others have claimed that the word 'this' in the locution "This is my body" points not to what is sensed, but to what is understood, so that its meaning is, "This is my body," i.e., "What is signified by 'this' is my body."

But this claim cannot stand, either. For since in the case of the sacraments what is signified is effected, what can be brought about through this [proposed] form is not that Christ's body exists in this sacrament *in reality*, but only that it exists in this sacrament *as in a sign*—a position that, as was explained above (q. 75, a. 1), is heretical.

And so others have claimed that (a) the word 'this' points to what is sensed, but that (b) this pointing is understood to apply not to the instant of the locution at which this word is uttered, but instead to the last instant of the locution—in the way that when an individual says, "Now I will be silent" (*nunc taceo*), the adverb 'now' points to the instant immediately following the locution; for the sense is, "Immediately after these words have been spoken, I will be silent."

But, once again, this cannot stand. For according to this claim, the sense of the locution in question is "My body is my body"—something that is not *effected by* the locution in question, since it was the case even before the words were uttered. Hence, the locution in question does not signify this, either.

And so one must reply along different lines that, as was explained above (a. 4), the locution in question has the causal power to convert the bread into the body of Christ. And so it is contrasted with other locutions that have the power only to signify and not to effect—in the way that a conception of the practical intellect, which *effects a reality*, is compared with a conception of our theoretical intellect, which is *received from realities*, since, according to the Philosopher, "Spoken words are signs of things that are understood." And so just as a conception of the practical intellect does not presuppose the entity conceived but instead brings it about, so the truth of the locution in question does not presuppose the entity signified but instead effects it. For this is the way in which the word of God is related to the entities made through that word.

However, as has been explained (q. 75, a. 7), the conversion is effected in an instant and not successively. And so it is necessary, to be sure, to understand the locution under discussion with respect to the last instant of the uttering of the words, though not in such a way that (a) it presupposes on the part of the subject that which is the terminus of the conversion, viz., that the body of Christ is the body of Christ, or, again, that (b) it presupposes that which existed before the conversion, viz., the bread. Instead, it presupposes that which is related in common to both of them, viz., whatever in general is contained under these appearances. For these words do not bring it about that the body of Christ is the body of Christ, or that the bread is the body of Christ; instead, they bring it about that what is contained under these appearances, which was previously the bread, is the body of Christ (*quod contentum sub his speciebus, quod prius erat panis, sit corpus Christi*).

And that is why, significantly, our Lord does not say, "This bread is my body," which would accord with the understanding that belongs to the second opinion; nor does He say, "This body of mine is my body," which would accord with the understanding of the third opinion. Instead, He says, in general,

“This is my body”—with no noun added on the part of the subject, but with just the pronoun, which signifies *substance in general without quality*, i.e., without a determinate form.

Reply to objection 1: As has been explained, the word ‘this’ points to *substance*, but without the determination of a proper nature.

Reply to objection 2: The pronoun ‘this’ does not point to the accidents themselves, but to the substance which is contained under the accidents and which was bread at first and is later the body of Christ—which, even though it is not *informed by* these accidents, is nonetheless *contained under* them.

Reply to objection 3: The signification of the locution under discussion is understood as prior to the signified reality *in the order of nature*, in the way that a cause is naturally prior to its effect, but not *in the order of time*, since this particular cause has its effect simultaneously with itself. And this is sufficient for the truth of the locution.

Article 6

Does the form of the consecration of the bread attain its effect before the form of the consecration of the wine is brought to completion?

It seems that the form of the consecration of the bread does not attain its effect until the form of the consecration of the wine is brought to completion (*forma consecrationis panis non consequatur effectum suum quousque perficiatur forma consecrationis vini*):

Objection 1: Just as the body of Christ begins to exist under this sacrament through the consecration of the bread, so His blood begins to exist through the consecration of the wine. Therefore, if the words of the consecration of the bread had their effect before the consecration of the wine, it would follow that in this sacrament the body of Christ begins to exist without blood. But that is absurd.

Objection 2: A single sacrament has a single completion. Hence, even though there are three immersions in baptism, nonetheless, the first immersion does not attain its effect until the third immersion is finished. But as was explained above (q. 73, a. 2), this whole sacrament [of the Eucharist] is a single sacrament. Therefore, the words by which the bread is consecrated do not attain their effect without the sacramental words by which the wine is consecrated.

Objection 3: As has been explained (a. 4, ad 3, and a. 5, obj. 1, and q. 75, aa. 2 and 7), in the very form of the consecration of the bread there are many words, the first of which does not attain the effect unless the last one has been uttered. Therefore, by parity of reasoning, the words by which Christ’s body is consecrated do not have their effect unless the words by which Christ’s blood is consecrated have been uttered.

But contrary to this: Immediately after the words of the consecration of the bread have been uttered, the consecrated host is shown to the people to be adored. But this would not be done if the body of Christ did not exist there, since this would involve idolatry. Therefore, the words of the consecration of* the* bread* attain their effect before the words of the consecration of the wine are uttered.

I respond: Certain ancient doctors claimed that these two forms, viz., the form of the consecration of the bread and the form of the consecration of the wine, wait upon one another in their acting, with the result that the first one does not bring its effect to completion before the second is uttered.

But this claim cannot stand. For as has been explained (a. 5, ad 3), for the truth of the locution “This is my body,” it is required, because of the present-tense verb, that the signified reality be simultaneous in time with the locution’s very act of signifying; otherwise, if the signified reality were expected in the future, then a future-tense verb, and not a present-tense verb, would be used. But the signification of this locution is brought to completion as soon as the utterance of these words has been

completed. And so it has to be the case that the signified reality, which is the effect of this sacrament, exists immediately; otherwise, the locution would not be true.

The position in question is also contrary to the Church's rite, since the Church adores the body of Christ immediately after the utterance of the words.

Hence, one should reply that the first form does not wait upon the second form in its acting, but instead has its effect immediately.

Reply to objection 1: It is by this argument that those who posited the position discussed above seem to have been deceived. Hence, one should understand that once the consecration of the bread has been carried out, Christ's body exists there by the power of the sacrament and His blood exists there by a real concomitance, whereas, conversely, later, after the consecration of the wine, Christ's blood exists there by the power of the sacrament and Christ's body exists there by a real concomitance. The result, as was explained above (q. 76, a. 2), is that the whole Christ exists under both sets of appearances.

Reply to objection 2: As was explained above (q. 73, a. 2), this sacrament is one in its completeness (*unum perfectione*), viz., insofar as it is composed of two things—more specifically, food and drink—each of which has its own completeness in its own right.

By contrast, the three immersions that belong to baptism are ordered toward a single non-composite effect (*ordinatur ad unum simplicem effectum*). Hence, the two cases are not similar.

Reply to objection 3: The different words that exist in the form of the consecration of the bread constitute the truth of a single locution, whereas the words of the two different forms do not. And so the cases are not similar.