

QUESTION 79

The Effects of This Sacrament

Next we have to consider the effects of this sacrament. And on this topic there are eight questions: (1) Does this sacrament confer grace? (2) Is the attainment of glory an effect of this sacrament? (3) Is the remission of mortal sin an effect of this sacrament? (4) Is venial sin remitted through this sacrament? (5) Is the entire punishment for sin remitted through this sacrament? (6) Does this sacrament preserve a man from future sins? (7) Does this sacrament benefit others besides those who consume it? (8) Is the effect of this sacrament impeded by venial sin?

Article 1

Is grace conferred through this sacrament?

It seems that grace is not conferred through this sacrament (*per hoc sacramentum non conferatur gratia*):

Objection 1: This sacrament is spiritual nourishment. But nourishment is given only to the living. Therefore, since the spiritual life comes through grace, this sacrament is fitting only for someone who already has grace. Therefore, it is not the case that grace is conferred in this sacrament as something that is had for the first time. Similarly, neither is grace conferred to increase grace, since, as has been explained (q. 65, a.1 and q. 72, a. 1), spiritual increase belongs to the sacrament of confirmation. Therefore, grace is not conferred through this sacrament.

Objection 2: This sacrament is received as a sort of spiritual restoration (*ut quaedam spiritualis refectio*). But spiritual restoration seems to have more to do with the *use* of grace than with the *reception* of grace. Therefore, it seems that grace is not conferred through this sacrament.

Objection 3: As was explained above (q. 74, a. 1), in this sacrament the body of Christ is offered for the health of our body, whereas His blood is offered for the health of our soul. But as was established in the Second Part (*ST* 1-2, q. 110, a. 4), it is the soul that is the subject of grace and not the body. Therefore, at the very least, grace is not conferred on our body through this sacrament.

But contrary to this: In John 6:52 our Lord says, “The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.” But spiritual life comes through grace. Therefore, grace is conferred through this sacrament.

I respond: The effect of this sacrament should be thought of, first of all and principally, on the basis of *what is contained in this sacrament*, i. e., Christ. Just as, coming visibly into the world, He conferred grace on the world—this according John 1:17 (“... grace and truth came through Jesus Christ”)—so, coming to a man sacramentally, He effects the life of grace—this according to John 6:58 (“... he who eats me, lives because of me”). Hence, Cyril says, “God’s life-giving Word, uniting Himself to His own flesh, made that flesh life-giving. Therefore, it was fitting for Him to be united to bodies through His sacred flesh and precious blood, which we receive in a life-giving blessing in the bread and wine.”

Second, the effect of this sacrament is thought of on the basis of *what is re-presented by this sacrament*, i.e., as was explained above (q. 74, a. 1, and q. 76, a. 2, ad 1), the passion of Christ. And so the effect that the passion of Christ brought about in the world, this sacrament brings about in a man. Hence, in commenting on John 19:34 (“... immediately there came out blood and water”), Chrysostom says, “Since the sacred mysteries take their beginning from this, when you draw near to the awe-inspiring chalice, approach it as if you were going to drink from Christ’s very side.” Thus, in Matthew 26:28 our Lord Himself says, “This is my blood, which will be poured out for you for the remission of sins.”

Third, the effect of this sacrament is thought of on the basis of *the way in which this sacrament is passed on to us*, viz., it is passed on in the manner of food and drink. And so every effect that food and drink bring about materially with respect to one's bodily life, viz., that they sustain, give growth, restore, and delight, this sacrament brings about all of this with respect to one's spiritual life. Hence, in *De Sacramentis* Ambrose says, "This is the bread of everlasting life that supports the substance of our soul." And in *Supra Ioannem* Chrysostom says, "He presents Himself to us, when we desire it, to touch Him and to eat Him and to embrace Him." And thus in John 6:56 our Lord says, "My flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."

Fourth, the effect of this sacrament is thought of on the basis of *the appearances with which this sacrament is passed on*. Hence, in *Super Ioannem* Augustine says, "Our Lord entrusted His body and blood in things that are reduced to one thing from many; for the one, viz., the bread, is made from many grains, whereas the other, viz., the wine, flows together from many grapes." And so in another place in *Super Ioannem* he exclaims, "O sacrament of piety, O sacrament of unity, O bond of charity!"

And since Christ, along with His passion, is a cause of grace, and since spiritual restoration and charity cannot exist without grace, it is clear from all these premises that this sacrament confers grace.

Reply to objection 1: This sacrament has in its own right the power to confer grace; nor does any individual have grace before receiving this sacrament except as the result of some sort of desire for it, either in his own right as an adult or, as was explained above (q. 73, a. 3), by a desire on the part of the Church in the case of young children. Hence, it is by the efficacy of this power that, also by a desire for grace, an individual receives the grace by which he is spiritually vivified. Therefore, what remains is that when this sacrament itself is consumed in reality, grace is increased and the spiritual life is perfected—yet in a way other than through the sacrament of confirmation, in which grace is increased and perfected in order that an individual might persist against exterior attacks by the enemies of Christ. By contrast, through this sacrament grace is increased and the spiritual life is perfected in order that a man might exist as perfect through his union with God.

Reply to objection 2: This sacrament confers grace spiritually, along with the virtue of charity. Hence, Damascene compares this sacrament to the burning ember that Isaiah saw in Isaiah 6: "For a burning ember is not simple wood, but wood united to fire; so, too, the bread of communion is not simple bread, but bread united with the divine nature." In the same way, in a Pentecost homily Gregory says, "The love of God is not idle, but does great work where it exists." And so through this sacrament, as far as its own power is concerned, the habit of grace and virtue is not only conferred, but put into action—this according to 2 Corinthians 5:14 ("The charity of Christ urges us on"). And the reason why the soul is spiritually restored by the power of this sacrament is that the soul is delighted and in some sense inebriated by the delightfulness of the divine goodness—this according to Canticles 5:1 ("Eat, my friends, and be inebriated, my beloved ones").

Reply to objection 3: Since the sacraments operate according to a likeness through which they signify, it is through a sort of assimilation that one claims that in this sacrament [Christ's] body is offered for the health of our body and His blood is offered for the health of our soul—even though both work for the health of both, since, as has been explained (q. 76, a. 2), the whole Christ exists under both. And even though the body is not the immediate subject of grace, nonetheless, the effect of grace overflows from the soul to the body when we now "present our members to God as weapons of justice," as Romans 6:13 puts it, and in the future our body will receive the incorruption and glory of the soul.

Article 2

Is the attainment of glory an effect of this sacrament?

It seems that the attainment of glory is not an effect of this sacrament (*effectus huius sacramenti non sit adeptio gloriae*):

Objection 1: An effect is proportioned to its cause. But this sacrament is fitting for wayfarers (*competit viatoribus*); that is why it is called ‘viaticum’. Therefore, since wayfarers are not yet capable of glory, it seems that this sacrament cannot be a cause of the attainment of glory.

Objection 2: If a sufficient cause is posited, then the effect is posited. But as is clear from Augustine in *De Civitate Dei* 21, there are many who receive this sacrament and who will never arrive at glory. Therefore, it is not the case that this sacrament is a cause of the attainment of glory.

Objection 3: It is not the case that what is greater is effected by what is lesser, since nothing acts beyond its own species. But it is less to perceive Christ under the appearances of something else, which is what happens in this sacrament, than it is to enjoy Him in His proper appearance, which is what glory involves. Therefore, this sacrament cannot be a cause of the attainment of glory.

But contrary to this: John 6:52 says, “If anyone eats of this bread, he shall live forever.” But eternal life is the life of glory. Therefore, the attainment of glory is an effect of this sacrament.

I respond: What can be thought of in this sacrament are both (a) *that from which (id ex quo)* the effect is had, viz., Christ Himself, who is contained in this sacrament, and His passion, which is re-presented in this sacrament, and (b) *that through which (id per quod)* the effect is had, viz., the use of the sacrament and of its appearances. And with respect to both of these it belongs to this sacrament to be a cause of the attainment of eternal life.

For Christ Himself, through His passion, opened access to eternal life for us—this according to Hebrews 9:15 (“... He is mediator of a new covenant, that, whereas a death has taken place, ... they who have been called may receive eternal life according to a promise”). That is why in the form of this sacrament it is said, “This is the chalice of my blood, the blood of the new and eternal covenant ...”

Similarly, the spiritual restoration that belongs to food, along with the unity signified by the appearances of bread and wine, are indeed had in the present, though imperfectly, whereas they will be had perfectly in the state of glory. Hence, in commenting on John 6:56 (“My flesh is food indeed”), Augustine says, “Even though by means of food and drink men aim at not being hungry or thirsty, the only thing that truly provides them with this is that food and drink which makes those by whom it is consumed immortal and incorruptible in the fellowship of the saints, where there will be full and perfect peace and unity.”

Reply to objection 1: Just as Christ’s passion, in the power of which this sacrament operates, is, to be sure, a sufficient cause of glory—though not in such a way that we are immediately led into glory by it, but instead, as Romans 8:17 puts it, we must first “suffer with Him” in order later “to be glorified with Him”—so, too, this sacrament does not immediately lead us to glory, but instead gives us the *power* to arrive at glory. And that is why it is called ‘viaticum’, as a prefigurement of which we read in 3 Kings 19:8 that Elijah “ate and drank, and he walked in the strength of that food for forty days and forty nights up to the mountain of God, Horeb.”

Reply to objection 2: Just as Christ’s passion does not have its effect in the case of those who are not related to it as they should be, so, too, those who receive this sacrament unworthily do not attain glory through it. Hence, in *Super Ioannem*, commenting on that same passage, Augustine says, “The sacrament is one thing, the power of the sacrament is something else. Many receive [the sacrament] at the altar and, by receiving it, they die. Therefore, eat the heavenly bread spiritually, and bring innocence up

to the altar.” Hence, it is no wonder if those who do not preserve their innocence do not receive the effect of this sacrament.

Reply to objection 3: The fact that Christ is received under the appearances of something else involves the nature of a sacrament, which acts instrumentally. But as is clear from what was said above (q. 77, a. 3, ad3), nothing prevents an instrumental cause from producing a greater effect.

Article 3

Is the remission of mortal sin an effect of this sacrament?

It seems that the remission of mortal sin is an effect of this sacrament (*effectus huius sacramenti sit remissio peccati mortalis*):

Objection 1: In one of the Collects [of the Mass] it says, “May this sacrament be the washing away of crimes (*ablutio scelerum*).” But it is mortal sins that are called crimes. Therefore, mortal sins are washed away through this sacrament.

Objection 2: This sacrament, like baptism, acts in the power of Christ’s passion. But as was explained above (q. 69, a. 1), mortal sins are forgiven through baptism and, therefore, through this sacrament as well—especially given that in the form of this sacrament it is said, “... which will be poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.”

Objection 3: As has been explained (a. 1), grace is conferred through this sacrament. But it is through grace that a man is made just from mortal sins—this according to Romans 3:24 (“... justified freely by His grace”). Therefore, through this sacrament mortal sins are forgiven.

But contrary to this: 1 Corinthians 11:29 says, “He who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment unto himself.” And a Gloss on the same passage says, “The one who eats and drinks unworthily is he who is in sin (*in crimine*) or who behaves irreverently toward [the sacrament], and such an individual eats and drinks judgment, i.e., damnation, unto himself.” Therefore, by the fact that an individual who is in mortal sin receives this sacrament, he adds sin to himself instead of receiving the forgiveness of his sin.

I respond: The power of this sacrament can be thought of in two ways:

In one way, *in its own right* (*secundum se*). And in this way this sacrament has the power to remit any sin whatsoever, and this by the passion of Christ, which is the source and cause of the forgiveness of sins.

In the second way, this power can be thought of *in relation to the one who receives this sacrament*, in regard to whether or not there exists in him an impediment to partaking of this sacrament. Now if any individual has a mortal sin on his conscience (*quicumque habet conscientiam peccati mortalis*), he has within himself an impediment to receiving this sacrament, because this is not fitting for one who receives this sacrament—both because (a) he is not alive spiritually and so should not be receiving spiritual nourishment, which belongs only to the living, and also because (b) as long as he is in the state of mortal sin (*dum est in affectu peccandi mortaliter*), he cannot be united to Christ, which is what is effected by this sacrament. And so, as it says in *Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, “If an individual’s mind is in the state of sin, he is weighed down, rather than purified, by receiving the Eucharist.” Hence, in an individual who receives this sacrament with a mortal sin on his conscience, the sacrament does not effect the forgiveness of his sin.

Still, there are two ways in which this sacrament can effect the remission of [mortal] sin (*potest operari remissionem peccati*): (a) when it is received not in actuality, but in desire, as when an individual is first justified from sin; and (b) even when it is received by an individual who is in mortal sin, but who

does not have a awareness of mortal sin or a disposition toward it; for perhaps he was not sufficiently contrite at first, but approaching now with devotion and reverence, he attains through this sacrament the grace of charity, which brings his contrition and the remission of his sin to completion.

Reply to objection 1: [In the cited Collect] we are praying that this sacrament might be for us a washing away of our crimes, either (a) that it might be the washing away of those crimes of which we are not aware—this according to Psalm 18:13 (“Cleanse me, Lord, from my hidden sins”)—or (b) that our contrition might be brought to perfection for the remission of our crimes; or, again, (c) that we might be given the strength to put up resistance to crimes.

Reply to objection 2: Baptism is a spiritual *generation*, which is a change from spiritual non-*esse* to spiritual *esse*, and it is given in the manner of a washing. And so on both counts, there is nothing inappropriate about an individual approaching baptism with mortal sin on his conscience.

By contrast, through this sacrament a man takes Christ into himself in the manner of spiritual *nourishment*, which is unfitting for one who is dead in his sins. And so the two cases are not similar.

Reply to objection 3: Grace is a sufficient cause of the remission of mortal sin, but it does not actually remit mortal sin except when it is first given to a sinner. But it is not given for the first time in this sacrament. Hence, the argument does not go through.

Article 4

Are venial sins remitted through this sacrament?

It seems that venial sins are not remitted through this sacrament (*per hoc sacramentum non remittantur peccata venialia*):

Objection 1: As Augustine says in *Super Ioannem*, this sacrament is “the sacrament of charity.” But as was established in the Second Part (*ST* 1-2, q. 88, aa. 1-2 and *ST* 2-2 qq. 8 and 10), venial sins are not opposed to charity. Therefore, since a contrary is removed through its contrary, it seems that venial sins are not remitted through this sacrament.

Objection 2: If venial sins were remitted through this sacrament, then for the same reason that one is remitted, they would all be remitted. But it does not seem that they are all remitted, because then it would frequently be the case that an individual is without any venial sin—which is contrary to 1 John 1:8 (“If we say that we do not have sin, we are deceiving ourselves”). Therefore, it is not the case that any venial sin is remitted through this sacrament.

Objection 3: Contraries mutually expel one another. But venial sins do not prohibit one from receiving this sacrament; for in commenting on John 6:50-52 (“... if anyone eats of it, he will not die forever”), Augustine says, “Bring your innocence to the altar, for even if your sins are daily, they do not bring death.” Therefore, venial sins are not taken away through this sacrament.

But contrary to this: Innocent III says, “This sacrament erases venial sin and wards off mortal sin.”

I respond: There are two things that can be thought of in this sacrament: (a) the sacrament itself (*ipsum sacramentum*) and (b) the reality of the sacrament (*res sacramenti*). And on both scores it is apparent that this sacrament has the power to remit venial sins.

For this *sacrament* is consumed under the appearances of food that gives nutrition. Now the nutrition of food is necessary to the body for restoring what is lost daily because of natural heat. But something is lost in us spiritually every day because of the heat of excessive sensory desire (*ex calore concupiscentiae*) through venial sin, which, as was established in the Second Part (*ST* 2-2, q. 24, a. 10 and q. 54, a. 3), diminishes the fervor of charity. And so it is fitting for this sacrament to remit venial sin.

Hence, in *De Sacramentis* Ambrose explains that this daily bread is consumed “as a remedy for daily weakness.”

Moreover, *the reality of this sacrament* is charity, not only as regards the *habit* of charity, but also as regards charity’s *act*, which is stirred up in this sacrament, and it is by means of this that venial sins are dissolved.

Hence, it is clear that venial sins are remitted by the power of this sacrament.

Reply to objection 1: Even if venial sins are not contrary to charity as regards the *habit* of charity, they are nonetheless contrary to charity as regards *the fervor of charity’s act*, which is stirred up by this sacrament. And it is because of this that venial sins are removed.

Reply to objection 2: The quoted passage should not be understood to mean that it is impossible for there to be a man who at some time is without any guilt of venial sin; instead, it should be understood to mean that the saints do not go through their lives without venial sins.

Reply to objection 3: The power of charity, of which this is the sacrament, is greater than the power of venial sins. For by its act charity removes venial sins, and yet venial sins cannot totally impede charity’s act. And the same argument holds for [the power of] this sacrament.

Article 5

Is the whole punishment for sin remitted through this sacrament?

It seems that the whole punishment for sin is remitted through this sacrament (*per hoc sacramentum tota poena peccati remittatur*):

Objection 1: As has been explained (aa. 1-2), through this sacrament a man receives into himself the effect of Christ’s passion, just as through baptism. But through baptism a man receives the remission of his whole punishment by the power of Christ’s passion, which, as is clear from what was said above (q. 69, a. 5), makes sufficient satisfaction for all sins. Therefore, it seems that through this sacrament one’s whole debt of punishment is remitted.

Objection 2: Pope Alexander says, “Nothing among sacrifices can be greater than the body and blood of Christ.” But through the sacrifices of the Old Law a man made satisfaction for his sins; for Leviticus 4-5 says, “If a man sins ... let him offer (this or that) for his sin, and it will be forgiven him.” Therefore, *a fortiori*, this sacrament has the power to remit every punishment.

Objection 3: It is clear that through this sacrament *some* of the debt of punishment is dismissed, and that it is why, to make satisfaction, it is enjoined upon certain individuals to have Masses celebrated for themselves (*quibusdam iniugitur quod pro se faciant Missas celebrare*). But for the same reason that *one* part of an individual’s punishment is dismissed, so too for the *other* part, since Christ’s power, which is contained in this sacrament, is unlimited (*sit infinita*). Therefore, it seems that through this sacrament the *whole* punishment is done away with.

But contrary to this: If that were so, then no other punishment would have to be enjoined upon a man, just as no punishment is enjoined on one who has just been baptized.

I respond: This sacrament is at one and the same time both a sacrifice and a sacrament, but it has the nature of a *sacrifice* insofar as it is offered, whereas it has the nature of a *sacrament* insofar as it is consumed. And so it has the effect of a sacrament in the one who consumes it, whereas it has the effect of a sacrifice in the one who offers it or in those for whom it is offered.

Therefore, if it is thought of as a *sacrament*, it has a *twofold effect*: in one way, *directly* by the power of the sacrament; in the second way, as it were, *by a certain concomitance*—just as it was explained above (q. 76, aa. 1-2) about what is *contained* in the sacrament.

By the power of the *sacrament*, it *directly* has the effect for which it was instituted. For it was instituted not in order to make satisfaction, but in order to nourish individuals spiritually through their union with Christ and with His members, in the way that nourishment is united with the one nourished. But because this unity is effected through charity, and since it is by the fervor of charity that a man receives remission not only of sin but also of punishment, it follows that, as a result, he receives a remission of punishment—not, to be sure, a remission of *all* punishment, but a remission proportionate to his fervor and devotion.

On the other hand, insofar as it is a *sacrifice*, it has the power to make satisfaction (*habitu vim satisfactivum*). But in a case of satisfaction, one pays more attention to the affection of the one making the offering than to the quantity of the offering; hence, in Luke 21:4 our Lord said of the widow who offered the two mites that “she put in more than everyone.” Therefore, even if this offering were by its quantity sufficient to make satisfaction for every punishment, nonetheless, it makes satisfaction for those for whom it is offered, or for those who offer it themselves, in a way proportionate to the quantity of their devotion and not for the whole punishment.

Reply to objection 1: The sacrament of baptism—but not the sacrament of the Eucharist—is directly ordered toward the remission of sin and punishment, because baptism is given to a man who is, as it were, dying with Christ, whereas the Eucharist is given to a man by, as it were, nourishing him and bringing him to perfection through Christ. Hence, the arguments are not parallel.

Reply to objection 2: Those other sacrifices and offerings did not effect the remission of all punishment, either (a) because of the quantity of what was offered, unlike in the case of this sacrifice, or (b) because of the man’s devotion, in light of which it happens even in the present case that less than the whole punishment is taken away.

Reply to objection 3: The fact that a part of the punishment, and not the whole punishment, is taken away through this sacrament happens not because of a defect in Christ’s power but because of a defect in human devotion.

Article 6

Is a man preserved from future sins through this sacrament?

It seems that a man is not preserved from future sins through this sacrament (*per hoc sacramentum non praeservetur homo a peccatis futuris*):

Objection 1: Many who worthily consume this sacrament fall into sin afterwards. That would not happen if this sacrament preserved an individual from future sins. Therefore, it is not the case that preserving an individual from future sins is an effect of this sacrament.

Objection 2: As was explained above (q. 73, a. 3, ad 3 and q. 78, a. 3, ad 6), the Eucharist is the sacrament of charity. But charity does not seem to preserve an individual from future sins, since, as was established in the Second Part (*ST* 2-2, q. 24, a. 11), charity, once had, can be lost through sin. Therefore, it seems that this sacrament does not preserve a man from sin, either.

Objection 3: As is clear from the Apostle in Romans 7:23, the origin of sin in us is “the law of sin, which exists in our members.” But the mitigation of the stimulus to sin (*mitigatio fomitis*), which is what the law of sin is, counts not as an effect of this sacrament, but rather as an effect of baptism. Therefore, preserving an individual from future sins is not an effect of this sacrament.

But contrary to this: In John 6:50 our Lord says, “This is the bread that comes down from heaven, so that if anyone eats of it, he will not die”—and it is clear that He does not mean bodily death. Therefore, He means that this sacrament preserves an individual from spiritual death, which occurs

through sin.

I respond: Sin is a sort of spiritual death of the soul. Hence, an individual is preserved from future sin in the way in which a body is preserved from future death. This occurs in two ways:

In one way, insofar as a man's nature is *strengthened interiorly* against what is corruptive interiorly, and in this sense he is preserved from death by food and medicine.

In a second way, by his being *fortified against exterior attacks*, and in this sense he is preserved by weapons through which his body is fortified.

Now this sacrament preserves an individual from sin in both ways:

For, first of all, by the fact that it *joins a man to Christ through grace*, it strengthens his spiritual life as spiritual food and spiritual medicine—this according to Psalm 103:15 (“Bread strengthens a man's heart”). And in *Super Ioannem* Augustine says, “Approach without fear; it is bread, not poison.”

In the other way, insofar as it is *a sign of Christ's passion*, through which the demons are defeated, given that it repels all the attacks of the demons. Hence, in *Super Ioannem* Chrysostom says, “Like lions breathing fire, so do we depart from that table, having become terrifying to the devil.”

Reply to objection 1: The effect of this sacrament is received in a man according to his condition—in the same way that it happens with any active cause that its effect is received in the matter according to the matter's state of being. But a man in the state of the present life has the condition of being such that his free choice can be bent toward what is good or toward what is bad. Hence, even though this sacrament has in its own right the *power* to preserve an individual from sin, this nonetheless does not remove from him the possibility of sinning.

Reply to objection 2: Likewise, charity in its own right preserves a man from sin—this according to Romans 13:10 (“Love (*dilectio*) of neighbor does no evil”). But because of the mutability of free choice it happens that individuals sin after having possessed charity, just as they do after having received this sacrament.

Reply to objection 3: Even though this sacrament is not directly ordered toward diminishing the stimulus to sin (*non directe ordinetur ad diminutionem fomitis*), it nonetheless does diminish the stimulus to sin as a certain consequence, viz., insofar as any increase of charity is a lessening of excessive sensory desire (*diminutio cupiditatis*).

On the other hand, this sacrament does directly strengthen a man's heart in the good, and the man is thereby also preserved from sin.

Article 7

Does this sacrament benefit anyone other than the one who receives it?

It seems that this sacrament benefits only the one who receives it (*hoc sacramentum non prosit nisi sumenti*):

Objection 1: This sacrament is of the same genus as the other sacraments, since it is co-divided with them. But the other sacraments benefit only those who receive them; for instance, only the individual being baptized receives the effect of baptism. Therefore, neither does this sacrament benefit others besides the one who receives it.

Objection 2: The effect of this sacrament is the attainment of grace and glory, along with the remission of sin, at least venial sin. Therefore, if this sacrament had an effect in individuals other than the ones who receive it, it could happen that someone would acquire glory and grace and the remission of sin without acting or being acted upon in his own right, all because someone else is offering or consuming this sacrament.

Objection 3: When the cause is multiplied, the effect is multiplied. Therefore, if this sacrament benefits individuals different from the ones who are consuming it, it follows that it would benefit an individual more if many* were* to* consume* this sacrament in many hosts consecrated at a single Mass. But this is not a custom of the Church, viz., that many should receive communion for some other individual's salvation.

But contrary to this: In the celebration of this sacrament intercessory prayer is made for many others. But this would be useless this sacrament benefitted others. Therefore, this sacrament does not benefit just those who consume it.

I respond: As was explained above (a. 5), this sacrament is not only a *sacrament*, but also a *sacrifice*. For insofar as what is represented in this sacrament is the passion of Christ, by which Christ offered Himself “as a victim to God,” as Ephesians 5:2 says, it has the nature of a *sacrifice*, whereas insofar as in this sacrament grace is given invisibly under visible appearances, it has the nature of a *sacrament*.

So, then, this sacrament benefits those who consume it in the manner of a *sacrament* and in the manner of a *sacrifice*, since it is offered for the sake of everyone who consumes it. For in the canon of the Mass it says, “... so that all of us, who through this participation at the altar receive the most holy body and blood of your Son, may be filled with every grace and heavenly blessing.”

On the other hand, it benefits others who do not consume the sacrament in the manner of a *sacrifice*, insofar as it is offered for their salvation; hence, again, in the canon of the Mass it says, “Remember, Lord, your servants N. and N. ... for whom we offer you this sacrifice of praise, or who offer it for themselves and all who are dear to them, for the redemption of their souls, in hope of health and well-being ...”

And our Lord expresses both of these when He says in Matthew 26:28, “... which will be poured out for you,” viz., those who are consuming it, “and for many,” viz., others, “for the forgiveness of sins.”

Reply to objection 1: Over and beyond the other sacraments, this sacrament is a sacrifice. And so the line of reasoning is not similar in the two cases.

Reply to objection 2: Just as Christ's passion benefits everyone as regards the remission of sin and the attainment of grace and glory, but has its effect only in those who are joined to Christ's passion through faith and charity, so, too, this sacrifice, which is a memorial of our Lord's passion, has an effect only in those who are joined to this sacrament through faith and charity. Hence, in *Ad Renatum* Augustine says, “Does anyone offer Christ's body except for those who are members of Christ?” And in the canon of the Mass there is no prayer for those who are outside the Church. Nonetheless, they do benefit to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the measure of their devotion.

Reply to objection 3: *Consuming* pertains to the nature of a *sacrament*, whereas *offering* pertains to the nature of a *sacrifice*.

And so from the fact that an individual—or even many individuals—*consumes* Christ's body, no help accrues to others. Similarly, the effect of this sacrament is not multiplied by the fact that a priest consecrates many hosts at a single Mass, since there is just one sacrifice; for there is no more power in many consecrated hosts than in a single one, since nothing other than the total Christ exists under all of them and under one. Hence, it is likewise not the case that if an individual were to consume many consecrated hosts at a single Mass, he would participate in some greater effect of the sacrament.

By contrast, the *offering* of the sacrifice is multiplied where there are many Masses, and in this way the effect of the sacrifice and of the sacrament is multiplied.

Article 8

Is the effect of this sacrament impeded by venial sin?

It seems that the effect of this sacrament is not impeded by venial sin (*per veniale peccatum non impediatur effectus huius sacramenti*):

Objection 1: In commenting on John 6:50-52 (“If anyone eats of it, he will not die ...”), Augustine says, “Eat the heavenly bread spiritually; bring your innocence to the altar; your sins, even if they are daily, are not deadly.” From this it is clear that “daily sins,” which are called venial sins, do not impede spiritual eating. But those who eat spiritually receive the effect of this sacrament. Therefore, venial sins do not impede the effect of this sacrament.

Objection 2: This sacrament is not less powerful than baptism. But as was explained above (q. 69, a. 9-10), the only thing that impedes the effect of baptism is deception (*fictio*), which does not involve venial sins; for as Wisdom 1:5 says, “The Holy Spirit of discipline will flee from the deceitful,” and yet He is not put to flight by venial sins. Therefore, neither do venial sins impede the effect of this sacrament.

Objection 3: Nothing that is removed by the action of a cause can impede the effect of that cause. But venial sins are taken away through this sacrament. Therefore, they do not impede the effect of this sacrament.

But contrary to this: In *De Fide Orthodoxa* 4 Damascene says, “The fire of that desire which is within us, being ignited by the burning coal,”—i.e., by this sacrament—“will burn away our sins and illumine our hearts, so that we might be inflamed and deified by our participation in the divine fire.” But the fire of our desire or love is impeded by venial sins, which, as was established in the Second Part (*ST* 2-2, q. 24, a. 10 and q. 54, a. 3), hold impede the fervor of charity. Therefore, venial sins impede the effect of this sacrament.

I respond: There are two ways in which the venial sins can be understood: in one way, *insofar as they are past*; in a second way, *insofar as they are actually being exercised [in the present]*.

In the first sense, there is no way in which venial sins impede the effect of this sacrament. For it can happen that an individual, after having committed many venial sins, approaches this sacrament devoutly and fully receives the effect of this sacrament.

In the second sense, however, venial sins impede the effect of this sacrament—not totally, but in part. For it has been explained that the effect of this sacrament is not only the attainment of habitual grace or charity, but also an actual restoration of spiritual freshness (*quaedam actualis refectio spiritualis dulcedinis*). This is impeded if an individual approaches this sacrament with a distracted mind because of venial sins (*mente distracta per peccata venialia*). However, it is not the case that the increase of habitual grace or charity is taken away.

Reply to objection 1: An individual who approaches this sacrament with an act of venial sin does, to be sure, eat spiritually, but he does this *habitually* and *not actually*. And so he receives the *habitual* effect of this sacrament, but not the *actual* effect.

Reply to objection 2: Baptism is not ordered toward an *actual* effect, i.e., toward a fervor of charity, in the way that this sacrament is. For baptism is a spiritual regeneration through which one acquires *first* perfection, i.e., a *habit* or *form*, whereas this sacrament is a spiritual eating, which is accompanied by an *actual* delight.

Reply to objection 3: This argument goes through for the case of *past* venial sins, which are removed by this sacrament.