

What could be more marvellous than this sacrament? –

The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist according to St Thomas Aquinas

David Berge^{r1}

1. Why Thomas Aquinas – or: Fog and Light

Both in theory and in the corresponding practical sphere, the matter is clear: there is great uncertainty regarding the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. This uncertainty, which frequently borders on a break with tradition, is essentially due to a lack of clarity—both in substance and in terminology—regarding the formal cause of this presence. Shortly before declaring in 1551, during its 13th session, that, in the Holy Eucharist, 'the true body and true blood of our Lord were present under the species of bread and wine, together with his soul and his divinity' (DH 1651, p. 1415)^{2*}, the Council of Trent taught: 'Through the consecration of the bread and wine, a change takes place whereby the whole substance of the bread is changed into the substance of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood. This change has been rightly and properly called, by the Holy Catholic Church, transubstantiation' (DH 1642)*.

From the very outset of modernist confusion, as in the '*new theology*' of the mid-twentieth century, attempts were made to replace this clear definition of the Council of Trent with new interpretations. Adopting a position remarkably close to that of Martin Luther, they began by rejecting the term 'substance'—which is completely misunderstood by modern philosophy and has become obsolete—and then went on to replace the term '*transubstantiation*', used by the Council of Trent and undoubtedly the key term of the entire doctrine of the Eucharist, with a new concept, supposedly more comprehensible. Thus, terms such as 'transsignification' (P. Schoonenberg), 'transfinalisation' (E. H. Schillebeeckx) or 'transessentiation' (L. Smits) have been proposed. All these terms actually conceal a common approach pursued, in the 1960s, in particular by K. Rahner and Bernhard Welte: the change is relegated to the realm of the subjective; only the character of the sign changes—that which is, for me, subjectively meaningful. Through the celebration

¹ Lecture delivered at the 6th CIEL symposium, in Versailles, on Thursday 9 November 2000.

² French translation: **Les Conciles œcuméniques 2 – Les Décrets**, Le Cerf, Paris 1994, p. 1415

of the communal meal, the bread simply takes on a new meaning for those taking part in the communal meal.³

Since the emergence of these new concepts in Catholic theology, the popes have consistently emphasised that they are incompatible with the dogma of transubstantiation and the Real Presence, solemnly confirmed at Trent. This was made very clear by Pope Pius XII in his truly prophetic encyclical **Humani generis** (1950)⁴, and by Pope Paul VI in the encyclical **Mysterium fidei** (1965)⁵. To realise the extent to which this new interpretation is based on a subversion of the Thomist concept of substance, it is, conversely, necessary to study St Thomas Aquinas very closely in order to fully understand the authentic doctrine of the Church.

And this is not only because, in the Tridentine definitions we have cited, the Church went so far as to reproduce almost verbatim the text of the doctrine as set out by Aquinas. There are also two other particularly important reasons. On this point, let us hear from the popes! As early as the 14th century, Pope Innocent VI wrote:

‘More than anything else, with the exception of the canonical Scriptures, the doctrine of the Angelic Doctor is characterised by such precision of expression and, closely linked to this, by such complete truth in its outcomes and conclusions that those who have followed it have never strayed from the path of truth. On the other hand, those who have attacked it have always been suspected of erring.’⁶ Amidst the mists that largely characterise the theological atmosphere, the doctrine of St Thomas can, generally speaking, act as a powerful ray of sunshine!⁷ But, in the context of our theme, it is particularly fitting to turn to Thomas, who, in his sermon on the Feast of Corpus Christi, poses the question: ‘*Quid hoc Sacramento mirabilius?* – What could be more remarkable than this sacrament?’⁸, a question entirely appropriate to our theme. All the more so since, in his encyclical **Studiorum ducem**, Pius XI states

³ K. Rahner: **Das Geheimnis unseres Christus**, Munich 1959, pp. 12–18; id.: **Schriften zur Theologie**, vol. IV, Einsiedeln 1960, pp. 380–381; B. Welte, in M. Schmaus (ed.): **Aktuelle Fragen zur Eucharistie**, Munich 1960, pp. 190–194. For the new terms, see J. Auer / J. Ratzinger: **Kleine katholische Dogmatik**, vol. VI, Regensburg 1971, pp. 184–186; A. Piolanti: **Il Mistero Eucaristico**, Vatican, 1983, pp. 345–353; B. Gherardini: ‘Eucharistic Theology and Ecumenism’ in: Piolanti: *Il Mistero*, pp. 651–655; R. Masi: ‘La conversione eucaristica nelle teologia odierna’, in: **Divinitas** 2 (1966), pp. 272–315; G. B. Sala: ‘Transsubstantiation oder Transignifikation?’, in: **Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie** 92 (1970), pp. 1–34.

⁴ Cf. D. Berger (ed.): *The Encyclical *Humani Generis* of Pope Pius XII: 1950–2000. History, Doctrine and Relevance of a Prophetic Encyclical*, Cologne 2000.

⁵ AAS 57 (1965), p. 755.

⁶ ‘Sermo de S. Thoma’, quoted from Laurentius a Ponte: *In Cap. 9 Sap. Hom.*, 13.

⁷ See on this subject D. Berger: ‘S. Thoma praesertim magistro... – Reflections on the Relevance of Thomism’ in: *Forum Katholische Theologie* 15 (1999), pp. 180–202.

⁸ *Opusculum* 57 of the Roman edition.

Note: ‘Finally, this saint possessed the exceptional gift of cloaking his scientific discoveries in prayers and liturgical hymns, and, through these harmonies, we also honour him as an incomparable cantor of the Most Holy Sacrament. Throughout the world, the Catholic Church joyfully uses the hymns of Saint Thomas in its liturgy and will always continue to do so, inasmuch as they are the intimate outpourings of a soul in prayer and incomparable expressions of the doctrine inherited from the Apostles concerning the Most Holy Sacrament, which is pre-eminently called the ‘Mystery of Faith’. In view of this, (...), it will doubtless come as no surprise that Thomas was also honoured with the title of ‘Doctor of the Eucharist’.’⁹

2. The general presence of Christ in the worship of his Church ^{e10}

In Thomism, too, Christ occupies a central place in God’s plan of salvation: God, who is the pure act of being, *the ipsum esse subsistens*, the being subsisting in itself (DH 1623), is the beginning and the end of all things, the alpha and the omega of all creation. In creation, which is inseparable from man’s elevation to the state of grace, man, in a circular movement – the most perfect of all movements – proceeds from God and aspires to return to God, the goal of all our actions and all our desires. This return is made objectively possible for man after he has fallen into sin, and it is with an ineradicable yet in itself ineffective longing (*desiderium naturale ex se inefficax*)” that he nevertheless strives towards this return, within the marvellous mystery of the Incarnation of God:

‘This is why, when human nature is united to God through the mystery of the Incarnation, all the streams of natural goods flow back towards their source.’¹² The human nature of Christ, substantially united in a unique manner to the divine nature in the hypostasis of the Logos, is for us the path that leads to the Father.

Through a free and gracious act, and because of the sin of humanity, the divine Person united Himself to human nature. In this hypostatic union, human nature subsists entirely within the person of the Logos – this is the highest union of God and creature, which made it possible for the satisfaction and redemption of sin to be accomplished within that very nature in which sin had originated.

⁹ A. Rohrbasser (ed.): *Heilslehre der Kirche*, Fribourg (Switzerland) 1953, p. 1939.

¹⁰ On this question, see our work: *Thomas von Aquin und die Liturgie*, Editiones thomisticae, 2nd ed., Cologne 2000, pp. 76–89.

¹¹ See **De Trin.* 6,4 ad 5*: ‘For although man is naturally inclined towards the ultimate end, he cannot attain it by nature, but only through grace, and this is due to the pre-eminence of that end.’ On this highly controversial point, see Yves Floucat: **Vocation de l’homme et sagesse chrétienne**, Paris 1989, pp. 246–247.

¹² *Sent. III*, Prol.: ‘And therefore, when human nature was united to God through the mystery of the Incarnation, all the streams of natural goodness flowed back to their source.’

To describe the role of the Assumption of human nature by the eternal Word of the Father, Saint Thomas draws upon the irreplaceable metaphysical doctrine of instrumental causality: the divine nature makes use of the operation of human nature ‘as the operation of its instrument; and, similarly, human nature participates in the operation of the divine nature just as a tool participates in the operation of the principal agent.’¹³ In the same vein, speaking of the deepening of the essence of the liturgy, the Second Vatican Council’s *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* itself emphasises this idea in particular, stating:

‘For it was his humanity, in the unity of the person of the Word, that was the instrument of our salvation’ (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, § 5). This is the deepest reason why it is entirely appropriate that Christian worship should be perceptible to the senses.

Fallen man is incapable of achieving this return to God through his own efforts alone. This return had to be merited and bestowed by God himself. In the context of the theme we are discussing here, this form of merit and mediation—referred to in metaphysics as instrumental causality—finds its culmination in the priesthood of God made man.¹⁴ Mediation between man and God is the proper function of the priest, who transmits what comes from God and presents to God the prayers and repentance of mankind: but the priesthood ‘is most fittingly attributed to Christ, for it is precisely through him that divine gifts are bestowed upon humankind (...) Moreover, he has reconciled the human race with God.’¹⁵

Moreover, given his divine person and nature, Christ is also the one who grants salvation and to whom repentance is offered. This repentance and this inner offering are expressed materially, in a manner perceptible to the senses, in the sacrifice. The primordial model of every sacrifice and, at the same time, the sole source that renders all human offerings meritorious, is the sacrifice of Christ: ‘Thus Christ, as a man, was not only a priest but, at the same time, a perfect offering insofar as he was, at once, a sin offering, a peace offering and a burnt offering.’¹⁶

Just as the sun gives light but is not itself illuminated, and fire gives heat but is not itself heated, so the priesthood of Christ, eternal in its perfection, is the source of all

¹³ ST IIIa, q. 19, a. 1, resp.: ‘(...) the divine nature makes use of the operation of human nature as of the operation of its own instrument; and similarly, human nature participates in the operation of the divine nature, just as an instrument participates in the operation of the principal agent.’

¹⁴ Cf. S. Th. Bonino: ‘Saint Thomas and the Priesthood’ in: *Proceedings of the symposium organised by the Institut Saint-Thomas-d’Aquin on 5 and 6 June in Toulouse* (= RTh 1-1999), Toulouse 1999.

¹⁵ ST IIIa, q. 22, a.1: “This, however, applies most of all to Christ. For through him gifts have been bestowed upon mankind (...) He himself also reconciled the human race to God (...) Hence it is most fitting for Christ to be a priest.”

¹⁶ ST IIIa, q. 22, a.2: ‘And therefore Christ himself, insofar as he was a man, was not only a priest, but also the perfect sacrifice, being at once a sacrifice for sin, a sacrifice of peace, and a burnt offering.’

priesthood; and his sacrifice, which, once offered, need never be repeated – for its immeasurable efficacy endures for ever – is the archetype of all other sacrifices. The whole liturgy of the Church is thus a participation in the liturgy of the mysteries of Jesus' life; it acts solely by virtue of them.

The value and duration of Christ's sacrifice and priesthood are eternal; they encompass all times and all places.¹⁷ Although the salvific acts once performed by Christ—the '*actiones et passionis Christi*' (ST IIIa, q. 48, a.6), were performed physically and therefore cannot be repeated owing to their unique nature, they nonetheless continue to be effective, in the fullness of their physical essence, in a mysterious and remarkable way.¹⁸ In the worship of his Church, Christ himself, the eternal High Priest and Head of his Mystical Body, continues the divine worship and atonement which reached their culmination in the sacrifice of the Cross and made his entire life a divine worship: '*Totus autem ritus christianae religionis derivatur a sacerdotio Christi* – The whole Christian rite derives from the priesthood of Christ' (ST IIIa, q. 63, a.3). Pope Pius XII's encyclical **Mediator Dei** accords a central place to this idea: "The priesthood of Jesus Christ lives and acts at all times, throughout the ages, for the sacred liturgy is nothing other than the exercise of this priesthood." This same idea is found in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (§ 7) and in the recent *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (no. 1069): "Through the liturgy, Christ, our Redeemer and High Priest, continues in his Church, with her and through her, the work of our redemption." This is expressed particularly clearly in the celebration of the sacraments, which forms the heart of the liturgy. In this context, it is significant that Thomas, in the *Tertia*, draws a link between the final *quaestio* (q. 59) of his Christology and the first question (q. 60) dealing with the sacraments, saying: 'Having examined the mysteries of the Incarnate Word, we shall now discuss the sacraments of the Church, which derive their efficacy from the Incarnate Word himself'.¹⁹

It is Christ, the Incarnate Word (note the frequent use, in the preceding quotation, of the term *incarnatus*), God made man, who is the true liturge, the primary dispenser of the sacraments, for the priest acts only *in persona Christi*: 'Because he

¹⁷ ST IIIa, q. 56, a.1, ad 3: '(...) quae virtus praesentialiter attingit omnia loca et tempora.'

¹⁸ As for how this is possible, this is a very difficult theological question. Bartholomew of Medina, a scrupulous Thomist and renowned commentator on the *Tertia*, speaks of a '*mysterium reconditae theologiae*' in this regard: '*To explain the manner in which the aforementioned operations and passions of Christ were wrought for our salvation through the mode of efficiency pertains to the mystery of recondita theologiae*' (*In III.*, q. 134, a.2 [Ed. Coloniae 1618, p. 402]). Odo Casel, O.S.B.'s theology of the mysteries ultimately foundered on this mystery – cf. J. Gaillard: 'La théologie des mystères' in: *RTh* 57 (1957), pp. 510–551.

¹⁹ ST IIIa, q. 60, prol.: '*Having considered those matters pertaining to the mysteries of the Incarnate Word, we must now consider the sacraments of the Church, which derive their efficacy from the Incarnate Word himself.*'

It is Christ who, because He is God and because He is man, imparts the inner efficacy of the sacraments; but He does so in different ways. Indeed, insofar as He is God, He acts in the sacraments as their author; insofar as He is man, He acts in the internal effects of the sacraments in a meritorious and efficacious manner, but only as an instrument (...) Just as Christ, as God, has the power of authority in the sacraments, as a man, He has the power of principal minister, or power of excellence.’²⁰ This is expressed in a particularly perfect way in the sacrifice of the Holy Mass. From the point of view of their substance (*quoad substantiam*), the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice of the Cross are numerically identical: they are linked by the same offering, the same chief sacrificial priest and the same end; they differ only in the external form of the oblation (*quoad modum oblationis externae*): formerly in a blood-shedding manner on Golgotha, now in a bloodless manner on our altars.²¹

3. The special presence of Christ in the Eucharist

If the sacraments, and in particular the Eucharist, are to be regarded as the spatio-temporal dimension of the mystery of the Incarnation, it is clearly evident that, viewed objectively (*in intentione*), the sacrament of the Eucharist is the most important of all the sacraments; it is the source from which all the other sacraments flow and the end to which they are all ordered: ‘In itself, the sacrament of the Eucharist is the most important of all the sacraments (...) This is clearly evident, first of all, in the fact that Christ is substantially contained within it (...).’²²

To better understand this essential ‘being contained’, we must first consider the formal cause of this presence: namely, what the Church’s doctrine rightly calls transubstantiation.

²⁰ ST IIIa, q. 64, a.3: ‘(...) that Christ brings about the inner effect of the sacraments, both insofar as He is God and insofar as He is man; in one way and yet in another. For insofar as He is God, He acts in the sacraments by virtue of His authority; but insofar as he is man, he brings about the inner effects of the sacraments meritoriously and effectively, yet instrumentally (...) And therefore, just as Christ, insofar as he is God, possesses the power of authority in the sacraments, so insofar as he is man he possesses the power of the principal ministry, or the power of excellence.’

²¹ Cf. R. Garrigou-Lagrange: **Le sacrifice de la Messe**, Var 1933, p. 4 [on Garrigou-Lagrange, cf. D. Berger: ‘Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange O.P.’, in: **Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon** XVII (2000), pp. 441–442].

²² ST IIIa, q. 65, a.3: ‘(...) to put it simply, the sacrament of the Eucharist is pre-eminent among the other sacramenta. This is evident in three ways: firstly, from what it contains; for in the sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ himself is contained substantially; whereas in the other sacraments, a certain instrumental power derived from Christ is contained (...).’ See also on this point Piolanti: **Il mistero eucaristico**, p. 623: ‘The Second Vatican Council, drawing inspiration from St Thomas, presents, in a concise summary, the doctrine of the centrality of the Eucharist and the convergence of the sacraments (...).’

3.1 Transubstantiation²³

Whilst the new concepts we have mentioned are frequently characterised by misplaced philosophical concerns, the Angelic Doctor, in his **Summa Theologiae** (IIIa, q. 75), deals first and foremost, in his question, with the transformation of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, clearly affirming that this doctrine is a mystery in the strict sense of the term and that it ‘is not learnt through

the senses but by faith alone, which is grounded in the authority of God”.²⁴ The Angelic Doctor Angelic emphasises just as clearly the ‘*Dogma datur*’ which he mentions in his Eucharistic hymns²⁵: ‘*Dogma datur Christianis / Quod in carnem transit panis / Et vinum in sanguinem. / Quod non capis, quod non vides / Animosa firmat fides* – It is a dogma given to Christians that the bread becomes flesh and the wine becomes blood. You cannot see it nor understand it; living faith assures us of it.” (*Lauda Sion* 11–12)²⁶.

On the other hand, this means nothing less than that, as a result, theological reason (*ratio fide illustrata*) is inexorably excluded or suppressed. This is evident in the many practical reasons that Aquinas puts forward in this context to justify what is, in the highest sense, a mystery (*ST* IIIa, q. 75 a.1): whilst the sacrifices of the Old Covenant merely foreshadow Christ, the sacrifice of the New Covenant must be something more: Christ himself is present in it: ‘*Vetustatem novitas / Umbram fugat veritas: / Noctem lux eliminat* – The old gives way to the new, the shadow to reality; night gives way to day’ (*Lauda Sion* 8). This is the idea that underlies the entire Office of the Feast of the Most Holy Sacrament composed by Thomas, with its very particular arrangement of texts drawn from the Old and New Testaments as well as from tradition—a composition artistically arranged and thought out down to the smallest detail.²⁷

²³ On this question, see J. Puig de la Bellacasa: **De transsubstantiatione secundum S. Thomam**, Barcelona 1926; R. Garrigou-Lagrange: **De Eucharistia. Commentarius in Summam theologicam S. Thomae**, Turin–Rome, 1946, pp. 86–128; A. Bertuletti: *La presenza di Cristo nel Sacramento dell’Eucaristia*, Rome 1969, pp. 133–185; A. Piolanti: *Mistero Eucaristico*, pp. 241–250 (an exemplary presentation of the Thomist doctrine of transubstantiation).

²⁴ *ST* IIIa, q. 75 a.1: ‘*That the true body and blood of Christ are present in this sacrament cannot be grasped by the senses or the intellect, but only by faith, which relies on divine authority.*’ In its doctrinal exposition on the sacramental sacrifice, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (no. 1381) has reproduced this passage verbatim.

²⁵ Regarding their authenticity, which is no longer disputed today, see P.-M. Gy: ‘The Office of Corpus Christi and St Thomas Aquinas’ in: *RSPTh* 64 (1980), pp. 491–507; J.-P. Torrell: **Magister Thomas**, Freiburg im Breisgau 1995, pp. 148–154.

²⁶ French translation: J. Feder S.J., in: **Missel quotidien des fidèles**, Mame, Tours 1961.

²⁷ See on this point P. Descourtieux: ‘Theology and Liturgy of the Eucharist in St Thomas Aquinas’ in: *Una Voce Korrespondenz* 8 (1978), pp. 18–23.

Furthermore, this presence is particularly fitting in that God's love for humankind was manifested in the Incarnation. It was necessary for this love to continue and be sustained in its fullness even after the earthly life of God made man, which is indeed the case in the permanent and real presence of Christ himself.

But these are merely reasons for its appropriateness: the fact of Christ's presence is already given in advance to theology by the words of Christ himself (Luke 22:19); theology no longer needs to attempt to prove it. Rather, it is the task of theology to seek to penetrate this great mystery more deeply, to reflect on the precise mode of transubstantiation, and to refute any heresies.

It should be noted here that, from the very first **Quaestio**, Thomas himself refutes the heresy of those who assert 'that the body and blood are present in this sacrament only as a sign'. This is a heresy that must be rejected, for it contradicts the words of Christ. * * '28 Whilst Thomas was specifically targeting Bérenger's symbolism on this point, one cannot fail to see the thoroughly contemporary relevance of what he says! Further on (q. 75, a. 2), Thomas, drawing on profound reflections (q. 75, a. 2), refutes the doctrine of impanation put forward by certain followers of Berengar.²⁹ In fact, this heresy is based on the false idea – also contested, with serious consequences, by the nominalists³⁰ – that there is a spatial movement of Christ, coming from heaven to enter the host. According to this doctrine, Christ would therefore no longer be in heaven but would have spatially passed into the substance of the bread. In this case, there can obviously be no question of transformation in the full sense of the term. In the same vein, the nominalists and Scotists of the 14th and 15th centuries taught a conception of the annihilation³¹ of the substance of the bread and wine, which likewise rendered true transubstantiation (*conversio*)³² impossible—a conception already refuted by Thomas in the third article of his question 75.

²⁸ ST IIIa, q. 75 a.1: 'Some, without due consideration, have posited that the body and blood of Christ to be present in this sacrament only as a sign, which is to be rejected as heretical, since it is contrary to the words of Christ.'

²⁹ Cf. Guitmund of Aversa: **De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in Eucharistia**, PL 149, col. 1427–1512.

³⁰ By rejecting the real distinction between substance and accident, the nominalists came to assert that Christ's presence in the Eucharist implied a spatial identity between the place of the bread and the body, and between the place of the wine and the blood. Luther took up this idea – no doubt from Pierre d'Ailli – and this is how he arrived at the doctrine of consubstantiation, which was condemned by the Council of Trent.

³¹ Piolanti: *Misterio eucaristico*, p. 244: 'For St Thomas, the concept of annihilation excludes that of conversion, and vice versa.'

³² In very general terms, Thomas teaches that God never completely annihilates anything – ST Ia, q. 104, a.4: 'Unde simpliciter dicendum est, quod nihil omnino in nihilum redigetur.'

What all these heretical doctrines fail to recognise is the fact that the conversion taught by dogma takes place in a manner distinct from natural transformations and, more precisely, ‘in a wholly supernatural manner and by the power of God alone’.³³ In the realm of nature, transformations always and exclusively concern form, rather than the thing in its entirety, whose ultimate essence remains unchanged regardless of the transformation.

On the other hand, being *actus purus et infinitus*—an absolutely unlimited reality and the cause of all reality—God can grasp the entire nature of a being and transform it completely. This is precisely the case in the Eucharistic conversion: *in instanti*, in a timeless instant, He converts the entire substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ:

‘This conversion is therefore not a conversion of form but of substance. Nor does it fall within the category of natural motion; rather, it may be called, strictly speaking, “transubstantiation”’.³⁴

One cannot fail to note the fundamental importance here of the Thomist distinction between substance and accident. This is particularly clear in relation to the testimony of the senses, which, after the consecration, still perceive all the properties of the bread and wine. But what the senses perceive are simply the accidents of the bread and wine, which remain without anything to support them; on the other hand, the substance of the bread has been transformed into the substance of the body, and that of the wine into the substance of the blood. Whilst the accidents—the forms of the bread and wine—are perceived by our senses, it is the substance that is, strictly speaking, the object of reason. But supernatural faith guards reason against all error:³⁵ ‘Faith must play its part, for we invisibly consume something visible, hidden under a foreign form. Thanks to faith, the senses, which judge only on the basis of the outward appearance they know, are protected from all deception.’³⁶

This particular association of the accidents of bread and wine with the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ is not only fitting from the point of view of the reception – appropriate to human beings – of this sacrament, but, moreover, it fosters the merits of faith:

³³ ST IIIa, q. 75 a. 4: ‘(...) it is entirely supernatural, brought about by the power of God alone.’

³⁴ ST IIIa, q. 75 a. 4: ‘Unde haec conversio non est formalis, sed substantialis; nec continetur inter species motus naturalis, sed proprio nomine potest dici “transubstantiatio”.’

³⁵ ST IIIa, q. 75 a. 5, ad 2: ‘That in this sacrament there is no deception; for the accidents, which are judged by the senses, are in accordance with the truth of the thing. The intellect, however, whose proper object is substance (...) is preserved from deception by faith.’ ” See also on this point P.-M. Gy: “The Office of Corpus Christi and the Theology of Eucharistic Accidents” in: *RSPHTh* 66 (1982), pp. 81–86.

³⁶ ‘Sermon of Saint Thomas Aquinas on the Feast of Corpus Christi’ (= *Opusc.* 57), in: *Breviarum Romanum*, 5, Matins Reading: ‘*Accidentia autem sine subjecto in eodem subsistunt, ut fides locum habeat, dum visibile invisibiliter sumitur aliena specie occultatum; et sensus a deceptione reddantur immunes, qui de accidentibus judicant sibi notis.*’

‘Visus, tactus, gustus in te fallitur / Sed auditu solo tuto creditur – Sight, touch and taste only deceive us here. But we believe only what we have heard’ (*Adoro te* 2). Already, in his commentary on the Sentences, the *Doctor Communis* asserts that faith is clearly encouraged insofar as this sacrament leads one to give one’s assent ‘not only beyond reason but even contrary to what

one’s senses’.³⁷ And this applies not only to his divinity but also

in relation to his true human nature: *‘In Cruce latebat sola Deitas, / At hic latet simul et humanitas, / Ambo tamen credens atque confitens, / Peto, quod petivit latro poenitens* – On the Cross, only the divinity was hidden, but here humanity too is hidden; yet I believe in both, and I profess them, and I ask for what the repentant thief asked for’ (*ibid.* 3).

The dogma of transubstantiation is, as Aquinas himself points out, very closely and necessarily linked to that of the Real Presence .³⁸ Thus, through what he said about transubstantiation, the Angelic Doctor laid the foundations for a more detailed study of the mode of Christ’s existence in the sacrament of the Altar.

However, before we get to that point, we must first clarify two important issues. We shall first examine whether Saint Thomas can truly be described as the “inventor” of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which the Council of Trent was subsequently to elevate to the status of dogma.³⁹ The answer is clearly ‘no’, for such a claim is false because it is too sweeping. And this incorrect perspective is most likely one of the reasons why, in an anti-Thomist reaction, Luther rejected this dogma, describing it as a ‘human invention’, and why he strayed into the heterodox doctrine of consubstantiation.⁴⁰ From the perspective of the history of theology, Pesch’s assertion is untenable. The term *transsubstantiatio* is firmly established as early as the 11th century in the works of Lanfranc and, in 12th-century theology, among others, in those of Étienne de Tournai, Pierre Comestor and Maître Roland. It had already been definitively ratified by the Magisterium 20 years

before the birth of Aquinas .⁴¹ There can therefore be absolutely no question of a

³⁷ *IV. Sent.* D. 10 q. 1 a. 1: ‘*And the merit of faith lies above all in the fact that many things are believed in this sacrament which are not only beyond reason but also contrary to the senses.*’

³⁸ Cf. V. Cachia: **De natura transsubstantiationis iuxta S. Thomam et Scotum**, Rome 1929, pp. 10–12.

³⁹ To borrow an expression from O. H. Pesch, in: *Thomas von Aquin, Grenze und Größe mittelalterlicher Theologie*, Mainz 1995, p. 44. Regarding Pesch’s interpretation of Thomas in general, cf. D. Berger: *S. Thoma magistro*, p. 192.

⁴⁰ See B. Neunheuser: **Eucharistie in Mittelalter und Neuzeit** (HDg IV/4b), Freiburg im Breisgau 1963, pp. 51–55.

⁴¹ In 1202, by Pope Innocent, in a decretal (DH 782–784); in 1215 by the Fourth Lateran Council (DH 802). For this development, see Neunheuser: **Eucharistie im Mittelalter**, pp. 19–24.

Thomas's 'invention', which Pesch, in a curious anachronism, further describes as 'a thoroughly modernist theory'.⁴² That said, one cannot, of course, dispute that no one before Thomas was able to explain this pre-existing dogma ('*Dogma datur christianis*!') in such a speculative manner as he did, and that the Council of Trent made remarkable use of his lucid explanations.

Secondly, we must refute an objection frequently raised, since around 1950, against the doctrine of transubstantiation, according to which, in the light of modern physics, the concept of substance employed by Aquinas and the Council of Trent is now questionable, if not completely outdated, and should therefore be replaced by other concepts. Fundamentally, this argument holds water only because it is based on a fallacy: the metaphysical concept of substance, which forms the basis of the dogma and

which harmonises remarkably well with *common sense*,⁴³ is entirely independent of the progress of modern physics. The latter rejects the concept of substance in that 'it aims solely to study phenomena, that is to say, the measurable manifestations of nature. Of course, scientific reflection takes place at a completely different level from that of existential philosophy. The approach of physics does not assert that one could not admit a substance at the ontological level.'⁴⁴ Furthermore, one might even say that modern physics has absolutely no genuine concept of substance. Horst Seidl rightly asserts: 'A concept of substance that is reduced to the accidental—in this case, to the quantitative and the qualitative—is not a concept at all.' And he quite rightly concludes that not only are the objections to the concept of substance unfounded, but that, on the contrary, to explain the dogma of transubstantiation and the Real Presence, one absolutely requires the classical concept of substance 'and this in the only possible sense, the traditional sense, with the clear distinction between substance and accident'.⁴⁵

⁴² Pesch: *Thomas*, p. 44.

⁴³ Garrigou-Lagrange: **De Eucharistia**, pp. 116–120; id.: **Le sens commun**, Paris 1922, pp. 91–98; H. Meyer: **Thomas von Aquin**, Paderborn 1961, p. 689: 'Thomas's philosophy is the philosophy of natural reason expressed in philosophical terms.'

⁴⁴ L. Elders: **Die Metaphysik des Thomas d'Aquin**, vol. I, Salzburg 1985, p. 199.

⁴⁵ H. Seidl: 'On the Concept of Substance in the Catholic Doctrine of Transubstantiation', in: *Forum Katholische Theologie* 11 (1995), p. 5.

3.2 *The sacramental mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist*.⁴⁶

The 75th Question of the *Tertia* is followed by a *Quaestio* dealing with the manner in which Christ is present in the sacrament of the Altar. Here again, St Thomas expressly emphasises: 'The mode of being in which Christ is present in this sacrament is entirely supernatural.'⁴⁷ Neither human understanding nor even the intellect of the angels is capable, by its own means, of discovering what divine revelation gives us and what is set forth in the Church's dogma: 'According to the Catholic faith, it is necessary to confess that the whole Christ is present in this sacrament.'⁴⁸ Clearly, this presence is markedly different from the presence of Christ in the entire liturgy of the other sacraments, which we have described previously: 'In the other sacraments, Christ is not, as in this sacrament, truly present. That is why, in the other sacraments, the substance of the matter remains, but not in this sacrament.'⁴⁹

To understand this unique presence properly, Thomas draws, as he did previously in the **Summa contra Gentiles** (IV, chap. 64), on the distinction between **ex vi sacramenti** and **ex naturali concomitantia**—a distinction that will fundamentally shape everything he goes on to say. Christ is present in two ways: 'Firstly, as it were, by the power of the sacrament, and secondly, by natural concomitance. By the power of the sacrament, this means, under the species of this sacrament, that into which the pre-existing substance of the bread and wine is directly transformed [that is to say, the substance of flesh and blood]. By natural concomitance, this means, within this sacrament, that which is truly associated with it and in which the said conversion finds its fulfilment.'⁵⁰ Thus, the human soul of Christ and his divinity are present by real concomitance. However, the hypostatic union has never been interrupted and, since the Resurrection, the real union of the body of Christ with

⁴⁶ On this question, see J. B. Gonet: **Clypeus theologiae thomisticae**, vol. 6, Paris 1867, disp. 5 [on Gonet, see D. Berger: 'Jean-Baptiste Gonet' in: **Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon**, vol. XVII, Hamm 2000, pp. 485–486]; G. Reinhold: **Die Lehre von der örtlichen Gegenwart Christi in der Eucharistie beim hl. Thomas**, Vienna 1893; R. Garrigou-Lagrange: **De Eucharistia**, pp. 129–171; A. de Sutter: 'The Concept of Presence and its Various Applications in St Thomas's *Summa Theologica*' in: **Ephemerides Carmeliticae** 17 (1967), pp. 49–69; Piolanti: **Mistero Eucaristico**, pp. 290–371.

⁴⁷ ST IIIa, q. 76, a. 7: 'The mode of being by which Christ is present in this sacrament is entirely supernatural.'

⁴⁸ ST IIIa, q. 76, a. 1: 'It is absolutely necessary to confess, in accordance with the Catholic faith, that the whole Christ is present in this sacrament.'

⁴⁹ ST IIIa, q. 75, a. 2, ad 2: 'In the other sacraments, Christ himself is not really present, as he is in this sacrament; and therefore, in the other sacraments, the substance of the matter remains, but not in this one.'

⁵⁰ ST IIIa, q. 76, a. 1: 'In one way, as it were, by virtue of the sacrament; in another way, by natural concomitance. By virtue of a certain sacrament, that which the pre-existing substance of bread and wine is directly converted into is present under the species of this sacrament (...) By natural concomitance, however, that which is actually united to it—in which the aforementioned conversion is completed—is present in this sacrament.'

the soul remains truly and for ever: ‘And that is why the body of Christ is present in this sacrament by the power of the sacrament, but the soul of Christ is present there by real concomitance.’⁵¹

Owing to the present state of the risen Christ, in which the blood is not separated from the body, it is not only the body of Christ that is present under the species of bread but, *concomitantly*, also his blood; and, similarly, the body is also present *concomitantly* under the species of wine (IIIa, q. 76, a. 2).⁵² It is on the basis of this doctrine, elevated to the rank of dogma by the Council of Constance (DH 1198) against the Hussites, that it is permitted to receive Communion only under the species of bread: ‘*Caro cibus, sanguis potus: / Manet tamen Christus totus / Sub utraque specie* – The flesh of Christ is food, and his blood a drink; yet in each species Christ remains wholly present’ (*Lauda Sion* 14).

But this distinction also plays a key role in the question of whether Christ is wholly present in every part of the species of bread and wine: in this sacrament, indeed, by real concomitance, the substance of Christ’s body is, *ex vi sacramenti*, the spatial dimension. Christ’s body is therefore substantially present there; yet the nature of the substance is present in every part of the spatial dimension: ‘Thus it appears that the whole of Christ is in every part of the species of bread.’⁵³ In his sermon for the Feast of the Most Holy Sacrament, included in the Roman Breviary as the fifth reading at Matins, the holy Doctor says: ‘He is eaten by the faithful without being harmed; on the contrary, when it is distributed, this sacrament remains intact in each of its parts.’⁵⁴ And he takes up this idea strikingly in the **Lauda Sion**: ‘*Fracto demum sacramento, / Ne vacilles, sed memento, / Tantum esse sub fragmento, / Quantum toto tegitur* – When the Host is broken, do not be troubled, but remember that each fragment contains as much as the whole Host’ (19).

Building on what has just been said, Saint Thomas goes on to say: ‘In this sacrament, the Body of Christ is not present in the manner proper to spatial dimension (...) Indeed, in this sacrament, the Body of Christ is not as though in a place’,⁵⁵ but it is not limited

⁵¹ ST IIIa, q. 76, a. 1: ‘And therefore, in this sacrament, the Body of Christ is present by virtue of the sacrament itself, whilst the soul of Christ is present by real concomitance.’

⁵² Cf. also IV Sent., dist. 10, a.2; 4; *Summa contra Gentiles* IV, chap. 64. *In Johan.* VI, lect. 6; *In I Cor.* 11, lect. 6.

⁵³ ST IIIa, q. 76, a. 3: ‘And therefore it is clear that the whole Christ is present in every particle of the species of bread.’

⁵⁴ ‘It is therefore to be consumed by the faithful, but is in no way broken up; indeed, when the sacrament is divided, the whole remains intact in every particle of the division.’

⁵⁵ ST IIIa, q. 76, a. 5: ‘The Body of Christ is not present in this sacrament in the proper sense of dimensional quantity (...) for the Body of Christ is not present in this sacrament as in a place.’ See also *Summa contra Gentiles* IV, chaps. 63–64.

spatially but through the sacramental species: ‘The place where the Body of Christ is is not empty. Yet neither, strictly speaking, is it filled by the substance of the Body of Christ, which is not locally present there (...) but it is filled by the sacramental species. “ ”’⁵⁶

It therefore also follows that, strictly speaking, Christ is entirely immobile in this sacrament and is moved from one place to another only indirectly, *per accidens*. However, one should not underestimate the relationship between accidents and substance, for it is of paramount importance with regard to the permanence of the Real Presence. Indeed, the Body of Christ ‘remains in this sacrament not only until the following day but also into the future, for as long as the sacramental species endure. If these disappear, the Body of Christ also ceases to be in them, not as though it depended on them, but because its relationship with these species will have ceased.’⁵⁷

Whilst we can see with our eyes the outward forms – the species of bread and wine – the Body and Blood of Christ, like any substance in general, remain invisible. It is only with our glorified bodies, when our eyes are bathed in supernatural light, that we shall be able to see the Body of Christ. The light of faith in which, in adoration, we draw near to him, hidden beneath the veils of the species of bread, is, in a sense, a faint foretaste of this marvellous spectacle: ‘*Jesu, quem velatum nunc adspicio, / Oro, fiat illud, quod tam sitio: / Ut te revelata cernens facie, / Visu sim beatus tuae gloriae* – O Jesus, whom I now behold veiled, I pray, grant my ardent desire: that I may one day have the joy of seeing you face to face in your glory ” (*Adoro te*, 7). Jean-Pierre Torrell has emphasised that this eschatological tension found in Eucharistic doctrine is highly original and that one finds scarcely any equivalent among other 13th-century theologians.⁵⁸

This eschatological qualification also applies to the explanation of what are known as Eucharistic miracles.⁵⁹ ‘In apparitions of this kind, (...) one sees not the proper form of Christ but a form miraculously formed either in the eyes of those who

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, ad 2: ‘That place in which the Body of Christ is present is not empty; nor, however, is it properly filled with the substance of the Body of Christ, which is not there locally (...) but it is filled with the sacramental species.’

⁵⁷ *ST* IIIa, q. 76, a. 7, ad 3: ‘The Body of Christ remains in this sacrament not only for the time being, but also in the future, for as long as the sacramental species remain; when these cease, the Body of Christ ceases to be present under them, not because it depends on them, but because the form of the Body of Christ is removed from those species.’

⁵⁸ Torrell: *Magister Thomas*, p. 154.

⁵⁹ Cf. P. Browe: ‘Die scholastische Theorie der eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder’ in: *Theologische Quartalschrift* 110 (1929), pp. 305–332.

‘contemplate either within the spatial dimensions of the sacrament itself’;⁶⁰ this means, in the latter case, that accidents appear, remaining within the quantity. However, even in the former case, one cannot speak of an illusion because, through such miracles, God wishes to make the dogma of the Real Presence of Christ in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar more explicit.⁶¹

4. The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist and Reason⁶²

In Thomas’s speculative presentation of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Real Presence, one notes the striking prominence given to the remarkable harmonious encounter between mystery and reason, between *fides* and *ratio*. This is particularly evident when the Angelic Doctor discusses the mode of being of the accidents that remain (*ST* IIIa q. 77; *IV Sent. Dist.* 12, q. 1, a. 1; *ScG* IV, ch. 63–3; *Quodl.* 3, a. 1, 9; *In I Cor.* 11, lect. 5).

The real distinction between substance and accident is a fact that *common sense* has no difficulty in perceiving. On the other hand, in the realm of nature, we know of no real separation between the two, since the accident is not autonomous. What appears impossible according to the law of nature is, however, made possible by a special privilege of grace:⁶³ the accidents of bread and wine that remain after consecration and which we perceive are no longer borne by the substances of bread and wine, which, in fact, no longer exist. One might therefore think, at first glance, that they are now borne by the substances of the body and blood of Christ. But this too is impossible: ‘For the substance of the human body cannot in any way be affected by these accidents; and it is equally impossible for the glorious and impassible body of Christ to be modified in such a way as to receive such qualities.’⁶⁴ The only thing that can therefore be said is that the sacramental species, whilst retaining their prior real existence, subsist without a subject to which they are attached. ‘In this sacrament, the

⁶⁰ *ST* IIIa, q. 76, a. 8, ad 2: ‘In such apparitions (...) the proper species of Christ is not seen, but rather a species miraculously formed either in the eyes of those beholding it, or even in the sacramental elements themselves.’

⁶¹ See on this subject Johannes a S. Thoma: **Cursus Philosophicus – Logica**, q. 23, a. 2; Garrigou-Lagrange: **De Eucharistia**, pp. 152–155.

⁶² On this question, see C. R. Billuart: **De mente Ecclesiae catholicae circa accidentia Eucharistiae**, Liège 1715; Diekamp-Jüssen: **Katholische Dogmatik nach den Grundsätzen des heiligen Thomas**, vol. III, Münster 1954, pp. 159–168.

⁶³ *ST* IIIa, q. 77, a.1 ad 1: ‘Nothing prevents something from being ordered according to the common law of nature, whilst its opposite is ordered according to a special privilege of grace.’

⁶⁴ *ST* IIIa, q. 77, a.1: ‘For the substance of the human body cannot in any way be affected by these accidents; nor is it possible that the glorious and impassible body of Christ, as it exists, should be altered so as to receive such qualities.’

Accidents remain without a subject. This can, of course, be achieved by divine power. Indeed, since an effect depends more on the first cause than on the second cause, God, who is the first cause of both substance and accident, can, by his infinite power, sustain an accident in existence even when the substance by which that accident was sustained has been removed, as if it were its own cause. ‘⁶⁵

Indeed, the order of grace rises majestically far above the realm of nature, without, however, eliminating or replacing it. The supernatural distinction between substance and accident can neither be contradicted by logic nor be internally impossible; in reality, the definition of the accident simply includes the necessity of actualised existence within the substance but not that existence itself. However, following supernatural transubstantiation, this natural necessity nonetheless remains ‘⁶⁶.

From all this, a number of other important conclusions can be drawn. Among the accidents, it is quantity—spatial dimension, the first accident of every body—which is directly sustained by God’s omnipotence. All other accidents are found within it, inasmuch as they are its immediate and direct subjects (*ST* IIIa, q. 72, a.2). Furthermore, insofar as they are sustained in their previous state, species retain their previous capacities (*ibid.*, a.3): they can not only alter other bodies but also be themselves subject to *corruption*; if this corruption proceeds to such an extent that the original substance of the bread and wine is itself dissolved, for example if the species of the bread is reduced to dust, the presence of Christ ceases (*ibid.*, a.4).

But such a transformation of the species in no way entails a transformation of the heavenly body of God made man. This is particularly evident when the sacramental form of the host is broken during Holy Mass, which metonymically represents ‘the sacrament of the Lord’s suffering, which was real in the true body of Christ’: ‘But one cannot say that the body of Christ is itself actually broken; firstly, because it is incorruptible and impassible; secondly, because it

⁶⁵ *ST* IIIa, q. 77, a.1: ‘Accidents in this sacrament remain without a subject. Which can be brought about by divine power. For since the effect depends more on the first cause than on the second cause, God, who is the first cause of both substance and accident, can, by His infinite power, preserve accidents in existence even after the substance through which they were preserved in existence—as through their proper cause—has been removed.’ Cf. also *Opusc.* 57: ‘For accidents without a subject continue to exist in the same thing.’

⁶⁶ See P. Sedlmayr: ‘Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von den accidentia sine subjecto remanentia’ in: *Divus Thomas* (F) 3–12 (1934), pp. 315–326.

is contained in its entirety within every part, which is not compatible with that which is broken.’⁶⁷

5. Mystery, joy and adoration

The doctrine of St Thomas, which displays such remarkable unity with that of the Church, is neither, on the one hand, the symbolism of Bérenger nor, on the other, the identification of the Body of Christ with its *figura*; nor does it belong among the heterodox conceptions of our time. This is not a compromise but a higher centre which reflects eternal divine truth just as a crystal-clear high-mountain lake reflects the sun. Here, the timeless presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist ‘takes precedence over our conscience and our intellect’⁶⁸; it possesses a clear, superior value that nothing can shake. With the clear distinction it establishes between substance and accident, the doctrine of transubstantiation—upon which, through a remarkable correlation, the dogma of the Real Presence is founded—not only satisfies logic but, moreover, better than any other conception, preserves the objective and supernatural reality of the mystery and prevents it from being subjectivised or made comprehensible through a materialisation of the divine. The leitmotif of this entire treatise is this: although the substance of the bread is transformed ‘*totally*’ and, strictly speaking, into the Body of Christ (*‘transsubstantiatio conversiva seu proprie dicta’*) and although Christ becomes truly, ‘*totally*’ and permanently present, the Body of Christ nevertheless undergoes no transformati ,⁶⁹

Thomistic speculation boldly and profoundly anticipates reason enlightened by faith, and yet it bows with incomparable humility before the supernatural character of the mystery with which it is confronted in the dogma of the Church. By emphasising that, in the Holy Eucharist, we are dealing with a mystery in the strictest sense of the term, Aquinas opens the doors to his speculative reflection on the dogma; similarly, his theology leads to acts of praise and adoration which adequately express the attitude towards the mystery.

⁶⁷ ST IIIa, q. 77, a. 7: ‘It cannot, however, be said that the true Body of Christ is broken; firstly, because it is incorruptible and impassible. – Secondly, because the whole is present in every part, as has been stated above, which is indeed contrary to the nature of that which is broken (...) Thus, the breaking of this kind is a sacrament of the Lord’s Passion, which took place in the true Body of Christ.’

⁶⁸ Seidl: **Substanzbegriff**, p. 16.

⁶⁹ Cf. Garrigou-Lagrange: **De Eucharistia**, I.

Faced with this inexpressible mystery, this ‘greatest of the miracles wrought by the Christ’⁷⁰ to this ‘*perfectio omnium perfectionum*’⁷¹ he responds with the wonderful hymns of the liturgy of the Feast of the Most Holy Sacrament. These are, in a very special way, the liturgical expression of the gladness and joy that fill the one who humbly contemplates the original mystery of the liturgy: the Holy Eucharist: ‘*Sacris solemniis juncta sint gaudia / Et ex praecordiis sonent praeconia* – On this holy solemnity, let us give voice to our joy, and from the depths of our hearts let us sing hymns of praise’ (*Sacris solemniis* 1). ‘*Quantum potes, tantum aude: / Quia major omni laude, / Nec laudare sufficis* – Sing it as loudly as you can, and do not be afraid: He is beyond all praise, and you will never praise Him enough’ (*Lauda Sion*, 2). ‘*Sit laus plena, sit sonora / Sit jucunda, sit decora / Mentis jubilatio* – May our praise be full, may it be resounding, may it be joyful; and may the songs of our joy be beautiful’ (*ibid.* 5).

It is not only the hymns of the Feast of the Most Holy Sacrament that proclaim this. The prayer with which this great yet humble Doctor ended his life demonstrates it in a striking way. Before receiving the Viaticum, he prayed thus: ‘I receive you as the ransom of my soul, I receive you as viaticum for my pilgrimage; it was out of love for you that I studied, kept vigil and worked; it was for you that I preached and taught; I have never said anything against you; but, if I have done so, it was without realising it, and I do not cling to my opinion; but if I have spoken ill of this sacrament or of other matters, I entrust myself entirely to the correction of the Holy Roman Church, in obedience to which I now leave this life.’⁷²

⁷⁰ *Opusc.* 57: ‘*Miraculorum ab ipso factorum maximum.*’

⁷¹ *IV Sent.* De. 8, q. 1, a.1, sol. 1 ad 1: ‘*The source of Christian life is Christ, and therefore the Eucharist perfects by uniting us to Christ; and therefore this sacrament is the perfection of all perfections, whence all who receive other sacraments are ultimately confirmed by this sacrament.*’

⁷² Guillaume de Tocco: **Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis**, 58: ‘*I take you as the highest prize for the redemption of my soul, I take you as the provision for my pilgrimage; for love of you I have studied, kept watch and laboured; I have preached and taught about you; I have never spoken against you, but if I have said anything, I spoke in ignorance and am not obstinate in my views; yet if I have spoken wrongly about this Sacrament or others, I leave it all to the correction of the Holy Church, in obedience to which I now pass from this life.*’ (Ed. Prümmer, p. 132). On the context of this prayer, see D. Berger: ‘Die letzte Schrift des hl. Thomas von Aquin’ in: *Forum Katholische Theologie* 14 (1998), pp. 221–230.