

QUESTION 83

The Rite of This Sacrament

Next we have to consider the rite of this sacrament. And on this topic there are six questions: (1) Is Christ sacrificed (*immoletur*) in the celebration of this mystery? (2) What about the time of the celebration? (3) What about the place and the other things that belong to the preparation for this celebration? (4) What about the things that are said in the celebration of this mystery? (5) What about the things that are done surrounding the celebration of this mystery? (6) What about mishaps that occur surrounding the celebration of this sacrament?

Article 1

Is Christ sacrificed in the celebration of this sacrament?

It seems that Christ is not sacrificed in the celebration of this sacrament (*in celebratione huius sacramenti Christus non immoletur*):

Objection 1: Hebrews 10:14 says that Christ “by one offering has perfected forever those who are sanctified.” But that offering was His sacrifice or immolation (*fuit eius immolatio*). Therefore, Christ is not sacrificed in the celebration of this sacrament.

Objection 2: Christ’s sacrifice was made on the cross, on which, as Ephesians 5:2 says, “He delivered Himself up as an offering and a sacrifice ... in fragrant odor.” But in the celebration of this mystery Christ is not crucified. Therefore, neither is He sacrificed.

Objection 3: As Augustine explains in *De Trinitate* 4, in Christ’s sacrifice (*in immolatione Christi*) the priest (*sacerdos*) and the victim (*hostia*) are the same. But in the celebration of this sacrament it is not the case that the priest and the victim are the same. Therefore, the celebration of this sacrament is not Christ’s sacrifice.

But contrary to this: In *Liber Sententiarum Prosperi*, Augustine says, “Christ was sacrificed once in His very self, and yet He is sacrificed daily in the sacrament (*semel immolatus est in semetipso, et tamen quotidie immolatur in sacramento*).”

I respond: There are two reasons why the celebration of this sacrament is called the sacrifice of Christ (*Christi immolatio*):

First of all, because, as Augustine says in *Ad Simplicianum*, “Images are often called by the names of those things of which they are images—as when, for instance, looking at a painted panel or wall, we say, ‘That’s Cicero’ or ‘That’s Sallust’.” Now as was explained above (q. 75, a. 2, ad 1 and q. 79, a. 1), the celebration of this sacrament is a sort of representative image of Christ’s passion, which is a true sacrifice (*vera immolatio*). Hence, in *Super Epistolam ad Hebraeos* Ambrose says, “In Christ, a sacrifice capable of giving eternal salvation was offered once and for all. Then what about us? Do we not offer it every day in remembrance of His death?”

Second, as regards the effect of the passion, viz., because through this sacrament we are made participants in the fruits of our Lord’s passion. Hence, in the Secret Prayer [for the ninth Sunday after Pentecost] it says, “As often as the commemoration of this sacrifice (*hostia*) is celebrated, the work of our redemption is being carried out.”

As regards the first point, Christ could have been said to be sacrificed even in the prefigurements of the Old Testament; hence, Apocalypse 13:8 says, “... whose names have not been written in the book of life of the Lamb who has been slain from the foundation of the world.”

But as regards the second point, it is proper to this sacrament that Christ be sacrificed in its celebration.

Reply to objection 1: As Ambrose says in the same place, “There is just one sacrifice (*hostia*)”—viz., the one which Christ offered and which we offer—“and not many sacrifices, because Christ was offered but once, and this sacrifice (*sacrificium*) is a copy (*exemplum*) of that first one. For just as what is offered everywhere is one body and not many bodies, so also it is one sacrifice.”

Reply to objection 2: Just as the celebration of this sacrament is an image representing Christ’s passion, so the altar represents that cross on which Christ was sacrificed with His proper appearance.

Reply to objection 3: For the same reason, the priest likewise bears the image of Christ and, as is clear from what was said above (q. 82, aa. 1 and 3), it is in Christ’s person and power that he pronounces the words of consecration.

Article 2

Is the time of the celebration of this mystery appropriately determined?

It seems that the time of the celebration of this mystery is not appropriately determined (*inconvenienter sit determinatum tempus celebrationis huius mysterii*):

Objection 1: As has been said (a. 1), this sacrament represents our Lord’s passion. But the commemoration of our Lord’s passion takes place once a year in the Church; for in *Super Psalmos* Augustine says, “Is not Christ slain as often as the Passover is celebrated? But yet the anniversary remembrance represents what took place long ago, and so it does not cause us to be moved as if we were seeing our Lord present upon the cross.” Therefore, this sacrament should be celebrated only once a year.

Objection 2: Christ’s passion is commemorated in the Church on the sixth day of the week before Easter (*sexta feria ante Pascha*), but not on the feast of our Lord’s birth (*non in festo natalis*). Therefore, since this sacrament commemorates our Lord’s passion, it seems inappropriate for this sacrament to be celebrated three times on the day of His birth, whereas it is entirely omitted on the Day of Preparation, [i.e., on Good Friday].

Objection 3: In the celebration of this sacrament the Church should imitate Christ’s institution of it. But Christ consecrated this sacrament at an evening hour. Therefore, it seems that it is at such an hour that this sacrament should be celebrated.

Objection 4: As is found in *De Consecratione*, dist. 1, Pope Leo writes to Discorus, Bishop of Alexandria, “It is permissible to celebrate Masses in the first part of the day.” But as was noted above (q. 80, a. 8, ad 5), a day begins at midnight. Therefore, it seems that it is permissible to celebrate Mass [at any time] after midnight.

Objection 5: In the Secret Prayer [for the ninth Sunday after Pentecost] it says, “Grant us, Lord, we beseech you, to frequent these mysteries.” But there will be greater frequency if a priest celebrates the Mass at more hours during the day. Therefore, it seems that a priest should not be prohibited from celebrating the Mass several times a day.

But contrary to this is the custom that the Church observes in accord with the statutes of the Canons.

I respond: As has been explained (a. 1), there is in the celebration of this mystery both a representation of Christ’s passion and a participation in its fruits. And on both scores it is necessary to designate a time that is appropriate for the celebration of this sacrament.

For since we need the fruits of our Lord’s passion daily because of our daily defects, this sacrament is, as a rule, offered every day. Hence, in Luke 11:5 our Lord teaches us to ask, “Give us this day our daily bread,” and in commenting on this in *De Verbis Domini* Augustine says, “If the bread is daily, then why do you eat it once a year, as the Greeks in the East have become used to doing? Receive every day

what will benefit you every day.”

On the other hand, since our Lord’s passion was celebrated from the third hour to the ninth hour, this sacrament is, as a rule, celebrated solemnly in the Church during that part of the day.

Reply to objection 1: In this sacrament Christ’s passion is called to mind insofar as its effect flows to the faithful, whereas on the anniversary of the passion (*tempore passionis*), Christ’s passion is called to mind only insofar it was brought to completion in our head Himself. That, to be sure, occurred once and for all, whereas the faithful receive the fruit of our Lord’s passion every day. And that is why the commemorative anniversary (*commemoratio*) occurs once a year, whereas this [sacrament] takes place every day, both for the sake of its fruit and for the sake of having a perpetual memorial.

Reply to objection 2: When the reality arrives, the figure recedes. But as has been explained, this sacrament is a sort of figure and copy of our Lord’s passion. And so on the day on which our Lord’s passion itself is recalled as it was carried out in reality, the consecration of this sacrament is not celebrated. Yet in order that even on that day the Church might not be without the fruit of the passion that is given to us through this sacrament, the body of Christ, consecrated on the previous day, is reserved to be eaten on that day—not, however, the blood, because of the danger [of spillage], and because, as was explained above (q. 78, a. 3, ad 2) the blood is more especially an image of our Lord’s passion. Nor is it true, as some have claimed, that it is through the dropping of a particle of the body into the wine that the wine is converted into blood. For this conversion cannot be effected in any way other than through a consecration made with the appropriate form of words.

Now on the day of Christ’s nativity more than one Mass is celebrated, and this because of Christ’s triple nativity:

The first of these nativities is *eternal* and, with respect to us, it is hidden. And so one Mass is sung at night, and the Introit of this Mass is: “The Lord said to me, ‘You are my Son, this day I have begotten you’” (Psalm 2:7).

The second nativity is *temporal but spiritual*, and by this nativity Christ “rises up as the morning star in your hearts (*oritur tanquam lucifer in cordibus nostris*),” as 2 Peter 1:19 puts it. And because of this a Mass is sung at dawn, and its Introit is: “The light will shine over us today*.”

The third nativity of Christ is *temporal and corporeal*, insofar as He came forth from the virginal womb clothed in flesh. And for this reason a third Mass is sung in the full light of day, and its Introit says, “A child is born to us”—even though, conversely, one could claim that the eternal nativity in its own right takes place in full light and, because of this, the gospel reading for the third Mass makes mention of the eternal nativity. On the other hand, as regards His corporeal nativity, He was literally born during the night, as a sign that He came into the darkness of our infirmity, and so in the Mass at night the gospel reading talks about Christ’s corporeal birth.

The same holds true for other days on which many of Christ’s gifts are to be recalled or sought after. More than one Mass is celebrated during the day, e.g., one for the feast and another for a fast or for the dead.

Reply to objection 3: As was explained above (q. 73, a. 5), Christ wished to hand this sacrament down to His disciples last of all, in order that it might be impressed more strongly on their hearts. And that is why He consecrated this sacrament and handed it over to his disciples after dinner and at the end of the day. We, however, celebrate it at the hour of our Lord’s passion, viz., (a) on feast days, at the third hour [or Terce], when Christ was ‘crucified’ by the Jews crying out, as described in Mark 15:14, and when the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles; or, on non-feast days, at the sixth hour [or Sext], when He was crucified at the hands of the soldiers, as reported in John 19:14; or, on feastdays, at the ninth hour [or None], when, crying out in a loud voice, he gave up His spirit, as described in Matthew 27:50.

However, the celebration can be delayed, especially when there are holy orders to confer, and principally on Holy Saturday (*in sabbato sancto*), both because of the length of the service and also

because holy orders belong to Sunday, as is laid out in *Decretals*, dist. 25, chap. *Quod a partibus*. Yet Masses can also be celebrated in the first part of the day because of some sort of necessity, as is laid out in *De Consecratione*, dist. 1, chap. *Necesse est*, etc.

Reply to objection 4: As a rule, Mass should be celebrated in the daytime and not at night, because Christ Himself is present in this sacrament and in John 9:4-5 He said, “I must do the works of Him who sent me while it is day. Night is coming, when no one can work. As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.” Yet this should be done in such a way that the beginning of the day is taken not from midnight, or even from sunrise, i.e., from when the *substance* of the sun appears above the horizon, but instead from when the dawn first begins to appear. For the sun is said to be risen insofar as the brightness of its *rays* appears. Thus, (a) Mark 16:1 says that the women “came to the tomb when the sun had just risen”—and yet (b), as John 20:1 relates, they came to the tomb “when it was still dark.” For it is in the way just explained that, in *De Consensus Evangelistarum* Augustine, resolves this tension (*solvit hanc contrarietatem*).

However, as is laid down in *De Consecratione*, dist. 1, chap. *Nocte*, etc., Mass is specially celebrated on the night of Christ’s nativity, because our Lord was born at night. And, similarly, Mass is also celebrated around the beginning of nightfall on Holy Saturday, since our Lord rose from the dead at night, i.e., “when it was still dark,” before the manifest rising of the sun.

Reply to objection 5: As we read in *De Consecratione*, dist. 1, from a decree by Pope Alexander, “It is sufficient for a priest to celebrate one Mass each day, since Christ suffered once and redeemed the whole world, and very happy is he who can worthily celebrate one Mass. Yet there are some who say one Mass for the dead and another Mass of the day, if needs be. But as for those who, for sake of money or for the adulation of seculars, presume to celebrate several Masses a day, I do not think that they escape condemnation.”

Article 3

Is it necessary to celebrate this sacrament in a house and with sacred vessels?

It seems that it is not necessary to celebrate this sacrament in a house and with sacred vessels (*non oporteat hoc sacramentum celebrare in domo et vasis sacris*):

Objection 1: This sacrament represents our Lord’s passion. Yet Christ suffered not in a house, but outside the gates of the city—this according to Hebrews 13:12 (“Jesus, in order that He might sanctify the people by His blood, suffered outside the gates”). Therefore, it seems that this sacrament should be celebrated not in a house, but in the open air (*in divo*).

Objection 2: In the celebration of this sacrament the Church ought to imitate the practice of Christ and the apostles. But the house in which Christ first confected this sacrament was not consecrated; it was instead, as Luke 22:11-12 notes, a certain ordinary dining room prepared by the father of the house. We likewise read in Acts 2:46 that the apostles were “continuing daily with one accord in the temple; and breaking bread in their homes, they took their food with gladness.” Therefore, it is even now not necessary for the houses in which this sacrament is celebrated to be consecrated.

Objection 3: Nothing should be done in vain in the Church, which is governed by the Holy Spirit. But it seems in vain for a consecration to be applied to a church or to an altar, along with other inanimate objects of this sort, which cannot receive grace or spiritual power. Therefore, it is inappropriate for consecrations of this sort to be done in the Church.

Objection 4: Only divine works should be recalled with solemnity—this according to Psalm 91:5 (“I will exult in the works of your hands”). But a church or an altar is consecrated by a human work, in

the same way that a chalice and a minister and other things of this sort are consecrated by a human work. But these latter consecrations are not recalled with a celebration in the Church. Therefore, neither should the consecration of a church or an altar be recalled with solemnity.

Objection 5: The reality should correspond to its prefigurement. But in the Old Testament, which was a prefigurement of the New Testament, an altar was not made of hewn stones; for Exodus 20:24 says, “You shall make an altar out of earth unto me ... and if you make me an altar of stone, you shall not build it out of hewn stones.” Again, Exodus 27:1-2 mandates that the altar be made of “acacia wood,” covered with “brass” or, as Exodus 25 says, with “gold.” Therefore, what is observed in the Church, viz., that the altar is to be made only of stone, seems to be inappropriate.

Objection 6: The chalice, along with the paten, represents Christ’s sepulcher, which, as the gospels tell us, was hewn in a rock (*in petra*). Therefore, the chalice should be made of rock and not only of silver or gold or, again, tin.

Objection 7: Just as gold is the most precious among the materials for vessels, so cloths of silk are the most precious among cloths. Therefore, just as the chalice is made of gold, so the altar cloths ought to be made of silk and not of linen cloth.

Objection 8: The dispensing and ordering of the sacraments belongs to the ministers of the Church, in the same way that the dispensing of temporal things is subject to the ordering of secular rulers; hence, in 1 Corinthians 4:1 the Apostle says, “Let a man so account us as ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God.” But if anything having to do with the dispensing of temporal things is done in a way that conflicts with the ordinances of the rulers, it is held to be void. Therefore, if the items mentioned above have been appropriately mandated by the prelates of the Church, then it seems that the* body* of* Christ* cannot be confected without them. And so it seems to follow that Christ’s words are not sufficient for confecting this sacrament. But that is just wrong. Therefore, it does not seem to have been fitting for these things to be mandated with respect to the celebration of this sacrament.

But contrary to this: The things mandated by the Church are ordained by Christ Himself, who in Matthew 18:20 said, “Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.”

I respond: There are two things to consider in what surrounds this sacrament, one of which pertains to *the representation of the acts surrounding our Lord’s passion*, and the other of which pertains to *reverence for this sacrament*, in which Christ is contained in reality and not just figuratively (*secundum veritatem continetur et non solum sicut in figura*).

Hence, consecrations are applied to those things which enter into use in this sacrament, both (a) because of reverence for the sacrament and (b) in order to represent the effect of holiness that proceeds from Christ’s passion—this according to Hebrews 13:12 (“Jesus, in order to sanctify the people through His blood, etc.”).

Reply to objection 1: As a rule, this sacrament should be celebrated in a house, where ‘house’ signifies the Church—this according to 1 Timothy 3:15 (“... in order that you might know how to conduct yourself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God”). For as Augustine says, “Outside of the Church there is no place of true sacrifice.”

Also, it was because the Church was not to be confined within the borders of the Jewish nation, but was to be established throughout the whole world, that Christ’s passion was celebrated not within the city of the Jews, but instead in the open air, so that the whole world might serve as a house for Christ’s passion.

Nevertheless, as *De Consecratione*, dist. 1 says, “If a church building is not available, we permit those who are traveling to celebrate the solemnities of the Mass in the open air, or under a tent, as long as a consecrated table is available there, along with the other sanctified things belonging to the rite.”

Reply to objection 2: Since a house in which this sacrament is celebrated signifies the Church,

just as it is called a church, it is appropriate for it to be consecrated, both (a) in order to represent the sanctification which the Church receives through Christ's passion and also (b) to signify the holiness that is required in those who are to receive this sacrament.

Now the altar signifies Christ Himself, of whom the Apostle says in Hebrews 13:15, "Through Him let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God." Hence, the consecration of the altar signifies Christ's holiness, of which Luke 1:35 says, "The holy one to be born of you will be called the Son of God." Hence, *De Consecratione*, dist. 1 says, "It was found pleasing for altars to be consecrated not only by an anointing with chrism, but also with a priestly blessing."

And that is why, as a rule, it is permissible to celebrate this sacrament only in consecrated houses. Hence, *De Consecratione*, dist. 1 says this: "Let no priest (*presbyter*) presume to celebrate Mass except in places consecrated by the bishop." Also, because of this, since pagans and other non-believers do not belong to the Church, in *De Consecratione*, dist. 1 it says, "It is not permissible to consecrate a church in which the bodies of dead non-believers are buried, but if it seems appropriate to consecrate it, then let it be rebuilt after the corpses have been removed and the walls or beams have been torn down. On the other hand, if this church has been previously consecrated, then even if there were members of the faithful who were buried within it, it is permissible to celebrate Mass in it."

Nevertheless, in a case of necessity, but with the bishop's consent, this sacrament can be celebrated in houses which have not been consecrated or which have been profaned (*in domis non consecratis vel violatis*). Hence we read in the same distinction, canon 12: "We judge that Masses are to be celebrated not just anywhere, but in places consecrated by the bishop or in places where he gives his permission," though not without a portable consecrated altar; hence, in the same distinction we read: "We permit Masses to be celebrated in chapels, with a consecrated table, if the churches have been destroyed or damaged by fire." For because Christ's holiness is the font of all the Church's holiness, in a case of necessity a consecrated altar is sufficient for celebrating this sacrament. This is also why a church is never consecrated without the altar—though sometimes, without the church's being consecrated, one consecrates an altar that contains relics of the saints, "whose lives are hidden with Christ in God" (Colossians 3:3). Hence, in the same distinction we read: "It has pleased us that if there are altars within which no body or relics of a martyr are proven to be hidden, these altars are being replaced, if this is possible, by the bishops who preside over such places."

Reply to objection 3: The church, the altar, and other inanimate things of this sort are consecrated not because they are capable of receiving grace, but because by the consecration they acquire a certain spiritual power through which they are rendered fit for divine worship—so that, more specifically, men receive a certain degree of devotion therefrom, with the result that they are more prepared for divine things, unless this devotion is impeded because of their irreverence. Hence, 2 Maccabees 3:38 says, "There is truly a certain power of God in that place; for He who dwells in the heavens visits and promotes that place." And hence it is that such places are cleansed and exorcized before being consecrated, in order that the power of the enemy might be expelled from them. And churches which have been defiled by the spilling of blood or by semen of any sort are reconciled in the same way, because an operation of the enemy in that place is apparent from the sins committed there. Because of this, we read in the same distinction: "Wherever you find churches of the Arians, consecrate them as Catholic churches without delay by means of devout prayers and works." Hence, too, some claim with high probability that by entering a consecrated church a man obtains the remission of venial sins, just as he does by being sprinkled with holy water; they cite Psalm 84:2-3, which says, "You have blessed your land, O Lord ... you have forgiven the iniquity of your people."

And so, because of the power that is acquired from such a consecration, the consecration of a church is not repeated. Hence, in the same distinction we read from the Council of Nicea, "Consecration should not be applied again to churches that have once been consecrated to God, unless they have been destroyed

by fire or defiled by the spilling of blood or by semen of any kind; for just as an infant who has once been baptized by any sort of priest in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit ought not to be baptized again, so neither should a place dedicated to God be consecrated again, except because of the causes that we named above—provided that those who [originally] consecrated it adhered to faith in the Holy Trinity.” Otherwise, [there would be no consecration, since] those outside the Church cannot consecrate. But as we read in the same distinction, “Let churches or altars be consecrated if there is uncertainty about whether or not they have already been consecrated.”

Reply to objection 4: The reason why it is more appropriate for the consecration of a church or an altar to be recalled with solemnity is that the consecration of an altar represents the holiness of Christ, whereas the consecration of a house represents the holiness of the whole Church. Also, the reason why the solemnity of the dedication is carried on for eight days is to signify the blessed resurrection of Christ and of the members of the Church. Nor is the consecration of a church or of an altar a human work alone, since it has a spiritual power. Thus in the same distinction of *De Consecratione*, canon 17, it says, “The solemnities of the dedication of churches are to be celebrated solemnly each year. You will find the reason why these anniversaries are to be celebrated for eight days in 3 Kings, once you have read through the dedication of the temple in chapter 8.”

Reply to objection 5: As we read in *De Consecratione*, dist. 1, “Altars, if not made of stone, are not to be consecrated with the anointing of chrism.” This fits in with the signification of this sacrament, both because (a) the altar signifies Christ—this according to 1 Corinthians 10:3 (“But the rock was Christ”)—and also because (b) Christ’s body was laid in a stone sepulcher. It also fits in with its use in the sacrament. For stone is solid and can easily be found anywhere—something that was not necessary in the Old Law, when an altar was made in just one place.

Now as for the commandment to make the altar out of earth or out of unhewn stones, this commandment was given in order to eliminate idolatry.

Reply to objection 6: As the same distinction, chap. *Vasa*, says, “At one time the priests used wood chalices and not gold chalices, whereas Pope Zephyrinus decided that Masses should be celebrated with glass patens, and later on Pope Urban made everything silver. Afterwards it was decided in canon 45 that “the Lord’s chalice, along with the paten, should be made either of gold or of silver, or at least that a tin chalice should be available. However, the chalice was not to be made of brass or of copper, because the power of the wine produces rust and, in like manner, vomiting. But no one is to presume to sing the Mass with a chalice of wood or of glass,” viz., because wood is porous and the consecrated blood would remain behind in it, whereas glass is brittle and the danger of its breaking could be a threat. And the same thing holds for stone. And so out of reverence for the sacrament, it was decreed that the chalice should be made of the materials noted above.

Reply to objection 7: Where it could be done without danger, the Church mandated for this sacrament what more expressively represents Christ’s passion. Now there is not as much danger with respect to the body [of Christ], which is placed on the corporal, as there is with respect to the blood, which is contained in the chalice. And so, even though the chalice is not to be made of stone, the corporal is nonetheless to be made of linen, since Christ’s body was wrapped in linen. Hence, in the same distinction we read in a letter by Pope Sylvester, “On the advice of everyone, we have decided that no one should presume to celebrate the sacrifice of the altar on silk or dyed cloth; instead, celebrate the sacrifice of the altar on pure linen consecrated by the bishop, just as Christ’s body was buried in a clean linen shroud.” Also, a linen cloth is fit to signify purity of conscience because of its cleanness and to signify Christ’s passion because of the multifaceted labor with which it is prepared.

Reply to objection 8: The dispensing of the sacraments belongs to the ministers of the Church, but their consecration is from God Himself. And so the ministers of the Church have something to decide not concerning the form of the consecration, but concerning the use of the sacrament and the manner of

celebrating it. And so if a priest pronounces the form of the consecration over the appropriate matter with the intention of consecrating it and without any of the things mentioned above—viz., the consecrated house and altar, chalice and corporal, and the rest of the things instituted by the Church—he does, to be sure, consecrate in reality the body of Christ, but he commits a serious sin by not observing the rite of the Church.

Article 4

Are the things that are said surrounding this sacrament appropriately ordered?

It seems that the things that are said surrounding this sacrament are not appropriately ordered (*inconvenienter ordinentur ea quae circa hoc sacramentum dicuntur*):

Objection 1: As Ambrose explains in *De Sacramento*, this sacrament is consecrated with the words of Christ. Therefore, no words other than the words of Christ should be uttered in this sacrament.

Objection 2: The words and deeds of Christ are made known to in the gospels. But some of the things said surrounding the consecration of this sacrament are not posited in the gospels. For instance, we do not read in the gospel that Christ raised His eyes to heaven in the institution of this sacrament; similarly, in the gospels it is said, “Take and eat (*comedite*),” but “all of you” is not posited, even though in the celebration of this sacrament it is said, “with His eyes raised to heaven” and, again, “Take and eat (*manducate*) of this, all of you.” Therefore, it is inappropriate to utter words of this sort in the celebration of this sacrament.

Objection 3: All the other sacraments are ordered toward the salvation of all the faithful. But in the celebration of the other sacraments no general prayer is made for the salvation of all the faithful and of the dead. Therefore, it is inappropriate for such a prayer to be made in this sacrament.

Objection 4: Baptism is specifically called the sacrament of faith. Therefore, those things that involve instruction in the Faith, such as apostolic and evangelical doctrine, ought to be given in the context of baptism (*circa baptismum*) rather than in the context of this sacrament.

Objection 5: The devotion of the faithful is required in every sacrament. Therefore, it should not be the case that in this sacrament, more than in the others, the devotion of the faithful is stirred up by the praise of God and by admonitions—as, for instance, when it is said, “Lift up your hearts.”

Objection 6: As has been explained (q. 82, a. 1), the minister of this sacrament is a priest. Therefore, all the things that are said in this sacrament should be said by the priest—and not some by the ministers and others by the choir.

Objection 7: The divine power effects this sacrament with certitude. Therefore, it is superfluous for the priest to pray for the completion of this sacrament when he says, “Be pleased, O God, to bless, acknowledge, and approve this offering in every respect” (*Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus, etc.*).

Objection 8: The sacrifice of the New Law is much more excellent than the sacrifice of the ancient fathers. Therefore, it is inappropriate for the priest to pray that this sacrifice be treated like the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech.

Objection 9: In the same way that, as was explained above (q. 75, a. 2), the body of Christ does not begin to exist in this sacrament through a change of place, so, too, neither does it cease to exist in this sacrament through a change of place. Therefore, it is inappropriate for the priest to pray, “Command that these gifts be borne by the hands of your holy angel to your altar on high (*Iube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum*).”

But contrary to this: In *De Consecratione*, dist. 1 it says, “James, the brother of the Lord according to the flesh, and Basil, bishop of Caesarea, edited the rite of celebrating the Mass.” And on the

basis of their authority it is clear that every word surrounding [this sacrament] is fitting to utter.

I respond: The reason why this sacrament is carried out with more solemnity than the other sacraments is that the whole mystery of our salvation is included in this sacrament.

And because it is written in Ecclesiasticus 4:17, “Watch your step when you are entering the house of the Lord,” and in Ecclesiasticus 18:23, “Prepare your soul before you pray,” it follows that the celebration of this mystery is preceded *in the first place* by a certain *preparation* for doing worthily the things that follow.

The *first part* of this preparation is the praise of God, which is done in the *Introit*—this according to Psalm 49:23 (“A sacrifice of praise will honor me, and from there is the way by which I will show him the salvation of God”). And this is most often taken from the Psalms, or is at least sung with a Psalm, since, as Dionysius explains in *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, chap. 3, “The Psalms include in the manner of praise everything that is contained in Sacred Scripture.”

The *second part* of the preparation contains a commemoration of our present misery, wherein mercy is asked for by saying, “Lord have mercy (*kyrie eleison*)” three times to the person of the Father, and three times to the person of the Son, when it is said, “Christ have mercy (*Christe eleison*)”, and three times to the person of the Holy Spirit, when it is added, “Lord have mercy (*kyrie eleison*)”—in order to counter the threefold misery of ignorance, guilt, and punishment or, alternatively, to signify that all three persons exist in one another.

The *third part* of the preparation calls to mind the heavenly glory, toward which we tend after the present misery, by saying “Glory to God in the highest (*Gloria in excelsis Deo*).” This is sung on feast days, on which the heavenly glory is called to mind, but it is omitted in the sorrowful services that involve calling to mind our misery.

The *fourth part* of the preparation contains a prayer that the priest makes on behalf of the people, that they might be found worthy of such great mysteries.

What precedes [the celebration of the mystery] *in the second place* is the *instruction of the faithful people*, since, as was established above (q. 78, a. 3, ad 3), this sacrament is “the mystery of faith.” This instruction is done in a coordinated way (*dispositive*) through the teaching of the *prophets and apostles*, which is read in the church by the lectors and subdeacons. After this reading, the *Gradual*, which signifies the progression of life, is sung by the choir, along with the *Alleluia*, which signifies spiritual exultation, or, in mournful services, the *Tract*, which signifies spiritual sighing. These [affections] should follow in the people from the aforementioned teaching. Next, the people are instructed perfectly by the teaching of Christ contained in the *Gospel*, and this is read by the higher ministers, viz., by the deacons. And since we have faith in Christ as the divine Truth—this according to John 8:46 (“If I speak the truth to you, why do you not believe me?”)—after the Gospel is read, the *Creed of the Faith* is sung, in which the people show that they assent through faith to the teaching of Christ. Now this creed is sung on feast days of which there is some mention in this creed, e.g., on feasts of Christ and of the Blessed Virgin and of the apostles, who laid the foundations of this Faith, and on other feasts of this sort.

With the people having been prepared and instructed in this way, [the priest] proceeds to the *celebration of the mystery*, which is both offered as a sacrifice and also consecrated and consumed as a sacrament. For first an *offering* is made; second, the *consecration* of the matter that has been offered; third, the *receiving* of what has been consecrated.

As regards the *offering*, two things are done, viz., (a) the people’s praise, in the *Offertory chant*, which signifies the joy of those making the offering, and (b) the [*Secret*] *Prayer* of the priest, who asks that the people’s offering be acceptable to God. Hence, in 1 Paralipomenon 29:17 David said, “In the simplicity of my heart, I have ... offered all these things, and I have seen with great joy that your people who are here present are offering you their gifts.” And afterwards (29:18) he prays, saying “Lord God, preserve this desire.” Then, leading up to the consecration, which is effected by a supernatural power, the

people are first stirred to devotion in the *Preface*, and thus they are advised, “Lift up you hearts to the Lord” (*Sursum corda ad Dominum*). And after the Preface is finished, the people, along with the angels (Isaiah 6:3), devoutly praise the *divinity* of Christ, saying, “Holy, Holy, Holy (*Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*),” and, again, along with the little children (Matthew 21:9), they praise His *humanity*, saying, “Blessed is He who comes [in the name of the Lord] (*Benedictus qui venit [in nomine Domini]*).” Then the priest remembers silently (*secreto*), first of all, those for whom this sacrifice is being offered, viz., for the universal Church and for those “set in high places” (1 Timothy 2:2), and specifically for those “who are making this offering or those for whom it is being offered.” Second, the priest commemorates the saints, whose patronage he implores for all those mentioned above, saying, “In communion with those whose memory we venerate, etc.” Third, he concludes his petition by saying, “Therefore, Lord, we pray, graciously accept this oblation, etc.”—in order that the oblation might be salvific for those on whose behalf it is being offered.

Next, the priest comes to the *Consecration* itself. Here he first asks for the effect of the consecration when he says, “Humbly we pray to you, O God, be pleased to make this offering, etc. (*Quam oblationem tuam, etc.*)” Second, he effects the consecration with our Savior’s words, when he says: “Who the day before, etc. (*Qui pridie, etc.*)” Third, he excuses his own presumption by appealing to the fact that he is obeying Christ’s command, saying, “Therefore, calling to mind, etc. (*Unde et memores, etc.*)” Fourth, he asks that the sacrifice now accomplished may find favor with God, when he says, “Be pleased to look upon these offerings, etc. (*Supra quae propitio, etc.*)” Fifth, he asks for the effect of this sacrifice and sacrament, first, for the very ones who are consuming it, saying, “We humbly beseech you (*Supplices te rogamus*),” and then for the dead, who can no longer receive it, saying: “Be likewise mindful, O Lord, etc. (*Momento etiam, Domine, etc.*),” and, third, for the priests themselves who are making the offering, saying, “To us sinners, also, etc. (*nobis quoque peccatoribus, etc.*).”

Next, the priest moves to the receiving of the sacrament. And, first of all, the people are made ready to receive: First, by the prayer common to all the people, which is the *Lord’s Prayer*, in which we ask to be given “our daily bread,” and also by a private prayer, which the priest in particular offers for the people when he says, “Deliver us, we pray, O Lord (*libera nos, quaesumus, Domine*).” Second, the people are prepared by the *Pax*, which is given by saying, “Lamb of God (*Agnus Dei*),” since, as was explained above (q. 67, a. 2 and q. 73, a. 3, ad 3 and a.4 and q. 79, a. 1), this is the sacrament of unity and peace. Now in Masses for the dead, in which this sacrifice is offered not for present peace, but for the dead to rest in peace, the *Pax* is omitted. Then there follows the reception of the sacrament, first by the priest receiving and then by his giving the sacrament to the others; for as Dionysius explains in *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, chap. 3, “He who gives divine things to others ought first to be a participant himself.” Lastly, the whole celebration of the Mass ends with an act of thanksgiving, with the people exulting over their consuming of the mystery, which is signified by the *Postcommunion Chant*, and with the priest offering the *Thanksgiving Prayer*—just as Christ, after the supper had been celebrated with His disciples, “recited a hymn” (Matthew 26:30).

Reply to objection 1: The consecration is confected with just the words of Christ. But, as has been explained, it was necessary to add other words in order to prepare the people who are consuming [the sacrament].

Reply to objection 2: As John 21:25 explains, there are many things said or done by our Lord which the evangelists have not written down. Among these things were that our Lord raised His eyes to heaven at the supper, and yet the Church has received this from the tradition of the Apostles. For it seems reasonable that He who raised His eyes to the Father in the resuscitation of Lazarus, as is reported in John 11:41, and in the prayer that He made for the disciples in John 17:1, would all the more do this in the institution of this sacrament, which is a more important matter.

As for the fact that, [just before the consecration], *manducate* [eat by chewing] is used, and not

comedite [eat in general], does not change the meaning. Nor does it matter much which one is used, especially because the words in question are not part of the form [of the sacrament]. This was discussed above (q. 78, a. 1, ad 2 and ad 4).

Again, what is added, viz., “all of you,” is understood in the words of the gospel, even though it is not expressed; for in John 6:54 Christ Himself said, “Unless you [all] eat (*manducaveritis*) the flesh of the Son of Man, you will not have life in you.”

Reply to objection 3: The Eucharist is the sacrament of complete ecclesiastical unity. And that is why mention should be made in this sacrament, more than in the others, of everything that pertains to the salvation of the whole Church.

Reply to objection 4: There are two sorts of instruction:

One sort of instruction is given to those who are being imbued for the first time, viz., catechumens, and this sort of instruction takes place in the context of baptism.

The other sort of instruction is that in which the ones instructed are the faithful people, who receive communion in this mystery; and this sort of instruction takes place in the context of this sacrament. And yet catechumens and non-believers are not driven away from this instruction. Hence, *De Consecratione*, dist. 1 says, “A bishop is not to prohibit anyone—whether gentile or heretic or Jew—from entering a church and hearing the word of God for the duration of the ‘Mass of the Catechumens’”—i.e., the part of the Mass that contains instruction in the Faith.

Reply to objection 5: *Greater* devotion is required in this sacrament than in the other sacraments, because the whole Christ is contained in this sacrament, and, likewise, a *more general* devotion is required, since in this sacrament what is required is the devotion of the whole people for whom the sacrifice is being offered and not only, as in the case of the other sacraments, the devotion of those who are actually receiving the sacrament. And so, as Cyprian says, “The priest, in saying the *Preface*, prepares the minds of the brethren by saying, ‘Lift up your hearts’, and when they answer, ‘We have lifted them up to the Lord’, let the people be reminded that they are not to think of anything other than God.”

Reply to objection 6: As has been said (ad 3 above), in this sacrament the things that are touched upon pertain to the whole Church. And that is why some of the words that pertain to the people are said by the choir, and some among these are done in their entirety by the choir in order to inspire the people, and some are done by the people after the priest initiates them, with the priest acting in the person of God as a sign that such things have come to the people by divine revelation, e.g., the Faith and heavenly glory—and that is why the priest intones the *Creed of the Faith* and the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*.

However, some words, e.g., the teaching of the New and Old Testaments, are read aloud by ministers as a sign that it is through ministers sent by God that this teaching has been announced to the people.

Now some words are recited by the priest alone, viz., those that belong to the proper role of the priest, viz., “... in order that he might offer gifts and prayers for the people” (Hebrews 5:1). However, some of these he says out loud (*publice*), viz., those that pertain to both the priest and the people, e.g., the general prayers, whereas others belong to the priest alone, e.g., the offering and the consecration. And that is why the words that have to be said in this connection are said by the priest silently (*occulte a sacerdote dicuntur*).

In both cases, however, he gets the attention of the people by saying, “The Lord be with you,” and [at the end] waits for them to assent by saying, “Amen.” And so in the case of those things that are said silently, he begins by saying out loud, “The Lord be with you,” and he concludes by saying out loud, “... forever and ever.” Alternatively, some priests say everything silently, in order to mark the fact that in the events surrounding the passion of Christ, the disciples acknowledged Christ only in secret.

Reply to objection 7: The efficacy of the sacramental words can be impeded by the priest’s intention. Nor is it inappropriate for us to ask God for what we know for certain He is going to do, in the

way that, in John 17:1 and 5, Christ prays for own glorification.

Still, it seems that at the place in question the priest is not praying for the consecration *to be accomplished*, but is instead praying that the consecration will *become fruitful* for us; hence, he pointedly says, "... in order that [this offering] might become, *for our sake*, the body and blood [of your beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ]." In addition, the previous words signify the same thing by saying, "Be pleased, O God, with this offering," i.e., according to Augustine, "through which we are blessed," viz., by grace—"acknowledged," i.e., "through which we are written down in heaven"—"ratified," i.e., "through which we are judged to be an inward part of Christ's body"—"made reasonable," i.e., "through which we are stripped of our bestial sensibility"—"made acceptable," i.e., "that we, who are displeasing in ourselves, might through this offering be acceptable to His only Son."

Reply to objection 8: Even though this sacrifice is of itself preferable to all the ancient sacrifices, nonetheless, the sacrifices of the ancients were exceedingly acceptable because of their devotion. Therefore, what the priest is praying for is that this sacrifice might be acceptable to God because of the devotion of those who are offering it, in the same way that those [earlier] sacrifices had been acceptable to God.

Reply to objection 9: The priest is not praying for the sacramental appearances to be carried into heaven, or for the true body of Christ to cease to exist there. Instead, he is making this prayer on behalf of the mystical body, which is signified in this sacrament, viz., that the angel assisting with the divine mysteries might represent the prayers of both the people and the priest to God—this according to Apocalypse 8:4 ("The smoke of the incense with the prayers of the saints went up from the hands of the angel").

Now what is called "God's altar on high" is either the Church Triumphant, which we pray to be borne to, or else God Himself, in whom we pray to participate. For of this altar Exodus 20:26 says, "You shall not go up the steps to my altar"—that is, according to a Gloss, "You shall take no steps toward the Trinity." An alternative is that by 'the angel' we are to understand Christ Himself, who is the "angel of great counsel" (Isaiah 9:6) that unites His mystical body to God the Father and to the Church Triumphant.

Also, it is from this that the Mass derives its name, since it is through the angel that the priest sends (*mittit*) his prayers to God, as the people do through the priest. Or, alternatively, because Christ is the victim sent to us. Hence it is that on feast days the deacon at the end of the Mass gives leave to the people by saying, "*Ite, Missa est*," i.e., the victim (*hostia*) has been sent (*missa est*) to God through the angel, viz., in order to be accepted by God.

Article 5

Are the things done in the celebration of this sacrament fitting?

It seems that the things done in the celebration of this sacrament are not fitting (*ea quae in celebratione huius sacramenti aguntur non sunt convenientia*):

Objection 1: This sacrament belongs to the New Testament, as is apparent from the form of the sacrament. But in the New Testament one should not observe the ceremonies of the Old Testament, which used to involve the priest and the ministers washing themselves with water when they drew near to offer a sacrifice; for instance, in Exodus 30:19-20 we read, "Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and feet when they are about to go in to the altar." Therefore, it is not fitting for the priest to wash his hands during the ritual of the Mass.

Objection 2: In the same place the Lord commanded Aaron to "burn sweet-smelling incense" on the altar "before the place of propitiation," and this, too, belonged to a ceremony of the Old Testament.

Therefore, it is not fitting for the priest to use incense during the Mass.

Objection 3: The things that are done in the sacraments of the Church are not to be repeated. Therefore, it is not fitting for the priest to make the sign of the cross repeatedly over this sacrament.

Objection 4: In Hebrews 7:7 the Apostle says, “Beyond all contradiction, that which is less is blessed by the superior.” But Christ, who exists in this sacrament after the consecration, is much greater than the priest. Therefore, it is not fitting for the priest, after the consecration, to bless this sacrament by making the sign of the cross over it.

Objection 5: Nothing ridiculous should be done in a sacrament of the Church. But it seems ridiculous to make gesticulations—which is what seems to be going on when the priest sometimes stretches out his arms, or folds his hands, or joins his fingers together, or bows down. Therefore, such things should not be done in this sacrament.

Objection 6: It likewise seems ridiculous for the priest to turn himself toward the people many times and even to greet the people many times. Therefore, these things ought not to be done in the celebration of this sacrament.

Objection 7: In 1 Corinthians 1:13 the Apostle takes it to be unfitting for Christ to be divided. But after the consecration Christ exists in this sacrament. Therefore, it is unfitting for the host to be broken by the priest.

Objection 8: The things done in this sacrament represent Christ’s passion. But in Christ’s passion His body was divided in the places of the five wounds. Therefore, Christ’s body should be broken into five parts rather than into three.

Objection 9: In this sacrament the whole body of Christ is consecrated separately from His blood. Therefore, it is unfitting for one part of it to be mixed with the blood.

Objection 10: Just as Christ’s body in this sacrament is set before us as food, so, too, Christ’s blood is set before us as drink. But no other bodily food is joined to the eating of the body of Christ in this sacrament. Therefore, it is unfitting that after consuming Christ’s blood, the priest consumes unconsecrated wine.

Objection 11: The reality should correspond to the prefigurement. But concerning the paschal lamb, which was a prefigurement of this sacrament, it was commanded that nothing of it should “remain until the morning.” Therefore, it is unfitting for consecrated hosts to be reserved and not to be eaten immediately.

Objection 12: Further, the priest addresses his listeners in the plural number, when he says, for instance, “The Lord be with [all of] you (*Dominus vobiscum*)” and, “Let us give thanks (*Gratias agamus*).” But it is unfitting to address a single individual in the plural number, especially an inferior. Therefore, it seems unfitting for a priest to celebrate Mass with only a single minister present.

So, then, it seems that some things are done unfittingly in the celebration of this sacrament.

But contrary to this is the custom of the Church, and the Church cannot be mistaken, because she is instructed by the Holy Spirit.

I respond: As was explained above (q. 60, a. 6), in the case of the sacraments a given thing is signified in two ways, viz., by *words* and by *deeds*, in order that the signification might be more complete.

Now what is signified by the *words* in the celebration of this sacrament are certain things pertaining to *Christ’s passion*, which is represented in this sacrament, or, again, certain things pertaining to the *mystical body*, which is signified in this sacrament, along with certain things pertaining to the *consuming (usus)* of this sacrament, which ought to occur with devotion and reverence.

And so in the celebration of this mystery certain things are *done* to represent *Christ’s passion* or the disposition of the *mystical body*; and certain things are done pertaining to the devotion and reverence that belong to the *consuming* of this sacrament.

Reply to objection 1: The washing of the hands is done in the celebration of the Mass out of

reverence for this sacrament—and this in two ways:

First of all, because we are not accustomed to handling precious things except with washed hands. Hence, it seems indecorous for an individual to approach such a great sacrament with dirty hands, even corporeally speaking.

Second, because of its signification. For as Dionysius explains in *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, chap. 3, the ablution of the extremities signifies the washing away of even the least sins—this according to John 13:10 (“He who has bathed needs to wash only his feet”). And this is the sort of washing required of someone who approaches this sacrament. This is also signified by a confession that takes place before the *Introit* of the Mass. And, as Dionysius points out, it is this same thing that the washing of the priests signified in the Old Law.

Nor does the Church observe this as a ceremonial precept of the Old Law; instead, she observes it insofar as it has been instituted by the Church as something fitting in its own right. And that is why it is not observed in the same way that it was then. For instance, the washing of the feet is omitted and what is preserved is the washing of the hands, which can be done more quickly and which is sufficient to signify complete cleanness. For since, as *De Anima* 3 says, the hand is “the organ of organs,” all works are attributed to the hands; hence, Psalm 25:6 says, “I will wash my hands among the innocent.”

Reply to objection 2: We make use of incense as mandated not by a ceremonial precept of the Law but as a statute of the Church. Hence, we do not use it in the same way that had been mandated in the Old Law. Now this pertains to two things:

First of all, it pertains to *reverence* for this sacrament, viz., in order that it might, by its good odor, drive off from the place any corporeally bad odor that could cause dismay.

Second, it pertains to a representation of the *effect of grace*, by which the good odor that Christ was full of—this according to Genesis 27:27 (“Behold, the odor of my son is like the odor of a ripe field”)—flows to the faithful by way of the ministers—this according to 2 Corinthians 2:14 (“... manifesting through us the odor of his knowledge in every place”). And so when the altar, by which Christ is designated, has been incensed on every side, then everyone is incensed in the proper order.

Reply to objection 3: In the celebration of the Mass the priest makes use of the sign of the cross to express Christ’s passion, which was terminated on the cross. Now Christ’s passion was carried out in certain steps, as it were:

First of all, there is the *handing over of Christ*, which was done by God, by Judas, and by the Jews. This is signified by the threefold sign of the cross at these words, “... these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemished sacrifices (*haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata*).”

Second was the handing over of Christ *for payment* to the priests, the scribes and the Pharisees. To signify this, there is a threefold sign of the cross at the words, “... blessed, acknowledged, ratified (*benedictam, adscriptam, ratam*).” Or, to show the *price* for the handing over, viz., thirty denarii, what is added is a twofold sign of the cross at the words, “... that it might become, for our sake, the body and blood, etc.,” in order to designate the person of Judas, the seller, and the person of Jesus, who was sold.

Third was the foreshadowing of the passion made at the [last] supper. To designate this, two crosses are made in the third place, one in consecrating the body, the other in consecrating the blood, when “He blessed ...” is said in each case.

Fourth was Christ’s passion itself. Hence, to represent the five wounds there is, in the fourth place, a fivefold sign of the cross at these words, “This pure victim, this holy victim, this spotless victim, the holy bead of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation (*hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae aeternae, et calicem salutis perpetuae*).”

Fifth, the outstretching of Christ’s body, the flowing of His blood, and the fruit of the passion are represented, and this through three signs of the cross that are made at the words, “[so that all of us who] ... receive the most holy body and blood of your Son may be filled with every grace and heavenly blessing.”

What are represented in the sixth place are the three prayers Christ made on the cross: (a) the first was for His persecutors, when He said, “Father, forgive them”; (b) the second was for His liberation from death, when He said, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”; (c) the third had to do with His attainment of glory, when He said, “Father, into your hands I commend my spirit.” To signify this there is a threefold sign of the cross at the words, “You sanctify them, fill them with life, bless them, and bestow them upon us (*sanctificas, vivificas, benedixis, et praestas nobis*).”

What are represented in the seventh place are the three hours during which Christ hung on the cross, viz., from the sixth hour until the ninth hour. And to signify this, once again three signs of the cross are made, this time at the words, “Through Him and with Him and in Him (*per ipsum et cum ipso et in ipso*).”

Ninth, the resurrection effected on the third day is represented by three crosses that are made at the words, “The peace of the Lord be with you always (*pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*).”

More briefly, it can be said that the consecration of this sacrament, the acceptance of the sacrifice, and the fruits of the sacrifice proceed from the power of the cross of Christ, and so wherever mention is made of one of these, the priest makes use of the sign of the cross.

Reply to objection 4: As is clear from has been said (ad 3), after the consecration the priest makes use of the sign of the cross not to bless and to consecrate, but only to commemorate the power of the cross and the manner of Christ’s passion.

Reply to objection 5: Those things that the priest does in the Mass are not ridiculous gesticulations, since they are done in order to represent something.

For instance, the fact that the priest extends his arms after the consecration signifies the outstretching of Christ’s arms on the cross.

Again, he raises his hands when praying in order to signify that his prayer is directed toward God on behalf of the people—this according to Lamentations 3:41 (“Let us lift up our hearts with our hands to the Lord in heaven”). And Exodus 17:11 says, “When Moses kept his hands lifted up, Israel was winning.”

Now the fact that the priest sometimes folds his hands and bows, praying submissively and humbly, signifies the humility and obedience with which Christ suffered.

And he joins his fingers after the consecration, viz., his thumb and index finger, with which he had touched the consecrated body of Christ, so that if any particle is clinging to his fingers, it will not be scattered—a gesture that pertains to reverence for this sacrament.

Reply to objection 6: The priest turns toward the people five times to signify that on the day of the resurrection our Lord manifested Himself five times, as was noted above (q. 55, a. 3) in the treatise on the resurrection.

Now he greets the people seven times, more specifically, five times after he has turned around toward the people, and twice when he has not turned around—viz., before the preface, when he says, “The Lord be with you,” and later on when he says, “The peace of the Lord be with you always”—all in order to signify the sevenfold grace of the Holy Spirit.

However, a bishop celebrating Mass on a feast day says, “Peace be with you” in the first of these greetings. This is what was said after the resurrection by our Lord, whose person the bishop represents in a special way (*praecipue*).

Reply to objection 7: The breaking of the host signifies three things: first of all, the very rending of Christ’s body that occurs in the passion; second, the distinctions within the mystical body with respect to diverse states; (c) third, the distribution of the graces that proceed from Christ’s passion, as Dionysius explains in *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, chap. 3. Hence, this sort of breaking does not induce any division within Christ.

Reply to objection 8: Pope Sergius says, and this is found in *Decretals, De Consecratione*, dist. 3, [canon 22]: “Our Lord’s body is threefold. The part offered and dropped into the chalice signifies Christ’s body as already resurrected”—i.e., it signifies Christ Himself, the Blessed Virgin, and any other saints, if

there are any, who exist with their bodies in glory. “The part that is eaten signifies those still walking on the earth”—viz., because those living on earth are united by the sacrament and bruised by their passions, just as bread is worn down by the teeth. “The part remaining on the altar until the end of the Mass is the body of Christ remaining in the sepulcher, because the bodies of the saints will be in their sepulchers until the end of the world”—and yet their souls are either in purgatory or heaven, even though this rite of reserving one part on the altar until the end of the Mass is no longer observed. Nonetheless, the signification of the parts remains the same. Some have expressed it in verse as follows:

The host being rent—

What is dipped means the blest;

What is dry means the living;

What is kept, those at rest.

However, some claim that the part dropped into the chalice signifies those still living in this world, whereas the part kept outside the chalice signifies those fully blessed both in soul and body, and the part eaten signifies the others.

Reply to objection 9: There are two things that can be signified by the chalice:

In one way, the *passion* itself, which is represented in this sacrament. And on this score, what are signified by the part dropped into the chalice are those who are still participating in the sufferings of Christ.

In the other way, what can be signified is *blessed fruition*, which is also prefigured in this sacrament. And so those whose bodies already exist in full beatitude are signified by the part dropped in the chalice.

Also, it should be noted that the part dropped into the chalice should not be given to the people as a supplement to communion, since Christ offered dipped bread only to Judas the betrayer.

Reply to objection 10: Wine, by reason of its liquidity, is capable of being used for washing. And that is the reason why it is consumed after the reception of this sacrament to wash the mouth, so that no particles remain in it—something that pertains to reverence for the sacrament. Hence, *Extra, De Celebratione Missae*, chap. *Ex parte*, says, “The priest should rinse his mouth with wine after he receives the whole sacrament—unless he has to celebrate another Mass on the same day, lest he be prevented from celebrating the other Mass by swallowing some of the wine used for the ablution. And it is for the same reason that he washes the fingers that he had touched Christ’s body with.”

Reply to objection 11: The reality should correspond to the prefigurement in a certain respect—namely, because no part of a consecrated host that the priest and the minister and even the people share in, should be reserved until the following day (*non debet pars hostiae consecratae ... resevari in crastinum*). Hence, as we read in *De Consecratione*, dist. 2, Pope Clement ordered that “as many hosts (*quanta holocausta*) are to be offered on the altar as should suffice for the people. But if some remain, they are not to be reserved for the following day; instead, let them be carefully consumed with the fear and trembling of the clerics.”

However, since this sacrament is to be consumed daily, whereas the paschal lamb was not consumed every day, it is necessary to reserve other hosts for the sick. Hence, we read in the same distinction, “Let the priest always have the Eucharist ready, so that, when someone has become seriously ill, he may take Communion to him at once, lest he die without it.”

Reply to objection 12: Several individuals ought to be present at a *solemn celebration* of the Mass. Hence, in *De Consecratione*, dist. 1 Pope Soter says, “It has been decided that no priest is to presume to celebrate solemn Mass unless, with two others present responding to him, he himself is the third. For when he says in the [second-person] plural, ‘The Lord be with you (*Dominus vobiscum*)’, and again in the silent prayers, ‘Pray for me (*orate pro me*)’, the response to his greeting is most clearly appropriate.” Hence, for greater solemnity, we read in the same place the statute that a bishop is to perform the solemnities of his Masses in the presence of several others.

Nevertheless, in *private Masses* it is sufficient to have a single minister who acts in the person of the whole Catholic people and in their person responds to the priest in the plural.

Article 6

Can mishaps that occur in the celebration of this sacrament be sufficiently dealt with by observing the statutes of Church?

It seems that mishaps that occur in the celebration of this sacrament cannot be sufficiently dealt with by observing the statutes of Church (*non possit sufficienter occurrere defectibus qui circa celebrationem huius sacramenti occurrunt statuta Ecclesiae observando*):

Objection 1: It sometimes happens that, before or after the consecration, the priest dies, or loses his use of reason, or is impeded by some other sort of infirmity from receiving the sacrament and bringing the Mass to completion. Thus, [in such a case] it seems impossible to fulfill the statute of the Church which commands the consecrating priest to take part in his own sacrifice.

Objection 2: It sometimes happens that, before or after the consecration, the priest recalls that he has eaten or drunk something, or that he is in the state of mortal sin or even of excommunication—a thing he had no memory of ahead of time. Therefore, he who finds himself in such a difficulty must necessarily commit a mortal sin whether or not he consumes the sacrament, since in either case he will be acting in a way contrary to a statute of the Church.

Objection 3: It sometimes happens that (a) a fly or a spider or some poisonous living creature falls into the chalice after the consecration, or, again, that (b) the priest finds out that poison has been put into the chalice by some malevolent individual in order to kill him. In such a case, if he consumes the sacrament he seems to commit a mortal sin, either by killing himself or by tempting God. Similarly, if he does not consume the sacrament, then he sins [mortally] by acting in a way contrary to a statute of the Church. Therefore, it seems that he is in a dilemma (*esse perplexus*) and is subject to sinning necessarily. But this is absurd.

Objection 4: It sometimes happens through the negligence of a minister that either no water is put into the chalice or, again, that no wine is put into the chalice, and that the priest notices this [after the consecration]. Therefore, in this case, too, the priest seems to be in a dilemma, [committing a sin] regardless of whether (a) he consumes the body without the blood, in which case he makes an incomplete sacrifice, or (b) he consumes neither the body nor the blood.

Objection 5: It sometimes happens that a priest does not recall whether or not he has said the words of consecration or other words that are said during the consecration of this sacrament. Therefore, in such a case he seems to commit a sin regardless of whether (a) he repeats, over the same matter, the words that he may have already said, or (b) he consumes the unconsecrated bread and wine as if they were consecrated.

Objection 6: Sometimes, because of the cold, the host slips from the priest's hands into the chalice, either before or after the breaking of the host. Thus, in such a case the priest will not be able to fulfill the rite of the Church either (a) with respect to the breaking of the host or (b) or, again, as regards only a third of the whole host being dropped into the chalice.

Objection 7: Sometimes it happens that the blood of Christ is spilled through the carelessness of the priest, or, again, that the priest vomits out the sacrament that has been consumed, or, again, that consecrated hosts are kept for so long that they putrefy, or, again, that consecrated hosts are gnawed by mice, or, again, that they are spoiled in any way whatsoever. In cases such as these it does not seem possible for this sacrament to be shown the reverence that is due to it according to the statutes of the

Church. Therefore, it does not seem that these mishaps or dangers can be dealt with in a way that observes the statutes of the Church.

But contrary to this: Just as God does not command anything that is impossible, so neither does the Church.

I respond: Mishaps or dangers that occur regarding this sacrament can be dealt with in two ways:

In the first way, by *preventing* such mishaps from occurring.

In a second way, by *following up* in such a way that what has gone amiss is put right, either by applying a remedy, or at least by a penance on the part of the one who has acted carelessly regarding this sacrament.

Reply to objection 1: If a priest is stricken by death or by a grave infirmity *before* the consecration of our Lord's body and blood, there is no need for the sacrament to be brought to completion by another priest. By contrast, if this happens *after* the consecration has begun, with the body having been consecrated and before the consecration of the blood, or, again, after both have been consecrated, then the celebration of the Mass has to be completed by another priest. Hence, as is contained in *Decretals* 7, q. 1, chap. *Nihil*, the Council of Toledo says, "We judge it to be fitting that when the sacred mysteries have been consecrated by priests during the time of the Mass, if any illness occurs because of which the mystery, having begun, cannot be brought to completion, it is up to the bishop or another priest to bring to completion the consecration of the ritual that has begun. For nothing else is suitable for bringing to completion the mysteries once begun except that they be brought to completion by the blessing either of the priest who initiated them or of a priest who succeeds him—given that the mysteries cannot, it seems, be completed except in the right order. For since we are all one in Christ, the change of persons makes no difference, since the unity of faith guarantees a good outcome. However, do not let what is proposed here for a case of natural debility be turned into the bane of presumption, and, unless he is suffering from the onset of some physical affliction, let no priest or minister ever presume to leave the ritual unfinished. If anyone rashly presumes to do this, he will incur a sentence of excommunication."

Reply to objection 2: Where a difficulty occurs, one should always adopt the solution that is least dangerous. Now what is especially dangerous in the case of this sacrament is what is contrary to the completion of the sacrament itself, since this is an appalling sacrilege, and what is less dangerous is anything that involves the condition of the one who consumes the sacrament.

And so if, *after* the consecration has begun, the priest remembers that he has eaten or drunk something, he should nonetheless bring the sacrifice to completion and consume the sacrament. Similarly, if he remembers that he has committed some [mortal] sin, he should repent with the intention of confessing and making satisfaction, and in this way consume the sacrament fruitfully and not unworthily. Again, the same line of reasoning holds if he remembers that he is the subject of any sort of excommunication. For he should make the resolution of humbly* seeking absolution, and in that way he will receive absolution from the invisible high priest, Jesus Christ, for his act of bringing the divine mysteries to completion.

However, if he remembers any of the things mentioned above *before* the consecration, I think that, especially in a case of eating or of excommunication, it is safer for him to break off the Mass that has been started, unless he fears a serious scandal.

Reply to objection 3: If, *before* the consecration, a fly or a spider falls into the chalice, or, again, if one finds out that poison has been put [into the wine], it should be poured out, and after the chalice has been washed out, wine should be poured into it again to be consecrated.

By contrast, if one of these things happens *after* the consecration, the insect should be caught with care and thoroughly washed [with water], and then burned; and the water, along with the ashes, should be poured into the sacrarium. On the other hand, if it is discovered that poison, having been put in, is present there, then the priest should in no way either consume it or give it to anyone else, lest the chalice of life be turned to death; instead, it should be carefully conserved in a vessel that is fit to be kept with the relics.

And in order that the sacrament might not remain uncompleted, the priest should once again put wine into a chalice, resume the Mass from the consecration of the blood, and thus bring the sacrifice to completion.

Reply to objection 4: If, before the consecration of the blood and after the consecration of the body, the priest realizes that there is either no water or no wine in the chalice, then he should immediately add it and do the consecration.

On the other hand, if he realizes after the words of consecration that the *water* is missing, he should nonetheless continue, since, as was explained above (q. 74, a. 7), the addition of the water is not necessary for the sacrament. Still, the individual because of whose negligence this happened should be punished. However, there is no way in which water should be mixed with wine that has already been consecrated, since, as was noted above (q. 77, a.8), a partial corruption of the sacrament would follow.

By contrast, if the priest realizes after the words of consecration that no *wine* has been put into the chalice, then if he notices this *before consuming the body*, then, if the water has already been put in there, he should put in wine with the water and resume the Mass from the words of the consecration of the blood. However, if he notices this *after consuming the body*, he should procure another host to be newly consecrated together with the blood. The reason why I make this claim is that if he were to say only the words for consecrating the blood, then the correct order of consecrating would not be preserved, and, as is laid down in the chapter cited above (ad 1) from the Council of Toledo, sacrifices cannot be perfect unless they are completed in the perfect order. By contrast, if he were to begin from the consecration of the blood and repeat all the words that follow, this would not be fitting unless there were a consecrated host present, since among those words there are things to be said and done not only with respect to the blood, but also with respect to the body. And in the end he should consume the newly consecrated host along with the blood, even if he previously consumed the water in the chalice. For as was explained above (q. 80, a. 8), the precept concerning the completion of the sacrament has more weight than the precept that this sacrament should be consumed by those who are fasting.

Reply to objection 5: Even if the priest does not remember having said some of the things that he ought to have said, he should not be mentally disturbed by this. For an individual who says many things does not remember everything that he has said—unless perhaps, in speaking, he apprehends a particular thing under the concept *something that has already been said [by me]*; for it is in this way that something becomes a memory. Hence, if an individual is thinking attentively about *what he is saying*, but is *not* thinking about *himself as saying it*, then he does not much remember that he did say it. For as is explained in *De Memoria*, an object becomes a memory insofar as it is received under the concept *past*.

Nonetheless, if it is clear to the priest, with a high degree of probability, that he has omitted some words, then if those words are not absolutely necessary for the sacrament, then I do not think that he should because of this resume the Mass by changing the order of the sacrifice; instead, he should proceed further ahead. However, if he is certain that he has omitted some of the words that are necessary for the sacrament, viz., the form of the consecration, then since the form is necessary for the sacrament in the same way that the matter is, it seems that the same thing should be done that was explained above (ad 4) for a case in which the matter is missing, viz., that he should resume the Mass from the form of the consecration and repeat everything else in order, lest the order of the sacrifice be changed.

Reply to objection 6: The breaking of the consecrated host, along with the dropping of just one part into the chalice, has to do with the mystical body—in the same way that mixing water [with the wine] signifies the people. And so the omission of these acts does not make for an imperfection in the sacrifice that necessitates repeating anything in the celebration of this sacrament.

Reply to objection 7: As we read in *De Consecratione*, dist. 2, from a decree by Pope Pius I: “If, because of carelessness, any of the blood drips on to wooden surface that is fixed to the ground, let it be licked up with the tongue, and let the wooden surface be scraped. But if there is no wooden surface, let the ground be scraped and the scrapings burned, and let the ashes be placed within the altar. And let the priest do penance for forty days.

“On the other hand, if the chalice drips on to the altar, let a minister suck up the drop and do penance for three days. If a drop falls on the altar cloth and penetrates to the second cloth, let him do penance for four days. If it penetrates to the third cloth, let him do penance for nine days. If it penetrates to the fourth cloth, let him do penance for twenty days. And let the altar cloths which the drop touched be washed three times, with the chalice positioned underneath, and let the water from the washing be taken and put next to the altar.” It could even be consumed by the minister in a drink, unless it is rejected because of its awful taste and smell (*propter abominationem*). Some go further by cutting out that part of the cloth and burning it, and then putting the ashes in the altar or washing them down the sacrarium.

In the same place an excerpt is added from the *Poenitentiale* of Bede the Priest: “If, because of drunkenness or gluttony, an individual vomits out the Eucharist, let him do penance for forty days if he is a layman, sixty days for clerics or monks, or for deacons and priests, ninety days for a bishop. But if an individual vomits it out because of illness, let him do penance for seven days.”

Again, in the same distinction we read from the Council of Arles: “Those who do not guard the sacrifice well, with the result that a mouse or some other animal eats it in a church, must do penance for forty days. And if someone loses it in a church or if a part falls and is not found, he shall do penance for thirty days.” And a priest seems worthy of the same penance if consecrated hosts putrefy because of his carelessness.

Also, during the days noted above, the one who is doing penance ought to fast and to abstain from receiving Communion.

Nonetheless, once the situation has been weighed with respect to the deed and to the person, it is possible to add to, or subtract from, the penances specified above. Yet it has to be kept in mind that whenever the [sacramental] appearances are intact, they are to be treated with reverence or even to be consumed. For as was explained above (q. 77, a. 5), Christ’s body remains there for as long as the appearances remain. On the other hand, the things in which they are found should be burned if this can be done without too much trouble, and the ashes should be washed down the sacrarium, in the same way explained above for the scrapings from a wooden surface.