

## QUESTION 74

### The Matter of this Sacrament

Next we have to consider the matter of this sacrament: first, the species of the matter (question 74); second, the conversion of the bread and wine into the body of Christ (question 75); third, the mode in which Christ exists in this sacrament (question 76); and, fourth, the accidents of bread and wine that remain in this sacrament (question 77).

On the first topic there are eight questions: (1) Are bread and wine the matter of this sacrament? (2) Is a determinate quantity required for the matter of this sacrament? (3) Is the matter of this sacrament bread made of wheat (*panis triticeus*)? (4) Is the bread leavened or unleavened? (5) Is the matter of this sacrament wine made from grapes (*vina de vite*)? (6) Is the wine mixed with water? (7) Is the water necessary for this sacrament? (8) What about the quantity of water that is added?

#### Article 1

##### Are bread and wine the matter of this sacrament?

It seems that bread and wine are not the matter of this sacrament (*materia huius sacramenti non sit panis et vinum*):

**Objection 1:** This sacrament ought to represent Christ's passion more perfectly than the sacraments of the Old Law do. But the flesh of animals, which was the matter of the sacraments of the Old Law, represents Christ's passion more than bread and wine do. Therefore, the matter of this sacrament should be the flesh of animals rather than bread and wine.

**Objection 2:** This sacrament is to be celebrated everywhere. But there are many regions of the earth in which bread is not found and many regions in which wine is not found. Therefore, bread and wine are not a fitting matter for this sacrament.

**Objection 3:** This sacrament is for both the healthy and the sick. But wine is harmful to some who are sick. Therefore, it seems that it should not be the matter of this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** Pope Alexander says, "In the oblations of the sacraments only bread and wine mixed with water are to be offered."

**I respond:** Concerning the matter of this sacrament, there are many ways in which people have gone wrong.

For instance, as Augustine reports in *De Haeresibus*, those who are called Artotyrites "offer bread and cheese in this sacrament, claiming that oblations were celebrated by primitive men with the fruits of the earth and of sheep." By contrast, others, viz., the Cataphrygians and the Pepuzians, "are said to have confected their Eucharist by making bread with the blood of infants drawn from tiny punctures over their entire body and mixed with flour." Others, called Aquarians, in a show of sobriety, offer nothing but water in this sacrament.

Now all these errors, and similar ones, are excluded by the fact, which is clear from Matthew 26:26ff., that Christ instituted this sacrament under the appearances of bread and wine (*hoc sacramentum sub specie panis et vini instituit*). Hence, bread and wine are the fitting matter for this sacrament. And this makes sense:

First of all, as regards the *use* of this sacrament, which is the act of eating. For just as water is taken up in the sacrament of baptism to be used as a spiritual washing, because corporeal washing normally takes place with water, so bread and wine, by which men are normally replenished, are taken up in this sacrament to be used in spiritual eating.

Second, as regards the *passion of Christ*, in which the blood is separated from the body. And that is why in this sacrament, which is a memorial of our Lord's passion, the bread is consumed separately as

the sacrament of the body and the wine is consumed separately as the sacrament of the blood.

Third, as regards the *effect in each recipient*. For as Ambrose explains in commenting on 1 Corinthians 11:20, this sacrament “is strong enough to protect the body and the soul,” and so “the flesh of Christ is offered under the appearance of bread for the health of the body, whereas the blood is offered under the appearance of wine for the health of the soul, in the sense in which Leviticus 1:14 says that “the soul of an animal exists in its blood.”

Fourth, as regards the *effect with respect to the whole Church*, which is made up of the diverse faithful in the way that “the bread is made up of different grains and the wine flows from different grapes,” as a Gloss says on 1 Corinthians 10:17 (“We though many are one body, etc.”).

**Reply to objection 1:** Even though the flesh of slaughtered animals explicitly represents Christ’s passion, it is still less fitting for signifying (a) the common use of this sacrament and (b) the unity of the Church.

**Reply to objection 2:** Even though wheat and wine are not native to every region of the earth, they can nonetheless be easily sent in sufficient quantities for use in this sacrament.

Moreover, it is not the case that just one of them should be consecrated in the absence of the other, since this would not be a complete sacrifice.

**Reply to objection 3:** Consuming a small amount of wine cannot do much harm to someone who is sick. Still, as will be explained below (q. 80, a. 12), if harm is feared, it is not necessary for everyone who receives the body of Christ to receive His blood as well.

## Article 2

### Is a determinate quantity of bread and wine required as the matter of this sacrament?

It seems that a determinate quantity of bread and wine is required as the matter of this sacrament (*requiratur determinata quantitas panis et vini ad materiam huius sacramenti*):

**Objection 1:** The effects of grace are not less well-ordered than the effects of nature are. But as *De Anima 2* says, “There is a limit set by nature on all existing things, and a calculation of quantity and growth.” Therefore, *a fortiori*, in this sacrament, which is called the Eucharist, i.e., a good grace, what is required is a determinate quantity of bread and wine.

**Objection 2:** Christ gave no power to the ministers of the Church for things that involve provoke derision of the Faith and of His sacraments—this according to 2 Corinthians 10:8 (“... according to the power that the Lord has given me for building you up and not for your destruction”). But it would lead to the derision of this sacrament if a priest willed to consecrate all the bread that is being sold in a marketplace and all the wine that is in a wine cellar. Therefore, he is not able to do this.

**Objection 3:** If an individual is baptized in the ocean, then it is just the water by which the body of the one being baptized is washed that is sanctified by the formula for baptism—and not all the water in the ocean. Therefore, in this sacrament it is likewise not the case that an unnecessarily large quantity of bread can be consecrated.

**But contrary to this:** *Many* is opposed to *few* and *large* is opposed to *small*. But there is no quantity of bread or wine so small that it cannot be consecrated. Therefore, no quantity is so large that it cannot be consecrated.

**I respond:** Some have claimed that a priest could not consecrate a huge quantity of bread or wine, e.g., all the bread that is being sold in a marketplace, or all the wine that is in a cask.

But this does not seem to be true. For in the case of everything containing matter, the calculation of how the matter is to be determined is taken from the end, in the way that the matter of a saw is iron in

order that it might be suitable for cutting. But the end of this sacrament is its use by the faithful. Hence, the quantity of matter for this sacrament has to be determined in relation to its use by the faithful. However, it cannot be the case that it is determined in relation to the use of the faithful who are now present; otherwise, a priest who had few parishioners present would not be able to consecrate a large number of hosts. Hence, it follows that the matter of this sacrament is determined in relation to the use of the faithful *absolutely speaking*. But the number of the faithful is not determinate. Hence, one cannot claim that the quantity of the matter for this sacrament is determinate.

**Reply to objection 1:** The matter of a natural thing receives determinate quantity in relation to a determinate form. But the number of the faithful, whose use is what this sacrament is ordered toward, is indeterminate. Hence, the two cases are not similar.

**Reply to objection 2:** The power of the Church's ministers is ordered toward two things: (a) its proper effect and (b) the end of the effect. But the second does not destroy the first. Hence, if a priest intends to consecrate the body of Christ for some evil end, e.g., in order to cause derision or in order to administer poison, he commits a sin by intending the evil end, but he nonetheless, because of the power granted to him, brings the sacrament to completion.

**Reply to objection 3:** The sacrament of baptism is brought to completion in the *use* of the matter, and that is why no more water is sanctified by the formula of baptism than the amount that comes into use. By contrast, the present sacrament is brought to completion in the *consecration* of the matter. And so the two cases are not similar.

### Article 3

#### Is it required for the matter of this sacrament that the bread be made of wheat?

It seems that it is not required for the matter of this sacrament that the bread be made of wheat (*non requiratur ad materiam huius sacramenti quod sit panis triticeus*):

**Objection 1:** This sacrament remembers our Lord's passion. But bread made of barley (*panis hordeaceus*), which is more bitter and with which He fed the crowds on the mountain (John 6:9ff.), seems to be more consonant with our Lord's passion than bread made of wheat is. Therefore, bread made of wheat is not the appropriate matter of this sacrament.

**Objection 2:** Shape (*figura*) is a sign of the species among natural entities. But there are some cereals (*quaedam frumenta*) that have a shape similar to that of a grain of wheat, e.g., spelt and maize, and in some localities bread is made of them for use in this sacrament. Therefore, it seems that bread made of wheat is not exclusively the matter (*non sit propria materia*) of this sacrament.

**Objection 3:** Mixing (*permixtio*) destroys the species. But flour made of wheat is hardly ever found unmixed with some other species of grain, except in the case of specially selected grains. Therefore, it does not seem that bread made of wheat is exclusively the matter for this sacrament.

**Objection 4:** What has been corrupted seems to belong to another species. But some consecrate the sacrament with bread which has been corrupted and which at that point seems not to be bread made of wheat. Therefore, it seems that bread of this sort is not an appropriate matter for this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** What is contained in this sacrament is Christ, who compares Himself to a grain of wheat when He says in John 12:24-25, "Unless a grain of wheat falls into the ground and dies, it remains itself alone." Therefore, wheat bread (*panis frumentinus*), i.e., bread made of wheat (*panis triticeus*), is the matter of this sacrament.

**I respond:** As was explained above (a. 1 and q. 60, a. 7, ad 2), the sort of matter that is taken up for use in the sacraments is such that it is very commonly used among men. Among the types of bread,

men more commonly use bread made of wheat; for all the other sorts of bread seem to have been introduced in cases in which this sort of bread was lacking. And that is why Christ is thought to have instituted this sacrament under the appearances of bread of this sort. Again, this sort of bread strengthens a man and so more fittingly signifies the effect of this sacrament. And that is why the proper matter of this sacrament is bread made of wheat.

**Reply to objection 1:** Bread made of barley is fit to signify the hardness of the Old Law, both because of the hardness of the bread and also because, as Augustine explains in *83 Quaestiones*, “Barley flour, which is enveloped by a very tenacious fiber, signifies (a) the Law itself, which was given in such a way that in it the vital nourishment of the soul was enveloped by corporeal sacraments; or else it signifies (b) the people themselves not yet having been stripped of their carnal desires, which clung to their hearts like fiber.” By contrast, this sacrament involves “the easy yoke of Christ,” and the truth already manifested, and a spiritual people. Hence, bread made of barley would not be a fitting matter for this sacrament.

**Reply to objection 2:** A generator generates something similar in species, but sometimes there is a dissimilarity with respect to accidents between the generator and what is generated—either because of the matter or because of a deficiency in generative power. And so if there are grains which can be generated from the wheat seed, as in the case of wild wheat grown from wheat seed in bad soil, the bread made from such a grain can be the matter of this sacrament.

However, this does not seem to apply in the case of barley or of spelt or of maize, which, of all cereals, are the most similar to wheat. Instead, the similarity in shape of such grains seems to signify a *closeness* of species rather than an *identity* of species, in the way that it is clear from the similarity of shape that a dog and a wolf belong to species that are close to one another, but not identical. Hence, bread that is a fitting matter for this sacrament cannot be made from grains such as these, which can in no way be generated from the wheat seed.

**Reply to objection 3:** A slight mixture does not destroy the species, since what is slight is in some sense taken up by what is greater. And so if there is slight admixture of another grain with a much greater quantity of wheat, a bread which is the matter for this sacrament will be able to be made from it.

By contrast, if the admixture is large—say, half and half or almost so (*puta, ex aequo vel quasi*)—then that sort of mixture changes the species, and so the bread made from it will not be a fitting matter for this sacrament.

**Reply to objection 4:** Sometimes the corruption of the bread is such that it destroys the species of the bread, as when its continuity is interrupted and the taste, color, and other accidents are changed—and, thus, the body of Christ cannot be confectioned from such matter.

By contrast, sometimes there is just a disposition toward corruption, which is shown by some sort of change in the flavor, and not so great a corruption that it destroys the species of the bread. The body of Christ can be confectioned from such bread, though the individual who does the confectioning commits a sin of irreverence toward the sacrament.

Also, because starch comes from corrupted wheat, it does not seem that bread made up with starch could become the body of Christ—though there are some who assert the contrary.

#### Article 4

##### Should this sacrament be confectioned with unleavened bread?

It seems that this sacrament should not be confectioned with unleavened bread (*hoc sacramentum non debeat confici ex pane azymo*):

**Objection 1:** In this sacrament we should imitate Christ's institution. But Christ seems to have instituted this sacrament with leavened bread (*in pane fermentato*); for, as we read in Exodus 12, in accord with the Law the Jews began to use unleavened bread on the day of the passover, which is celebrated on the fourteenth day of the moon, whereas Christ instituted this sacrament at the supper which He celebrated "before the day of the passover," as John 13:1 has it. Therefore, we, too, should celebrate this sacrament with leavened bread.

**Objection 2:** In the time of grace there should not be observances belonging to the Law (*legalia non sunt observanda tempore gratiae*). But as is clear from Exodus 12, the use of unleavened bread is a certain ceremony that belongs to the Law. Therefore, we should not use unleavened bread in this sacrament of grace.

**Objection 3:** As was explained above (q. 65, a. 1 and q. 75, a. 3), the Eucharist is the sacrament of charity in the same way that baptism is the sacrament of faith. But the fervor of charity is signified by leaven, as is clear in a Gloss on Matthew 13:33 ("The kingdom of God is like leaven, etc."). Therefore, this sacrament should be confected with leavened bread.

**Objection 4:** *Leavened* and *unleavened* are accidents of bread that do not change its species. But in the matter of baptism no distinction is applied concerning the differences among the accidents of water, e.g., whether it should be salt water or fresh water, hot water or cold water. Therefore, in this sacrament no distinction should be applied to whether it is unleavened bread or leavened bread.

**But contrary to this:** *Extra, De Celebratione Missarum*, chap. *litteras*, says that a priest is to be punished "if he has presumed to celebrate the solemnities of the Mass with leavened bread and a wooden cup."

**I respond:** There are two possible things to consider with respect to the matter of this sacrament, viz., (a) what is *necessary* and (b) what is *fitting*.

As has been explained (a. 3), it is *necessary* that the bread be made out of wheat, and without this the sacrament is not brought to completion. On the other hand, it is *not necessary* to the sacrament that the bread be unleavened or that it be leavened, since the sacrament can be confected with either one.

However, it is *fitting* for each priest to observe the rite of his own church in celebrating the sacrament. And on this point there are diverse customs among the churches. For St. Gregory says, "The Roman church offers unleavened bread, because our Lord took on flesh without any commingling of the sexes, whereas the other churches offer leavened bread, because the Word of the Father was clothed with flesh in the way that leaven is mixed with flour." Hence, just as a priest commits a sin by celebrating with leavened bread in a church of the Latins, so a Greek priest would sin by celebrating with unleavened bread in a church of the Greeks, because he would be vitiating the rite of his own church.

Still, the custom of celebrating with unleavened bread makes more sense:

First of all, because of the institution by Christ, who—as attested to by Matthew 26:17, Mark 14:12, Luke 22:7—instituted this sacrament "on the first day of the Unleavened Bread," and on that day, according to Exodus 12, there had to be nothing leavened in the houses of the Jews.

Second, because the bread is properly speaking the sacrament of the body of Christ, which was conceived without corruption, rather than the sacrament of His divine nature; this will become clear below (q. 76, a. 1, ad 1).

Third, because this comports better with the sincerity of the faithful, which is required for the use of this sacrament—this according to 1 Corinthians 5:7-8 ("Christ our passover has been sacrificed. Therefore let us feast ... with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth").

Still, the corresponding custom of the Greeks carries some weight, both because of the signification that Gregory touches upon, and also in its detestation of the heresy of the Nazareans, who mixed observances of the Law in with the Gospel.

**Reply to objection 1:** As we read in Exodus 12:7 and 18, the paschal solemnity began in the

evening of the fourteenth day of the moon. And it was then, after the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, that Christ instituted this sacrament. Hence this day is said by John to precede the day of the passover, and the other three evangelists call it “the first day of the Unleavened Bread,” when leavened bread, as explained above, was not found in the houses of the Jews. This topic was discussed more fully in the treatise on our Lord’s passion (q. 46, a.9, ad 1).

**Reply to objection 2:** Those who confect with unleavened bread do not intend to observe the ceremonies of the Law, but instead intend to conform themselves to Christ’s institution. And so they are not Judaizers. Otherwise, even those who celebrate with leavened bread would be Judaizers, since the Jews made an offering of leavened bread from their first fruits.

**Reply to objection 3:** Leaven signifies charity because of a *certain effect*, viz., since it makes the bread more tasty and more sizable. But it signifies corruption because of the *very nature of its species*.

**Reply to objection 4:** The reason why more attention is given to the difference between unleavened bread and leavened bread than to the difference between hot and cold baptismal water is that leaven involves some sort of corruption and that, as has been explained (a. 3, ad 4), this sacrament cannot be confected with corrupted bread. For it could happen that the corruption of an instance of leavened bread is so great that the sacrament cannot be confected with it.

## Article 5

### Is wine made from grapes the proper matter of this sacrament?

It seems that wine made from grapes is not the proper matter of this sacrament (*non sit propria materia huius sacramenti vinum vitis*):

**Objection 1:** Just as water is the matter of baptism, so wine is the matter of this sacrament. But baptism can be conferred with any sort of water. Therefore, this sacrament can be confected with any sort of wine, e.g., wine made from pomegranates or from mulberries—especially given that grape vines do not grow in some lands.

**Objection 2:** As Isidore points out, vinegar is a species of wine made from grapes. But this sacrament cannot be confected with vinegar. Therefore, it seems that wine made from grapes is not the proper matter of this sacrament.

**Objection 3:** Just as clarified wine is drawn from grapes, so too are both the juice of unripe grapes (*argresta*) and unfermented or partially fermented grape juice (*mustum*). But it does not seem that this sacrament can be confected with either of the latter—this according to what we read in the Sixth Council: “We have learned that in some churches the priests add grapes to the sacrifice of the oblation, and so they dispense both together to the people. Therefore, we command that no priest do this from now on.” And Pope Julius rebukes certain priests “who offer wine pressed from grapes in the sacrament of the Lord’s chalice.” Therefore, it seems that wine made from grapes is not the proper matter of this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** Just as our Lord compared Himself to a grain of wheat, so, too, He compared Himself to a vine, when He said, “I am the true vine” (John 15:1). But as has been explained (a. 3), only bread made of wheat is the matter for this sacrament. Therefore, only wine made from grapes is the proper matter of this sacrament.

**I respond:** This sacrament can be confected only with wine made from grapes:

First of all, because of the sacrament’s institution by Christ, who instituted this sacrament with wine made from grapes; this is clear from the fact that in Matthew 26:29 He Himself says concerning the institution of this sacrament, “I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until ...”

Second, because, as has been explained (a. 3), it is that which properly and commonly has

such-and-such a species that is taken up as the matter of the sacraments. But it is that which is taken from the grape vine that is properly called wine, whereas other liquids are called wine because of some similarity to wine made from grapes.

Third, wine made from grapes comports better with this sacrament's effect, which is spiritual joy, since it has been written that "wine gladdens the heart of man" (Psalm 103:15).

**Reply to objection 1:** The liquids in question are called wine because of a similarity and not properly speaking.

Moreover, as much real wine as is sufficient can be sent to those lands in which grape vines do not grow.

**Reply to objection 2:** Wine becomes vinegar through corruption and thus, as *Metaphysics* 8 points out, there is no return from vinegar to wine. And that is why, just as this sacrament cannot be confectioned with totally corrupted bread, so neither can it be confectioned with vinegar.

However, the sacrament can be confectioned with wine that is turning sour—though, as was noted above (a. 3, ad 4), the individual who confectiones the sacrament commits a sin.

**Reply to objection 3:** The juice of unripe grapes is in the process of being generated, and it does not yet have the species of wine. And, consequently, this sacrament cannot be confectioned with it.

On the other hand, unfermented or partially fermented grape juice (*mustum*) already has the species of wine; for its sweetness indicates fermentation, which, as *Meteorologia* 4 puts it, "is the result of its natural heat." And so the sacrament can be confectioned with unfermented or partially fermented grape juice. However, whole grapes should not be mixed into this sacrament, since in that case there would be something other than wine.

Again, it is forbidden to make an oblation of grape juice immediately upon its being pressed from the grapes into the chalice; this is unbecoming because of the impurity of the grape juice. Still, it can be done in a case of necessity; for the selfsame Pope Julius says, "If it is necessary, let the cluster of grapes (*botrus*) be pressed into the chalice."

## Article 6

### Should water be mixed in with the wine?

It seems that water should not be mixed in with the wine (*aqua non sit vino permiscenda*):

**Objection 1:** Christ's sacrifice was prefigured by the offering of Melchisedech, who, as we read in Genesis 14:18, had offered only "bread and wine." Therefore, water should not be added in this sacrament.

**Objection 2:** There are diverse matters for the different sacraments. But water is the matter of baptism. Therefore, it should not be used as the matter of this sacrament.

**Objection 3:** Bread and wine are the matter of this sacrament. But nothing is joined to the bread. Therefore, nothing should be added to the wine, either.

**But contrary to this:** Pope Alexander writes, "In the sacramental oblations that are offered to the Lord during the celebration of the Mass, only bread and wine mixed with water are to be offered in sacrifice."

**I respond:** Water should be mixed with the wine that is offered in this sacrament:

First of all, because of the institution of the sacrament. For it is believed with a high degree of probability that our Lord instituted this sacrament with wine mixed with water, in accord with the custom of that land; hence, Proverbs 9:5 says, "Drink the wine that I have mixed for you."

Second, because this fits in with the representation of our Lord's passion. Hence, Pope Alexander

says, “Neither wine alone nor water alone ought to be offered in our Lord’s chalice, but both mixed together, because we read that both [blood and water] flowed forth from His side in the passion.”

Third, because it is appropriate for signifying the effect of this sacrament, which is the union of the Christian people with Christ. For as Pope Julius says, “We see that the people are understood in the water, whereas Christ’s blood is shown in the wine. Therefore, when the water is mixed with the wine in the chalice, the people are made one with Christ,”

Fourth, because this comports with the ultimate effect of this sacrament, which is the entry into eternal life. Hence, in *De Sacramentis* Ambrose says, “The water flows into the chalice and springs forth unto eternal life.”

**Reply to objection 1:** As Ambrose explains in the same place, “Just as Christ’s sacrifice was signified by the offering of Melchisedech, so too it is was signified by the water that flowed from the rock in the desert—this according to 1 Corinthians 10:4 (“They drank from the spiritual rock that came after them”).

**Reply to objection 2:** Water is taken up in baptism for use in washing, whereas in this sacrament it is taken up for use in replenishing—this according to Psalm 22:2 (“He led me out to the water of refreshment”).

**Reply to objection 3:** The bread is made from water and flour. And so since water is mixed in with the wine, neither the bread nor the wine is without water.

## Article 7

### Is the mixing with water necessary for this sacrament?

It seems that the mixing with water is necessary for this sacrament (*permixtio aquae sit de necessitate huius sacramenti*):

**Objection 1:** In *Ad Caecilium* Cyprian says, “So our Lord’s chalice is not water alone and not wine alone, but the two are mixed together, in the same way that our Lord’s body is not flour alone, unless the two of them, viz., the flour and the water, are united with one another. But the mixing of water and flour is necessary for this sacrament. Therefore, by parity of reasoning, the joining of water with the wine is necessary.

**Objection 2:** In our Lord’s passion, of which this sacrament is a memorial, just as blood flowed from His side, so, too, did water. But the wine, which is the sacrament of the blood, is necessary for this sacrament. Therefore, by parity of reasoning, so is the water.

**Objection 3:** If the water were not necessary for this sacrament, it would not matter what kind of water were added to this sacrament, and so water distilled from roses, or any other kind of water of that sort, could be added. But this is not part of the Church’s custom. Therefore, water is necessary for this sacrament.

**But contrary to this:** Cyprian says, “If any of our predecessors, out of ignorance or simplicity, has not preserved this custom”—i.e., of mixing water with the wine—“pardon can be granted for his simplicity.” But this would not be the case if the water were necessary for the sacrament in the way that the wine or the bread is. Therefore, mixing in the water is not necessary for the sacrament.

**I respond:** The judgment concerning a sign should be based on what it signifies.

Now, as has been noted (a. 6), adding water to the wine is meant to signify the participation by the faithful in this sacrament, in the sense that what is signified by the water mixed with the wine is the people as united with Christ. Again, the very fact that water flowed forth from the side of Christ hanging on the cross refers back to the same thing, because what was signified by that water is the washing away

of sins that was effected by Christ's passion.

But it was explained above (q. 73, a. 1, ad 3) that this sacrament is brought to completion in the *consecration* of the matter, whereas the *use* of the sacrament by the faithful is *not necessary* to the sacrament but is instead something that *flows from* the sacrament.

And so the result is that the adding of water to the wine is not necessary for the sacrament.

**Reply to objection 1:** This passage from Cyprian should be understood in the sense in which we say that what cannot exist fittingly cannot exist. And so the comparison concerns what *it is fitting to do* and not what *has to be done*. For water belongs to the essence of the bread, but not to the essence of the wine.

**Reply to objection 2:** The effusion of the blood belongs directly to Christ's passion itself, since it is natural for blood to pour forth from a wounded human body. By contrast, the effusion of the water was necessary not to the passion, but in order to demonstrate the passion's effect, which is the washing away of sins and a cooling to counter the heat of excessive sensual desire (*refrigerium contra ardorem concupiscentiae*).

And that is why the water is not offered separately from the wine in this sacrament in the way that the wine is offered separately from the bread. Instead, the water is offered as mixed with the wine in order to show that the wine belongs to this sacrament *in its own right* as something that is necessary for it, whereas the water belongs to it insofar as it is *adjoined to* the wine.

**Reply to objection 3:** Since the mixing of water with the wine is not necessary for this sacrament, it does not matter, as far as *necessity* for the sacrament is concerned, what kind of water is mixed with wine, whether natural water or artificial water like water distilled from roses. However, as regards what is *fitting* for the sacrament, an individual would commit a sin if he mixed in anything other than natural and genuine water. For it was genuine water that flowed from the side of Christ hanging on the cross (and not phlegmatic humor, as some have claimed), thus showing that Christ's body was truly composed of the four elements—just as, according to Pope Innocent III in a certain decretal, the flowing blood shows that Christ's body was composed of the four humors.

By contrast, because the mixing of water with flour is *necessary* to this sacrament, as something that constitutes the substance of the bread, if water distilled from roses or any other liquid besides true water were mixed with the flour, the sacrament could not be confected with it, because it would not be true bread.

## Article 8

### Should the water be added in great quantity?

It seems that the water should be added in great quantity (*debeat aqua in magna quantitate apponi*):

**Objection 1:** Just as the blood flowed from Christ's side in a way that could be sensed, so too with the water; hence, John 19:35 says, "He who saw it has borne witness." But the water could not be sensed in this sacrament unless it were added in great quantity. Therefore, it seems that it should be added in great quantity.

**Objection 2:** A small amount of water is corrupted when mixed with a lot of wine. But what has been corrupted does not exist. Therefore, adding a small amount of water in this sacrament is the same as adding nothing at all. But it is illicit to add nothing. Therefore, it is illicit to add a small amount.

**Objection 3:** If it were sufficient to add a small amount, it would follow that it is sufficient for one drop of water to be dropped into an entire cask. But this seems laughable. Therefore, it is not sufficient for a small quantity to be added.

**But contrary to this:** *Extra, De Celebratione Missarum* says, “The pernicious abuse has grown in your country of adding water of a greater quantity than the wine in the sacrifice, when, according to the reasonable custom of the entire Church, more wine than water should be used.”

**I respond:** As Innocent III notes in a certain decretal, there are three opinions about the water added to the wine:

Some claim that the water added to the wine remains in its own right after the wine has been converted into blood. But this opinion cannot stand, since in the sacrament of the altar, after the consecration, there is nothing except the body and blood of Christ. As Ambrose explains in *De Officio*, “Before the blessing other species are named; after the blessing the body is signified.” Otherwise, [the sacrament] would not be adored with the veneration of *latria*.

And so others have claimed that just as the wine is converted into blood, so the water is converted into the water that flowed from the side of Christ. But it can make no sense to say this. For on this score, the water would be consecrated separately from the wine, just as the wine is consecrated separately from the bread.

And so, as Innocent himself explains, the more probable opinion is the one held by others who claim that the water is converted into wine and the wine is converted into blood. Now this could not be the case unless what was added was such a small amount of water that it would be converted into the wine. And that is why it is always safer to add just a little bit of water, especially if the wine is weak, since if water were added in such a large quantity that the species of the wine was destroyed, then the sacrament could not be brought to completion. That is why Pope Julius rebukes certain individuals “who all year long keep a linen cloth steeped in unfermented or partially fermented grape juice (*musto instinctum*) and at the time of sacrifice soak a part of it with water, and so make the offering.”

**Reply to objection 1:** It is sufficient for the signification of this sacrament that the water be sensed while it is being added to the wine, and it is not necessary for it to be able to be sensed after the mixing.

**Reply to objection 2:** If the water were not added in any way, then its signification would be totally excluded. But when it is converted into wine, what is signified is that the people are being incorporated into Christ.

**Reply to objection 3:** If water were added to a cask, it would not be sufficient for the signification of this sacrament. Instead, the water must be added to the wine in the actual celebration of the sacrament.