CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

Dogmatic and Moral

in Compendium

by Fr. Daniele Concina, of the Order of Preachers

BOOK X

On the Sacraments of the New Law

Books I-III from the first of the four tomes printed at Venice in 1761;
Books IX-XIII from the second of the two volumes printed at Bologna in 1760.
The English translation is from a friend of this library who wished to remain anonymous;
passages translated for the library from the print are marked (ed.).
Prepared for the Morals of the Church library, where the text may be read and searched online.

Contents

BOOK X: ON THE SACRAMENTS OF THE NEW LAW **7**

DISSERTATION I: On the Sacraments in general 8

Chapter I. Propositions condemned by the Church 92 (8)

Chapter II. The lax propositions of the Casuists 93 (9)

Chapter III. On the Sacraments of the new law instituted by Christ 96 (13)

Question 1. What is a Sacrament of the new law? 96 (13)

Question 2. What are the parts of the Sacraments of the new law? 96 (13)

Question 3. Did Christ the Lord determine the matter and form of Baptism and of the Eucharist? ... 96 (13)

Question 4. Did Christ determine the things and words of the other five Sacraments in species? ... 96 (13)

Question 5. What change of matter or of form renders a Sacrament null? 97 (14)

Question 6. In how many ways can a sacramental form be varied? 97 (14)

Question 7. Is it lawful in performing the Sacraments to use doubtful matter or form? 97 (14)

Question 8. Is the use of a conditional form lawful? 97 (15)

Question 9. How many are the Sacraments of the new law? 97 (15)

Question 10. What is the efficacy of the Sacraments in conferring grace? 97 (15)

Question 11. Do the Sacraments of the new law produce grace physically or morally? 98 (15)

Question 12. What is the grace which the Sacraments of the new law confer? 98 (15)

Question 13. Do the Sacraments of the new law, besides sanctifying grace, confer some peculiar grace which is called sacramental? ... 98 (16)

Question 14. Whether the Sacraments of the living can by accident produce first grace? ... 98 (16)

Question 15. Whether the Sacraments of the new law imprint a character? 98 (16)

Question 16. How do the Sacraments of the new law differ from the sacraments of the old law? ... 98 (16)

Question 17. Whether Christ the Lord immediately instituted all the Sacraments? 98 (16)

Chapter IV. On the ministers of the Sacraments 99 (16)

Question 1. Who are the lawful ministers of the Sacraments? 99 (16)

Question 2. Whether in performing the Sacraments an intention is required in the ministers? ... 99 (17)

Question 3. That a Sacrament may be valid, is there required in the minister faith, or the intention of producing the sacramental effect? ... 99 (18)

Question 4. Whether for the integrity of a Sacrament it is required that the minister intend to do what the Roman Church does? ... 100 (18)

Question 5. Whether an actual intention is necessary, or a virtual one suffices? 100 (18)

Question 6. Is a Sacrament administered under a conditional form valid? 100 (18)

Question 7. Do Priests sin mortally who, conscious to themselves of grave fault, administer the Sacraments by office? ... 100 (18)

Question 8. Does a Priest sin mortally who, guilty of mortal fault, administers the Eucharist? ... 100 (19)

Question 9. Does a Priest sin who hears confessions in mortal sin? 101 (19)
Question 10. Whether a minister conscious to himself of mortal sin is bound to confess sacramentally before he administer a Sacrament, if there be opportunity of a Confessor, and no necessity press of succouring one in danger? ... 101 (20)
Question 11. When, and to whom, ought the Sacraments to be administered? 101 (20)
Question 12. Are the Sacraments lawfully administered to the unworthy? 101 (20)
Question 13. Is it lawful to simulate the administration of the Sacraments? 102 (21)
Question 14. Is it lawful to seek the Sacraments from an unworthy minister? 102 (21)
DISSERTATION II: On Baptism, and Confirmation 22
Chapter I. The notion of Baptism, and its matter 102 (22)
Question 1. What is the Baptism of the new law? 102 (22)
Question 2. What is the matter of Baptism? 102 (22)
Question 3. Is the usage ancient, and to be approved, by which the Roman Church consecrates the water serving for Baptism? ... 103 (22)
Question 4. What water is to be called natural? 103 (22)
Question 5. What is the proximate matter of Baptism? 103 (22)
Question 6. Can an infant enclosed in the mother's womb be baptized, the mother's womb being washed? ... 103 (23)
Question 7. Is it lawful to cut open the womb of a woman despaired of as to health, that the infant may be baptized? ... 103 (23)
Chapter II. On the form, and on the threefold Baptism 104 (23)
Question 1. Is the form of words which the Latin Church uses lawful? 104 (23)
Question 2. Is it required for the validity of Baptism that the act of the baptizer be expressed by the word "I baptize" or "is baptized"? ... 104 (24)
Question 3. Would one who should deliberately omit the particle "I" in the form of Baptism sin gravely? ... 104 (24)
Question 4. Would one who should baptize with this form, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, in the name of the Son, in the name of the Holy Ghost," confer valid Baptism? ... 104 (24)
Question 5. Of how many kinds is Baptism? 105 (25)
Question 6. What dispositions are required in adults for undergoing martyrdom? 105 (25)
Chapter III. On the minister of Baptism, its institution, obligation, and necessity 105 (25)
Question 1. Of how many kinds is the minister of Baptism? 105 (25)
Question 2. Can one minister by a single aspersion baptize several? 105 (26)
Question 3. When was Baptism instituted? 106 (26)
Question 4. What is the necessity of receiving Baptism? 106 (26)
Question 5. At what time ought Baptism to be received? 106 (27)
Question 6. Does the precept of receiving Baptism oblige adults to receive Baptism as soon as they conveniently can? ... 106 (27)
Question 7. Can the infants of unbelievers be baptized, the parents resisting? 107 (27)
Chapter IV. On the dispositions of adults for receiving Baptism, and on its effects and ceremonies ... 107 (28)
Question 1. Are faith, sorrow for sins, and inchoate charity required in adults for rightly receiving Baptism? ... 107 (28)

Question 2. What are the effects of Baptism? 107 (28)
Question 3. Does Baptism received with fiction, the fiction receding, blot out sins? 108 (29)
Question 4. What are the ceremonies of Baptism? 108 (29)
Chapter V. On the obligation of the baptismal profession 109 (30)
Chapter VI. On the Sacrament of Confirmation 110 (32)
Question 1. Is Confirmation a Sacrament of the new law? 110 (32)
Question 2. What is the matter of this Sacrament? 110 (32)
Question 3. What is the form of the Sacrament of Confirmation? 111 (33)
Question 4. Who is the author of this Sacrament? 111 (33)
Question 5. Is the Bishop alone the ordinary minister of this Sacrament? 111 (33)
Question 6. Who are capable of receiving this Sacrament? 111 (33)
Question 7. What dispositions are required in adults to be confirmed? 111 (33)
Question 8. What are the effects of Confirmation? 111 (33)
Question 9. Is there given a precept of receiving this Sacrament? 112 (34)
Question 10. What are the rites of receiving this Sacrament? 112 (35)
DISSERTATION III: On the most august Sacrament of the Eucharist 36
Chapter I. The notion of the Eucharist, and its matter and form 113 (36)
Question 1. What is the Eucharist? 113 (36)
Question 2. Are wheaten bread alone and wine of the vine the matter of the Eucharist? ... 113 (36)
Question 3. Ought the bread to be consecrated to be unleavened or leavened? 113 (36)
Question 4. Is wine of the vine the matter of the Eucharist? 113 (36)
Question 5. Is water to be mingled with the wine in the consecration of the chalice? 113 (37)
Question 6. Are these dominical words alone, "This is my body," essential to the consecration of the eucharistic bread? ... 114 (37)
Question 7. Are these words alone, "This is the chalice of my blood," or "This is my blood," of the essence of the consecration of the chalice; or the others also which follow, "of the new and eternal," and so forth? ... 114 (37)
Chapter II. Certain questions which are wont to be raised concerning the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist ... 114 (38)
Question 1. Is Christ whole in every part of the species? 115 (39)
Question 2. Can the accidents, or sacramental species, be corrupted and nourish? 115 (39)
Question 3. Is Christ in the Eucharist to be adored with the worship of latria? 115 (39)
Chapter III. On the minister of the Eucharist, and on those to whom it ought to be administered ... 115 (39)
Question 1. Is a Priest alone the ordinary minister of dispensing the Eucharist? 115 (39)
Question 2. Is a Parish Priest bound in time of plague to communicate his parishioners with danger to his life? ... 116 (40)
Question 3. Is the Eucharist to be administered to little ones? 116 (40)
Question 4. Is the Eucharist to be granted to public sinners? 116 (40)
Question 5. Can a Priest, on account of fear of death or of notable infamy to himself, administer the Eucharist to a public sinner? ... 116 (41)
Chapter IV. On the necessity of this Sacrament, and its effects 116 (41)
Question 1. Is the Eucharist necessary by force of a divine precept? 117 (41)

Question 2. Is one who communicated a little before he fell into danger of death bound to take the sacred Viaticum again? ... 117 (41)
Question 3. Does this divine precept oblige more than once? ... 117 (41)
Question 4. Does this divine precept oblige that the Eucharist be taken under both species? ... 117 (41)
Question 5. What are the effects of the Eucharist? ... 117 (42)
Chapter V. On the dispositions for the Eucharist, and on frequent communion. Several opinions of certain men are refuted ... 117 (42)
Question 1. Is the precept of sending Confession before, on the part of one who is in mortal sin, divine or human? ... 118 (42)
Question 2. What is to be thought of the interpretation of some upon the precept of Trent of confessing as soon as possible? ... 118 (42)
Question 3. What is to be said of the interpretation of Fr. La Croix, Viva, and others upon the aforesaid decree of Trent? ... 118 (42)
Question 4. What of the contrition which Fr. Tamburini teaches is to be sent before by a layman conscious of mortal sin, necessity pressing? ... 118 (43)
Question 5. What is to be said of the opinion of those asserting that a Priest sinning mortally in the very celebration of Mass is not bound to confess as soon as possible? ... 119 (44)
Question 6. What is to be said of the opinion asserting that a case can be given in which one communicating in mortal sin does not commit a new sin? ... 119 (45)
Question 7. What is to be said of the dispositions of the body necessary for the Eucharist? ... 120 (45)
Question 8. Is it lawful to approach the Eucharist after conjugal intercourse? ... 120 (45)
Question 9. What is to be said of frequent communion? ... 120 (46)
DISSERTATION IV: On the Sacrifice of the Mass ... 47
Chapter I. The notion of sacrifice, and its necessity ... 121 (47)
Question 1. What is a sacrifice, and of how many kinds is it? ... 121 (47)
Question 2. Is it a dogma of faith that the Mass is a Sacrifice? ... 121 (47)
Question 3. Is the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass set in the oblation? ... 121 (47)
Chapter II. On the value of the Sacrifice of the Mass. For whom, and by what minister, it can be offered ... 122 (48)
Question 1. Is the value of the Sacrifice of the Mass infinite? ... 122 (48)
Question 2. What are the effects of the Sacrifice of the Mass? ... 122 (48)
Question 3. To whom and for whom is the Sacrifice of the Mass offered? ... 122 (49)
Question 4. Can the Sacrifice be offered for the souls detained in Purgatory? ... 123 (49)
Question 5. Who is the minister of the Sacrifice of the Mass? ... 123 (49)
Question 6. Do wicked Priests, heretics, schismatics, the suspended, the excommunicated, the degraded, validly perform the Sacrifice? ... 123 (49)
Chapter III. On alms for Masses to be celebrated ... 123 (50)
Question 1. By whom is the alms to be conferred upon a Priest celebrating Mass to be fixed? ... 123 (50)
Question 2. Is it lawful for a rich Priest to accept an alms that he may celebrate Mass? ... 123 (50)
Question 3. What Priests in celebrating afford a suspicion of simony? ... 123 (50)

Question 4. Can a Priest celebrate through another, retaining for himself part of the stipend received? ... 124 (50)
Question 5. Can a Priest accept a twofold stipend, one for the attendance, as it is called, at a designated church, the other for the application? ... 125 (52)
Question 6. Can several obligations be satisfied by a single Mass? ... 125 (52)
Question 7. On what days ought those who have the care of souls to apply the Mass for the flock committed to them? ... 126 (53)
Question 8. At what hour is it lawful to celebrate? ... 126 (54)
Question 9. When is it lawful to celebrate several times on the same day? ... 126 (54)
Question 10. In what place is one to celebrate? ... 126 (54)
Question 11. What is to be said of private Oratories? ... 126 (54)
Question 12. What is to be said of the consecration of a Church, and of its pollution? ... 127 (55)
Question 13. Is a Priest bound to offer Mass? ... 127 (55)
Chapter IV. On the rite, or ceremonies, and rubrics with which Mass ought to be celebrated ... 127 (55)
Question 1. Of how many kinds is the ceremonial of the Mass? ... 127 (55)
Question 2. Into how many parts is the Mass distributed? ... 128 (56)
Question 3. Is it a mortal sin to neglect the rubrics in celebrating Mass? ... 128 (56)
Question 4. Would one who should omit some part of the Mass sin mortally? ... 128 (56)

Book Ten — On the Sacraments of the New Law

Dissertation I — On the sacraments in general

Chapter I — Propositions condemned by the Church

Alexander VII condemned the following.

I. *A priest can lawfully accept a twofold stipend for the same Mass, by applying to the petitioner even that most special part of the fruit which corresponds to the celebrant himself, and this after the decree of Urban VIII.* This is the 8th.

II. *After the decree of Urban, a priest to whom Masses to be celebrated are delivered can satisfy through another, a lesser stipend being conferred upon him, another part of the stipend being retained for himself.* This is the 9th.

III. *It is not against justice to accept a stipend for several sacrifices and to offer one sacrifice; neither is it against fidelity, even if I promise, by a promise confirmed even by an oath, to him who gives the stipend, that I will offer it for no other.* This is the 10th.

IV. *The command of Trent made to a priest sacrificing of necessity in mortal sin, that he confess as soon as possible, is a counsel, not a precept.* This is the 38th.

V. *That particle "as soon as possible" is understood as when the priest shall confess at his own time.* This is the 39th.

Innocent XI proscribed the following.

VI. *It is not unlawful in conferring the sacraments to follow a probable opinion concerning the validity of the sacrament, the safer being left aside, unless law, agreement, or the danger of incurring grave loss forbid it. Hence a merely probable opinion is not to be used in the conferring of Baptism, of priestly Orders, or of the episcopate.* This is the 1st.

VII. *Urgent grave fear is a just cause of simulating the administration of the sacraments.* This is the 29th.

VIII. *Frequent confession and communion, even in those who live in the manner of the heathen, is a mark of predestination.* This is the 56th.

Alexander VIII the following.

IX. *They are to be judged sacrilegious who claim a right to receiving communion before they have done condign penance for their offences.* This is the 22nd.

X. *Similarly they are to be kept from holy communion in whom there is not yet the most pure love of God and free from every admixture.* This is the 23rd.

XI. *Baptism was valid which was sometimes conferred under this form: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, those words being omitted, I baptize thee.* This is the 29th.

XII. *Baptism is valid conferred by a minister who observes the whole external rite and form of baptizing; but within, in his heart, resolves with himself: I do not intend to do what the Church does.* This is the 30th.

Chapter II — The lax propositions of the casuists

I. Fr. La Croix, Book 6, part 1, no. 102: "It must be said … that he does not sin mortally who in mortal sin begins the form of a sacrament, provided that before the utterance of the last essential part he be in the state of grace; and whatever Aversa and others say to the contrary."

II. Fr. Matthew de Moya in his *Select Questions,* Vol. I, tract 4, Miscellany, question 2, § 3, nos. 13 and 14: "There is no reason why, on account of fear, at least of death, it should not be lawful to use simulation of this kind in all the sacraments. Hence if a heretic (not out of hatred of the faith) should threaten death to a priest unless he consecrated all the bread present in the market, he could utter the words of consecration without the intention of consecrating, without any sin against religion or justice, and without any stain of lying."

III. John Sánchez in his *Select Disputations,* disputation 44, no. 6: "Nor is it an objection that some adore such bread as consecrated: for it will be material idolatry, which the priest in that case is not bound to avoid."

IV. Fr. Jerome Llamas in his *Method,* part 1, chapter 1, § 5, and part 2, chapter 2, § 11, in Leander of the Most Holy Sacrament, part 1, tract 1, disputation 6, question 8: "For the administering of other sacraments, nay even of the sacred Eucharist to be given to others, we do not believe that the precept of contrition obliges: because he who administers a sacrament in mortal sin does not place an obstacle to grace … therefore it is not a new fault, since he who gives the sacrament is not the one receiving it." Granados in the same place reputes this opinion probable.

V. Torrecilla, Vol. II, *Sum,* tract 4, disputation 1, chapter 4, no. 5: "An infant in the mother's womb is capable of baptism, even if no part of him come forth, provided water can be introduced there."

VI. The same in the same place, disputation 10, chapter 7, no. 3: "It is no sin not to receive the sacrament of confirmation, even in one who can conveniently do so, unless he omit it out of contempt. Nor is he to be judged to contemn it, unless he not receive it either because he holds it of small moment, or unworthy of himself, or as childish."

VII. The same in the same place, chapter 3, no. 8: "By necessity of the sacrament it is not required in confirmation that the unction be made with the bishop's finger: for it suffices for validity that it be made with some instrument."

VIII. Fr. Dominic Viva in his *Course of Theology,* part 5, question 3, article 2, no. 6: "I answer with the common opinion in Diana … that it is not mortal to be unwilling to receive that sacrament of confirmation, contempt and scandal being cut off. Nay, from Trullench and Henríquez, against Navarrus, in Coninck, not even venial, since nowhere is there a precept concerning receiving it."

IX. Fr. La Croix, Book 6, part 1, doubt 3, no. 395, question 71: "What besides is to be noted concerning the necessity of confirmation? ANSWER. That there was formerly an ecclesiastical precept that confirmation be received, Dicastillo here gathers, no. 105, from various councils and the sayings of the holy Fathers. But he rightly teaches at doubt 10, with the common opinion, that this precept has now ceased through desuetude."

X. Fr. Thomas Tamburini, Book 3, *On Confirmation,* chapter 3, § 4, no. 2: "Nevertheless the same men do not sin, neither mortally nor venially, if, apart from contempt or something similar, they neglect it when occasion is given: because concerning this no precept appears — which is the opinion of Suárez

against Cajetan and some others … thinking it to be venial. Whence credence is not to be given to Leander … who draws Suárez to himself, as though granting that it is venial."

XI. Sylvester, under the word *Eucharist* 3, § 1: "It seems mortal in such an article (of death) for one contemning, and therefore neglecting, to communicate … but because the taking of the Eucharist is not of necessity of salvation, but from the statute of the Church, therefore it is truer that this is not mortal, where negligence alone is the cause."

XII. Fr. Paul Layman, Book 5, tract 4, chapter 5, no. 4: "A sick man a little before, say eight or ten days, communicated, when he was well, thinking nothing of the danger of death: then …"

"then he is not bound to communicate again, having fallen into sickness."

XIII. Fr. Didacus Nuño Cabezudo, part 3, *On St. Thomas,* question 72, article 8, doubt 1: "The faithful have no divine precept of receiving the sacrament of confirmation. … No precept has been laid down by the Church concerning the sacrament of confirmation. … Speaking of itself, it is not a sin, even venial, to be unwilling to receive this sacrament."

XIV. Fr. Matthew de Moya in his *Select Questions,* Vol. I, tract 4, Miscellany, *On the Sacraments,* question 11, no. 7: "Whence is easily dissolved the foundation of those asserting that it is a venial sin, on the ground that it is a certain spiritual prodigality to deprive oneself of so great a fruit of this sacrament (of confirmation) when a man can conveniently receive it. Which reason indeed proves too much, and therefore nothing."

XV. The same in the same place, no. 11: "From the fact that no precept of confirmation is given, speaking of itself, they infer that its omission is not venial. … Therefore from the fact that no precept is given forbidding the reception of orders without confirmation preceding, it is similarly inferred that it is not venial to receive them before confirmation."

XVI. The Fathers of Salamanca, tract 1, chapter 7, point 2, no. 107: "Nay, if he hear a sacramental confession only in mortal sin, provided he have the purpose of confessing, or of making an act of contrition, before he utter the words of absolution (he does not sin mortally), as Henríquez and Diana say."

XVII. Fr. Leander, tract 7, disputation 9, question 6: "But I answer with a distinction. For if a particle (in the words of consecration) be omitted out of formal contempt, it will be mortal to omit it: because contempt formally is to set oneself directly against a superior's precept, which is mortal. But if it be omitted out of material contempt, namely because the precept is concerning a light matter, then it will not be mortal to omit it."

XVIII. The same in the place cited, disputation 7, question 6: "In the case in which a husband should threaten death to his wife unless she communicate, that thus he might cast off a suspicion against her: then indeed she will be very well able to simulate that she receives the Eucharist, just as she can simulate that she confesses sacramentally, since in that case she can very well without the crime of lying use equivocation: therefore the priest also can simulate that he puts the host into her mouth."

XIX. Fr. Claude La Croix, Book 6, part 1, *On the Eucharist,* no. 546, § 4: "Suárez, Vásquez, Sá, Marchant, Nuño, de Lugo, Diana, Dicastillo, Aversa, John Sánchez, Gobat, Pellizarius, Leander teach — on this almost all agree, says Moya, tract 4, question 6, § 1, citing very many — that a priest is not bound by this precept if, having opportunity of a confessor, he has not confessed out of malice:

because although he sin more gravely, nevertheless in positive precepts the argument from the lesser to the greater, or to the like, does not hold, as de Lugo with the common opinion says in his *Moral Answers,* Book 4, doubt 47, no. 5. But Trent speaks of him who, necessity urging, celebrated without previous confession. But if there was opportunity of a confessor, there was no urgent necessity of celebrating without previous confession. Therefore neither then will he be bound to confess as soon as possible. This opinion is probable."

XX. Fr. Thomas Tamburini, Book *On the Method of Communicating,* chapter 1, § 6, no. 50: "In a case of doubt whether some words of a law import an obliging precept or a counsel, the Doctors lay down as a certain rule that they are to be reputed counsels and not precepts: and the reason is, that since the law is grave and burdensome, it is always to be understood in the kinder part for the subjects. Add that in doubt the condition of the possessor is the better. Therefore in doubt whether a law be obliging or not obliging, the condition of human liberty is the better, which is immune from such an obligation."

No. 51: "Thirdly, because it is desirable, as Navarrus earnestly desires, that no one be obliged by lawgivers to sin, it helps to diminish human laws obliging under precept, lest by so great a multitude of precepts we be made worse than the Hebrews. Wherefore it is also worth while to diminish this precept of which we treat (of confessing as soon as possible)."

XXI. The same Tamburini in the place cited, § 7, no. 56: "Concerning a layman there is no difficulty: for it is enough if he elicit it immediately before the taking itself: and because the taking, or eating, is substantially done when we swallow the food or send it down, but not while it is in the mouth, when the taking is only inchoate, therefore I think it most probable that it suffices that the act of contrition be made when the most sacred host is held in the mouth. So Ilsung, de Lugo, *On the Eucharist,* disputation 13, no. 20, Hurtado *On the Eucharist,* disputation 8, and others."

XXII. The same in the same place, no. 59: "Although some with Layman assert that a priest defiled with mortal crime offends mortally if he hold out the Eucharist to the faithful, nevertheless some deservedly deny it, as Vásquez, whom de Lugo cites and follows, disputation 8, *On the Sacraments in Common,* section 2, because then the priest does not confect the sacrament but only dispenses what is consecrated, for which so great worthiness is by no means required. And the same is of a deacon, when by the priest's special commission he holds out the sacred Eucharist to others: since then he does not confect but only dispenses. If therefore that is probable, how much more probable will it become that it is not a mortal fault merely to touch?"

XXIII. Fr. Leander, tract 7, disputation 7, question 30: "*Whether a priest who in the very action of sacrificing recalls a mortal sin, or perhaps commits it, is bound afterwards by force of the said precept to confess as soon as possible?* I answer probably that he is not bound by that precept, because the Council spoke of a priest who, *necessity urging, celebrated without previous confession* — that is, of a priest who, compelled by necessity, did not send confession before, ere he approached to celebrate the Sacrifice: for this those words *previous confession* clearly signify, that is, confession before Mass; but not of a priest *who in celebrating commits a sin, or recalls one.* Therefore however much he then consecrate and communicate without confession, he will not be bound afterwards to confess as soon as possible. So Vásquez, disputation 108, chapter 3, no. 10; Sayre; Diana."

XXIV. The same Leander in the same place, question 32: "If a priest is poor, and lives on the accustomed alms of the Mass, there is truly found in him a bodily necessity, which is sufficient for celebrating without previous confession."

XXV. Fr. Tamburini, *On the Method of Communicating,* Book 1, chapter 1, § 10, no. 71: "Whether there be a case in which a man can communicate without confession, and even without contrition, and consequently in mortal sin? … So kindly are the bowels of the Lord's mercy that he does not disdain sometimes to excuse our obstinacy. For I find one case or another in which a man can take the most pure communion in sin without sin."

XXVI. The same in the place cited, no. 72: "For from the aforesaid it is established that a priest who, the Mass having been begun in good faith, recalls himself guilty of a mortal fault, ought to elicit an act at least of what he reckons contrition. But now if he cannot, or find that act very difficult to himself, what shall he do? He cannot confess, he is by no means able to be contrite, to leave the Sacrifice begun is most difficult on account of the infamy resulting to him. What therefore remains to be extorted from a soul so affected? I judge it probable, from the opinion of some, that this man will not sin mortally if with such a conscience of mortal sin, and with such sorrow as he can then elicit, he continue the Mass, consecrate, and communicate. So Vásquez, *On the Eucharist,* disputation 207, chapter 1, no. 34; Hurtado, disputation 9, *On the Eucharist,* difficulty 1; de Lugo, *On the Sacraments,* disputation 9, section 1, no. 8. The reason is, because the precept of communicating worthily does not seem to bind the faithful so strictly as to compel a priest with so great disgrace to himself to depart from the sacred rite begun. But then such a priest will not acquire grace, yet nevertheless will not sin."

XXVII. The same Tamburini in the same place, no. 73: "And the same will be of a layman who, being now about to receive the holy synaxis before the linen cloth, and unable under any pretext to remove himself, recalls a mortal sin and cannot be contrite. So there: for the reason is equal. Let the scrupulous, and those always timid of mind, note this doctrine."

XXVIII. The same, Book 3, *On the Method of Celebrating Mass,* chapter 1, § 5, no. 15: "If a man, being a procurator that a hundred Masses, for example, be celebrated, which Masses in this city are wont to be said for, say, two hundred *julii* — if a man, I say, by his own industry should send or go to another city, where within the time demanded they may be said for a hundred *julii* — for I think it not improbable that such a procurator can retain for himself the other hundred. The reason is that a parity can be taken from a servant who by extraordinary industry (for to the ordinary and moral he is obliged by his very service) by his own labour buys things for less than they are commonly worth in the market: for he can retain what is over, as the fruit of his own industry. In a like manner therefore in our case."

XXIX. Fr. Dominic Viva in his *Tract* on proposition 9 of Alexander VII, no. 8: "Besides, if the collectors of alms for Masses be priests, and Masses to be celebrated are not delivered to them, but they bear themselves as laymen who take care of the celebration of the Masses, they will be able, from Navarrus, Córdoba, and Tamburini, probably against Pellizarius and Soto, Book 9 *On Justice,* question 3, to take a moderate wage for their labour out of what is given for the Masses, since this seems lawful by the law of nature."

XXX. Fr. La Croix, Book 4, no. 1341: "The Pontiffs know that the opinion which denies an obligation of this kind (of interior attention) is defended; and yet, though they easily could, they do not contradict it. Therefore they acknowledge that that law is not certain: therefore neither does it oblige; but our liberty is in possession against it."

Chapter III — On the sacraments of the new law instituted by Christ

I. QUESTION I. *What is a sacrament of the new law?* ANSWER. It is *a sign of a sacred thing inasmuch as it sanctifies men,* says St. Thomas, III, q. 60, art. 2. A sacrament therefore is reduced to the genus of *sensible sign*. But a sign, adds St. Augustine, Book 2, *On Christian Doctrine,* chapter 1, *is a thing which, beyond the appearance which it presents to the senses, causes something else to come into knowledge*. One sign is *insensible,* such as is the character which Baptism, Confirmation, and Order imprint; another *sensible,* which is perceived by the senses, such as is the baptismal ablution. Again, one sign is *natural,* another instituted by free will.

II. The sacraments of the new law are signs not speculative but practical, instituted by God, which signify the grace which they produce.

III. QUESTION II. *What are the parts of the sacraments of the new law?* ANSWER. Two: matter and form. These names do not occur among the ancient Fathers; nevertheless the Church, both Greek and Latin, adopted these words as accommodated to the explaining of sacramental things. Under the name of matter are understood not only the sensible things themselves, but also sensible actions, such as unction, ablution, confession, consent expressed by nod or by word. One matter is *remote,* as water in Baptism; another *proximate,* as the ablution.

IV. QUESTION III. *Did Christ the Lord determine the matter and form of Baptism and of the Eucharist?* ANSWER. All theologians affirm that Christ determined the matter and form of this twofold sacrament not only in general, but in species also. That water was determined by Christ as the matter of Baptism, St. John testifies, chapter 3: *Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost,* and so forth. That Christ likewise determined bread and wine as the matter of the Eucharist, St. Matthew, chapter 26, and the other Evangelists testify. The form of Baptism Christ designated in these words: *Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* Matthew 28. The form of the Eucharist he determined, Matthew 26: *This is my body. This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.* And as regards this there is no disagreement among theologians.

V. QUESTION IV. *Did Christ determine the things and words of the other five sacraments in species?* ANSWER. There is a twofold opinion among Catholic theologians. The first affirms it. For the matter of Confirmation is had in Acts, chapter 8: *Then they laid their hands upon them.* The remote matter of the sacrament of penance is sins; the proximate, the acts of the penitent; the form, the words of the priest. The matter of extreme unction is the unction of oil; the form, prayer: *Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.* James 5. The matter of Order is the imposition of hands; the form, prayer: *These they set before the apostles: and they praying, imposed hands upon them.* Acts 6. The matter of matrimony is the mutual delivery of bodies: *They shall be two in one flesh.* Of the form it will be spoken in its place.

VI. It is therefore plain that Christ the Lord determined the matter of these five sacraments in species. For he himself is the institutor of all the sacraments, as Trent defined, session 7, canon 1: *If*

anyone shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema. And although the Council did not define that Christ was the immediate institutor, it nevertheless seems necessarily to follow.

VII. The authors of the second opinion object, contending that Christ designated the matter of Confirmation and of Order in general, but not in species. Since, they say, no mention is had of chrism or unction as the matter of Confirmation in Acts, chapter 8. Nor in the first seven centuries of the Church were the instruments to be touched held out as the matter of the sacrament of Order. The theologians of the former opinion answer that the imposition of hands is the matter as it were essential of each sacrament; but that the unction and the instruments are accidental matter, or an accidental rite added by the Church. They add that in Confirmation chrism was employed in the first centuries of the Church, and that the instruments are a rite of the Latin Church, since the Greek Church confers sacred Orders by the imposition of hands alone. And yet the Latin Church holds the sacred Ordinations of the Greek Church as valid. Therefore in each Church the imposition of hands is the essential matter, and the rest are accidental rites.

VIII. QUESTION V. *What change of matter or of form renders a sacrament null?* ANSWER. Change is twofold: one substantial, the other accidental. Substantial change alone renders a sacrament null. This change can be made in various ways. Water frozen and turned into snow or hail, although physically the same, nevertheless in the theological sense brings in a substantial change in respect of Baptism, since it is inept for the use of washing. Blessed chrism changed into chrism not blessed brings in a substantial change. Natural wine changed into distilled spirit is not apt matter for the Eucharist. Fr. Claude La Croix, Book 6, part 1, no. 24, defends that frozen wine is matter for the Eucharist, and praises Fr. Suárez. Other theologians deny it.

IX. QUESTION VI. *In how many ways can a sacramental form be varied?* ANSWER. Soto enumerates eight. First, by a diverse language. Second, by the addition of some word. Third, by the taking away of some word. Fourth, by the corruption of words. Fifth, by the transposition of words. Sixth, by the interpolation of words. Seventh, by synonymous words. Eighth, by equivocal words. Diversity of language and diverse synonyms bring in only an accidental change. The same is to be said of the transposition of words, and of an addition which does not take away the former sense. The interruption of words likewise does not bring in an absolutely substantial change, unless it destroy the sense. The corruption of words at the beginning of a word takes away the sense, as is plain in the word *Patris,* in which if you change the letter P into M, the word *matris* results. But at the end of a word a substantial change is commonly not made. That you may be able to discern whether the change be substantial or accidental, hold before your eyes the obvious sense of the words. When this is not changed, the change is accidental. Let this other rule cleave to your memory: *In conferring the sacraments, while the question is of validity, the safer part is to be embraced.* But any deliberate change, whether in the matter or in the form of the sacraments, carries with it a greater or lesser fault according to the diversity of the change.

X. QUESTION VII. *Is it lawful in performing the sacraments to use doubtful matter or form?* ANSWER. In sacraments which are necessary by necessity of means to salvation, such as are Baptism and Penance, the use of doubtful matter or form is lawful when extreme necessity urges, as theologians commonly teach. But outside the case of extreme necessity such use is unlawful; nay, even with extreme

necessity urging, such use is unlawful in those sacraments which are not necessary by necessity of means to salvation.

XI. QUESTION VIII. *Is the use of a conditional form lawful?* ANSWER. The conditional form is this: *If thou art not yet baptized, I baptize thee,* and so forth. It is agreed among theologians that in the first centuries of the Church the conditional form was unknown. This began to obtain about the thirteenth century of the Church; at length in the fourteenth century the custom of this conditional form, extreme necessity urging, became common among all the Churches of the Latins, and was inserted into the body of law on the authority of Gregory IX. First this form was employed in the conferring of Baptism. Before Trent there is no mention of that form in the administration of Penance. After Trent several authors began to employ it even outside the case of necessity, as when confessors doubt whether the penitent be sufficiently contrite. Which custom I do not approve, and it will be rejected in its place. With extreme necessity therefore urging, the use of the conditional form is lawful in the administration of Baptism. Of the sacrament of Penance it will be spoken below.

XII. QUESTION IX. *How many are the sacraments of the new law?* ANSWER. The Lutherans and Calvinists today admit only two sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist. Their error the Council of Trent condemned, session 7, and defined that there are seven sacraments of the Catholic Church, which are *Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony.* Obvious are the testimonies of the Scriptures by which this sevenfold number is proved, which for brevity's sake I pass over.

XIII. QUESTION X. *What is the efficacy of the sacraments in conferring grace?* ANSWER. The Council of Trent, session 7, canon 8, defined these things: *If anyone shall say that grace is not conferred by the sacraments of the new law themselves* ex opere operato, *but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for obtaining grace, let him be anathema.* The manner of producing grace is twofold, namely *ex opere operantis* and *ex opere operato.* It is produced *ex opere operantis* when God confers it in view of the faith, piety, or merit of him who receives or administers the sacrament. We say that grace is produced *ex opere operato* when it is produced by the force and efficacy of the external sacramental sign itself, instituted by Christ the Lord and applied in a congruous manner, apart from the merit of the recipient or of the administrator. It is nevertheless necessarily required that a man about to receive the sacraments should in fact prepare his soul by dispositions of faith and piety.

XIV. Ignorantly and malignantly do the heretics carp at this phrase *ex opere operato,* since it is excellent and necessary for confuting their error and for showing that the sacraments of the new law are not mere external signs, but efficacious signs which by their own force derived from Christ's passion produce grace. See more in Vol. VIII, Book 1, sole dissertation, chapter 8.

XV. QUESTION XI. *Do the sacraments of the new law produce grace physically or morally?* ANSWER. St. Thomas and all his disciples defend that the sacraments of the new law, which, as Trent defined, produce grace *ex opere operato,* are instruments physically concurring to the production of grace. This opinion is the more conformable to Trent, and seems the more probable to me. But since it is scholastic and of little use for the forming of morals, I do not discuss it further. See more in the place cited.

XVI. QUESTION XII. *What is the grace which the sacraments of the new law confer?* ANSWER. Grace is twofold, habitual and actual. The former indeed inhering in the soul and permanent; the latter is

called a transient motion. The grace which is conferred by force of the sacraments is something intrinsic and inhering in the soul, distinct from a flowing and transitory motion, as was defined in the Council of Trent, session 6, chapter 7, against the heretics who blurt out that the wicked are justified by an exterior imputation alone. *If anyone shall say that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and charity which is poured forth in their hearts and INHERES in them, let him be anathema.* More fully does he explain this at chapter 7. The Council abstained from the word *habit* and *quality;* but it defined that grace is something intrinsically inhering in the soul.

XVII. QUESTION XIII. *Do the sacraments of the new law, besides sanctifying grace, confer some peculiar grace which is called sacramental?* ANSWER. Theologians distinguish a twofold grace. One common to all the sacraments, the other proper to each. The common opinion is that the individual sacraments, besides the grace common to all the sacraments, confer some peculiar grace. The notion of that peculiar grace is hidden from us. The sacraments confer it of themselves when there is altogether the same disposition on the part of the recipients. But if the disposition be diverse, they produce it greater or less.

XVIII. QUESTION XIV. *Whether the sacraments of the living can by accident produce first grace?* ANSWER. The sacraments *of the dead* are Baptism and Penance, which of themselves produce first grace. The other sacraments are called *of the living,* because they presume men alive in grace; and these of themselves confer second grace. Theologians dispute whether these sacraments of the living can by accident confer first grace. The common opinion affirms it with St. Thomas, III, q. 79, art. 3.

XIX. QUESTION XV. *Whether the sacraments of the new law imprint a character?* ANSWER. Besides the effect of grace, three sacraments of the new law — Baptism, Confirmation, and Order — imprint a character, as all Catholics teach against the innovators and heretics, whose error Trent condemned, session 7, canon 9. That character is something real and permanent in the soul indelibly. The curious and useless questions of the scholastics on this matter I pass over.

XX. QUESTION XVI. *How do the sacraments of the new law differ from the sacraments of the old law?* ANSWER. The evangelical sacraments differ on several titles from the Mosaic sacraments. The sacraments of the old law conferred grace *ex opere operantis* only, as the common opinion teaches; but the evangelical produce it *ex opere operato,* as we have seen. I omit many other differences.

XXI. QUESTION XVII. *Whether Christ the Lord immediately instituted all the sacraments?* ANSWER. Some of the ancient scholastics maintained that the Apostles by Christ's concession instituted some sacraments. But the common and true opinion teaches that all and singular the sacraments were immediately instituted by Christ the Lord. Innumerable are the testimonies of the Scriptures which prove this. St. Paul, 1 Corinthians 3, says: *What then is Apollo? and what is Paul? The ministers of him whom you have believed.* And again, chapter 4: *Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God.* And at last, session 7, canon 1, Trent defines: *If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, let him be anathema.*

Chapter IV — On the ministers of the sacraments

I. QUESTION I. *Who are the lawful ministers of the sacraments?* ANSWER. Man alone, a wayfarer, is a fit minister of the sacraments. Not all, however, but only those who, lawfully ordained in the Church,

have the power of administering the sacraments, as all Catholics teach against the Lutherans.

II. QUESTION II. *Whether in performing the sacraments an intention is required in the minister?* ANSWER. Intention is a purpose of the will by which the minister deliberates to confer the sacrament. Theologians distinguish a threefold intention. One is called *habitual,* which is a certain prompt facility of operating. Another *actual,* which is a present application of mind and attention to the work which is in fact being done; for example, a priest while he confers a sacrament actually thinks of conferring it, and in fact intends to administer it. The third at last is *virtual,* which flows from a preceding act and which has not been retracted by a contrary intention, nor interrupted for a long time.

III. It is agreed among all Catholics that a habitual intention does not suffice for performing a sacrament, nor is an actual one necessary, but a virtual one suffices. Luther taught that ministers confer the sacraments even if they baptize in jest and in play, and betray themselves as buffoons and mimes. This error Leo X proscribed, and at last Trent, session 7, canon 11, defined: *If anyone shall say that in ministers, while they confect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema.*

IV. Theologians dispute whether, besides the intention which they call *exterior,* which arises from words seriously uttered, an interior intention of mind is necessary. Some denied it, contending that a minister validly performs a sacrament while he seriously utters the necessary words, although interiorly he say: *I will not perform the sacrament*.

V. This opinion I reject. Since either the exterior administration of a sacrament performed according to the rite instituted by Christ makes the sacrament valid by its own nature, every internal intention of the minister being altogether excluded, or not. If the first, then in no way does the administration of the sacraments depend upon the interior intention of the minister. But this is condemned by Trent. If the second, then the minister's intention is necessary. Again, either a minister seriously uttering the form and applying the sacramental matter according to the lawful rite can intend the opposite of that which the Church does, or not. If he cannot, but, the external serious administration being posited, is compelled to will to do that which the Church does, the Tridentine canon is altogether superfluous. For it is in vain enjoined that something be posited which the minister cannot omit. According to the opposite opinion, the external serious administration being posited, the minister necessarily intends to do what the Church does: because this exterior serious administration collides with and routs the contrary internal intention. Therefore in vain does Trent require the minister's intention. But it does require it. Therefore the opposite opinion is false. According to the system of our adversaries the Tridentine canon should have been framed thus: *If anyone shall say that in ministers, while they confect the sacraments, a jesting administration suffices and a serious one is not required, let him be anathema.* What of this, that Trent, session 14, canon 9, condemned a jesting administration, and by another canon already transcribed requires the minister's intention? Two things therefore the Council necessarily asserts: a serious administration and an interior intention of the minister.

VI. Alexander VIII proscribed the following thesis, no. 30: *Baptism is valid conferred by a minister who observes the whole external rite and form of baptizing; but within, in his heart, resolves with himself: I do not intend to do what the Church does.* Some answer that the French canonists do not hold as ratified Roman decrees which do not proximately emanate from the Supreme Pontiff. But this answer is futile. Sery, Milante, and Le Drou reply that the thesis is deservedly proscribed, because it is absolute and comprehends every rite, whether jesting or serious. But this answer seems false. There is condemned

in this thesis the doctrine by which it is taught that the intention is not required. What then? Do you cavil childishly about the external serious administration, if the proscribed thesis plainly excludes the interior intention of the mind? I should be inept if I drew out this question further. Read Vol. VIII, sole dissertation, chapter 11, where you will find all the sophisms of our adversaries overthrown.

VII. QUESTION III. *That a sacrament may be valid, is there required in the minister faith, or the intention of producing the sacramental effect?* ANSWER. The opinion of the Church has always been that faith is not required in the minister for the valid conferring of a sacrament, and that it is validly conferred by a heretic and an unbeliever, provided the evangelical rite be observed. In the time of St. Cyprian this truth had not been defined: therefore the holy Martyr refuted the letters of Pope St. Stephen. All likewise confess that the intention of producing the sacramental effects is not necessary in the minister.

VIII. QUESTION IV. *Whether for the integrity of a sacrament it is required that the minister intend to do what the Roman Church does?* ANSWER. The common and true opinion denies it: for it is enough that the minister will in general to do what the Church of Christ does: because this general intention is not impeded by a private error, by which a man believes the Lutheran or Calvinist Church to be orthodox, since the minister acts not as a private person but as a public one, nor can his private error infect the work of God.

IX. QUESTION V. *Whether an actual intention is necessary, or a virtual one suffices?* ANSWER. It has been said above that a habitual intention does not suffice, nor is an actual one required, but a virtual one suffices and is necessary. How this virtual intention perseveres, and how long it lasts unretracted, can scarcely be explained; but it can be gathered from circumstances at the judgment of prudent men. He who, seized by sleep, drunkenness, or madness, baptizes or consecrates, and so forth, although before he fell into drunkenness he deliberately determined to baptize, does not baptize, does not consecrate: because a sacramental action must necessarily be human; but the action of a drunken or demented man is the action of a man, but not human, as the common and true opinion teaches.

X. QUESTION VI. *Is a sacrament valid administered under a conditional form?* ANSWER. Either the condition is concerning a past thing, as *if thou art not baptized, I baptize thee;* or concerning a present thing, as *if thou art capable, I baptize thee;* or concerning a future thing, as *if tomorrow thou shalt have restored another's property, I absolve thee.* That the sacrament is valid under a condition concerning a past or present thing, if the condition be true, but not if false, all teach. Under a future condition a sacrament cannot be performed. Since while the matter is applied and the form uttered, the present intention is suspended: if at a future time the condition shall be, then the matter and the form will not be present.

XI. QUESTION VII. *Do priests sin mortally who, conscious to themselves of grave fault, administer the sacraments by office?* ANSWER. All affirm it, and this St. Paul plainly teaches, 1 Timothy 3: *Let them first be proved, and so let them minister, having no crime.* And the Council of Trent, session 23, chapter 7, declares that *this proving is necessary, so that no one conscious to himself of mortal sin, however contrite he may seem to himself, ought to approach the holy Eucharist without previous sacramental confession; which this holy Synod has decreed to be perpetually observed by all Christians, even by those priests upon whom it lies by office to celebrate.*

XII. We say that this sin is mortal. Let the Tridentine Catechism be read, part 2, § 15. He nevertheless who, not by office but with necessity urging, administers baptism while stained with grave fault, whether priest or layman, does not sin mortally, as St. Thomas teaches, III, q. 64, art. 6, reply 3. A priest nevertheless administering the sacrament of Penance even to a dying man ought to elicit an act of contrition, if he be conscious to himself of mortal sin. A priest who celebrates unworthily perpetrates a twofold crime: one, because he confects unworthily; another, because he unworthily receives the sacrament.

XIII. QUESTION VIII. *Does a priest sin mortally who, guilty of mortal fault, administers the Eucharist?* ANSWER. Fr. La Croix in the place cited, no. 94, with Vásquez, de Lugo, Amicus, Bernal, Sporer, Ilsung, Diana, and others teaches that it is probable that this man does not sin mortally; and at the same time adds that it is probable, according to Suárez, Valentia, Gonet, and others, that he does sin mortally. Fr. Viva, question 1, article 4, no. 4, says: *It does not seem improbable which many and grave authors teach … in Diana, that a priest administering the Eucharist in mortal sin does not sin mortally.* The Roman Ritual published by order of Paul V decrees these things at no. 1: *If therefore a priest shall have been conscious to himself of mortal sin (which God forbid), let him not dare to approach to the administration of the sacrament, unless he first repent in his heart. But if he have opportunity of a confessor, and the reason of time and place bear it, it is fitting that he confess.* There is added the Catechism of the Council of Trent, part 2, chapter 1, § 26, where these things are laid down: *Pastors and other ministers of the sacraments … ought always to remember that the sacraments never indeed lose the divine power which is in them; but that to those who administer them impurely they bring eternal ruin and death. For holy things (which it behoves to admonish once and again and more often) must be holily and religiously handled.*

XIV. What then do Frs. La Croix and Viva obtrude — *grave authors*? Who are these grave authors? Are they to be preferred to the Roman Ritual and to the Roman or Tridentine Catechism? These are the grave authors whom we ought to follow, as the Church admonishes us. By right therefore the aforesaid opinion is to be rejected as false. I reckon false also the other opinion of the same Fr. La Croix, who in the place cited, no. 96, asserts that a bishop does not sin mortally who consecrates chrism in mortal sin.

XV. QUESTION IX. *Does a priest sin who hears confessions in mortal sin?* ANSWER. Someone thinks that *he does not sin mortally who in mortal sin begins the form of a sacrament, provided that before the utterance of the last essential part he be in the state of grace.* Which here we ought the more to wonder at — the force of speculation or the novelty of the doctrine — let others judge. Does a priest not sin who, polluted with grave crime, begins the sacramental form? Is not one beginning the form a minister of Christ? Why will that beginning not be sacrilegious? While he begins it in mortal sin, he exposes himself to the most grave danger of completing it in mortal sin. Will he in an instant elicit an act of perfect contrition, so difficult? But why do I refute at greater length an opinion collapsing of itself?

XVI. Fr. La Croix contends also that a deacon solemnly administering the Eucharist by office does not sin mortally, though he be in mortal sin. This opinion likewise I repute false, and the opposite St. Thomas teaches in Book 4, distinction 24, question 1, article 3, question 5: *But whosoever handles any sacred office with mortal sin, there is no doubt that he does it unworthily. Whence it is plain that he sins mortally.*

XVII. Cajetan, Merbesius, Farvacques, Tournely, Bouchat, and Henry of St. Ignatius teach that preachers stained with mortal sin sin mortally while preaching the word of God. This same opinion

St. Thomas seems to teach in Book 4, distinction 19, question 2, article 1, reply 2. See Vol. VIII, Book 1, sole dissertation, chapter 11, no. 4.

XVIII. QUESTION X. *Whether a minister conscious to himself of mortal sin is bound to confess sacramentally before he administer a sacrament, if there be opportunity of a confessor and no necessity urge of succouring one in peril?* ANSWER. Many deny it, especially Fr. Viva, question 1, article 4, no. 4, where he says that it is enough if he be contrite, and that there is no precept of confessing. Is there no precept? Is not this a precept: *Holy things must be holily handled?* By contrition he is made holy. But perfect contrition is needed. That this perfect contrition is most difficult to a sinner all teach, and especially the Tridentine Catechism, part 2, § 36. And Fr. Viva himself, tract 5, reputes imperfect contrition itself so difficult that he excludes it from the sacrament of Penance. The aforesaid opinion therefore I repute false and adverse to the Tridentine Catechism and to the graver theologians. There is added that contrition does not abolish sin save with the desire of the sacrament. Can this desire be presumed in a minister who, having both opportune time and the opportunity of a confessor, deliberately omits the sacrament? The Council of Trent, session 13, chapter 7, plainly defines that sacramental confession is to be sent before by a priest conscious to himself of mortal sin, *however contrite he may seem to himself;* and it adds that if opportunity of a confessor be lacking, let him confess as soon as possible. And this is not a counsel, but a precept to be fulfilled at the first opportunity. The opposite Alexander VII condemned, proposition 38. And the Catechism of the Council of Trent, part 2, chapter 4, § 45, in set words asserts this same thing of a priest conscious to himself of grave fault: *When we administer or receive the sacraments, sacramental confession is not to be omitted.* The same the Roman Ritual made plain, whose words I gave above.

XIX. QUESTION XI. *When and to whom ought the sacraments to be administered?* ANSWER. Parish priests are bound by divine law to administer the sacraments to their own parishioners, as Trent declares, session 23, chapter 1. In time of plague they are bound to exercise this office with danger of life. Many limit this to two sacraments, Baptism and Penance; but the restriction is unjust. Why ought they not to administer the sacred viaticum and extreme unction? Not only in time of plague, but also of persecution, parish priests are bound to assist their own sheep. Parish priests failing in time of plague, private priests ought, even with danger of life, to administer the sacraments to those in extreme need. And to this above all are the mendicant priests bound, since they are *the co-operators of bishops and parish priests, and their auxiliary forces.* For to this pertains their institute, and to this end are they fed by the alms of the faithful.

XX. QUESTION XII. *Are the sacraments lawfully administered to the unworthy?* ANSWER. All deny it, and this Christ expressly forbids: *Give not that which is holy to dogs.* To a hidden sinner nevertheless publicly asking, the sacraments are not to be denied, just as Christ the Lord did not deny the Eucharist to the faithless Judas. But to a sinner asking secretly they ought to be denied, unless he give signs of penitence. But to public sinners the sacraments are to be denied both privately and publicly: as to comedians, to mimes, to women players or harlots, to female dancers in the theatres, to public concubinaries, to usurers, to adulterers.

XXI. Some contend that this doctrine is true ordinarily, but not if fear of death should threaten: for then, they say, the sacraments are to be administered, unless they be asked in hatred of the faith or in contempt of religion: because, say the cited authors, the precept of which we treat is not merely negative, but resolves into an affirmative one of prudently dispensing the sacraments. Good heavens!

Does prudent zeal for preserving life therefore prescribe that the sacraments be administered to public sinners who seek the priest's throat unless he administer? Is that not a merely negative precept — *Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine?* All things therefore being regarded, the opinion recounted is to me false.

XXII. QUESTION XIII. *Is it lawful to simulate the administration of the sacraments?* ANSWER. Simulation is twofold. One express and formal, by which another's deception is directly intended; the other material, which is made for a just cause, by permitting another's deception. Formal simulation all condemn. Concerning material simulation some formerly disputed, whose opinion Innocent XI condemned, who condemned this thesis 29: *Urgent grave fear is a just cause of simulating the administration of the sacraments*.

XXIII. Fr. Claude La Croix, Book 6, part 1, no. 133, teaches that the thesis was justly condemned as being indefinite and abstracting from formal or material simulation: for he says: *But whether the condemnation ought to be extended to material simulation cannot be gathered from the words of the decree. Hence the authors are divided: for some hold that it ought not to be extended to it; on the contrary, that it ought to be extended, Gormaz contends at length.* Behold how true it is that pontifical decrees are not rarely eluded by the benefit of a single little distinction. Was it ever disputed among the casuists concerning formal simulation? If you say yes, then such casuists maintained that formal deception is lawful, which no one even of the heathen philosophers asserted. If you deny it, then it is beyond dispute that the condemnation of the thesis comprehends material simulation, concerning which alone the casuists disputed. Therefore from the words of the pontifical decree, whether Fr. La Croix will or no, material simulation is expressly condemned.

XXIV. QUESTION XIV. *Is it lawful to seek the sacraments from an unworthy minister?* ANSWER. When it is certainly established that a minister is unworthy, it is not lawful outside the case of necessity to seek the sacraments from him, when he is not the parish priest or one appointed to administer the sacraments. If he be the parish priest, or one bearing his place, it is lawful for parishioners to seek the sacraments from him, even though he be known as evil. If nevertheless an upright minister were at hand, by title of charity the sacraments would have to be sought from this one, not from that.

XXV. In a case of extreme necessity, namely in the article of death, it is lawful to seek from heretics, schismatics, and those cut off from the Church the two sacraments of Baptism and Penance, as was declared by Trent, session 14, chapter 7. That the sacraments may lawfully be sought from an evil but tolerated minister, grave necessity suffices — say, of fulfilling the paschal precept, when nevertheless no upright priest is at hand. For in such a case the petitioner affords no occasion of sinning, but only consults his own eternal salvation.

XXVI. Concerning the ceremonies of the sacraments, and of those things which are called sacramentals, see Vol. VIII, sole dissertation, Book 1, chapter 14, where you will find all these things explained at length; and here for brevity's sake I omit them, because graver matters press to be explained, and I fear prolixity.

Dissertation II — On Baptism and Confirmation

Chapter I — The notion of Baptism, and its matter

I. QUESTION I. *What is the Baptism of the new law?* ANSWER. It is, says the Tridentine Catechism, part 1, chapter 1, § 5, *the sacrament of regeneration through water in the word.* This definition in few words sets forth the matter, the form, and the property of Baptism. That Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration is established from the Gospel. In the word is set the form of the sacrament. St. Thomas, III, q. 66, art. 1, hands down this description of Baptism: *It is a sacrament by which a man is outwardly washed and spiritually regenerated through water under the form of words prescribed by Christ*. Each definition comes back to the same thing.

II. QUESTION II. *What is the matter of Baptism?* ANSWER. Twofold: remote and proximate. Of the former now; of the latter below. Natural water alone is the remote matter of Baptism, as is had in John 3: *Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* Why Christ the Lord chose water rather than another liquor no true reason can be assigned beyond the divine will. Many congruences the Fathers assign — Ambrose and Jerome — which St. Thomas recounts, III, q. 66, art. 3.

III. QUESTION III. *Is the ancient usage to be approved by which the Roman Church consecrates the water serving for Baptism?* ANSWER. That this sacred custom is ancient the Fathers prove — Basil, Cyril, Cyprian, and others. See the testimonies in Vol. VIII, Book 2, dissertation 1, chapter 2.

IV. QUESTION IV. *What water is to be called natural?* ANSWER. That natural water alone is the matter of Baptism all Catholics affirm. What is to be called natural water the Roman Ritual published by order of Gregory XIII answers: it is *the water of springs, wells, the sea, rivers, lakes, ponds, and marshes, and rain-water; and let it be simple and pure of whatever kind, which retains the proper species of water: nor does it matter whether it be cold or hot: but it is not artificial water, such as is expressed or distilled from roses, flowers, herbs, or like things, nor any other liquor whatsoever.* In how many ways natural water can be corrupted St. Thomas explains, III, q. 66, art. 4. For the rest, there is no need of philosophers' disputations; the common judgment of men suffices for discerning natural water.

V. They dispute whether one drop of water or another suffices for Baptism. But these disputations are vain. That quantity of water is necessary which suffices for washing. But one drop or another does not truly wash. Water melted from salt I should not reckon, outside the case of necessity, to be matter of Baptism; but well indeed water resolved from snow, ice, frost, or the dew of heaven, as the common opinion teaches. But snow itself, ice, and hail, since they are not a matter apt for washing, are not matter of Baptism. Nor is water which flows from the vine or from other trees an apt matter of Baptism, because it is not natural water. Lye and broth, if they be not thick but diluted, are water apt for baptizing, as St. Thomas teaches in the place cited.

VI. QUESTION V. *What is the proximate matter of Baptism?* ANSWER. It is the use of water, by which the body is washed. A threefold manner of washing has obtained: by *immersion,* by *infusion,* and by *aspersion*. Immersion was first threefold, afterwards simple obtained. In the early centuries of the Church the discipline of triple immersion flourished, and in the thirteenth century it still obtained.

About the fourteenth century the usage obtained of baptizing by aspersion or infusion. In whatever manner Baptism be conferred — whether by immersion, or by infusion, or by aspersion — it is valid. Nevertheless the rite of one's own Church is to be observed; and he who without compelling necessity should change it would sin gravely. Such infusion or aspersion ought to be made so that the baptized may according to the common sense be truly said to be washed.

VII. QUESTION VI. *Can an infant enclosed in the mother's womb be baptized, the mother's womb being washed?* ANSWER. If no member of the infant appear, it can in no way be baptized, and the Baptism conferred would be null. See St. Thomas, III, q. 68, art. 2, reply 4, and the Roman Ritual. Wherefore false is the opinion of some, whom Leander cites, namely that Baptism is valid conferred upon an infant enclosed in the mother's womb by the art of a midwife who introduces water into it with her hand. For the validity of Baptism it is required that either the whole or some part of the body of the infant to be baptized appear from the woman's belly. An infant wrapped in the skin of the afterbirth, if danger of death threaten, is to be baptized, the membrane being broken; if no danger of death press, the infant, being stripped of this skin, is to be baptized. It does not suffice that the hair or the clothes be washed, but some part of his body ought to be washed.

VIII. If anyone, on account of scarcity of water, should cast a boy near to death into a well or a river that he may baptize him, and utter the form, the Baptism is valid. Since the word, the element, and the minister's intention are had. Valid also is Baptism administered with poisoned or with boiling water, and with the intention of killing the infant, provided there be present the intention of baptizing and the due form be observed. All these things nevertheless cannot lawfully be done: for evils are not to be done that goods may come.

IX. QUESTION VII. *Is it lawful to cut open the womb of a woman despaired of as to health, that the infant may be baptized?* ANSWER. Fr. Comitolus, Book 1, question 14, says that this can be done, because the eternal salvation of the infant is to be preferred to the bodily life of the pregnant mother. But St. Thomas, to whom theologians commonly subscribe, teaches the opposite, 3, question 68, article 11, reply 3, where he says: *Evils are not to be done that goods may come:* Romans 3. *And therefore a man ought not to kill a mother that he may baptize the child. If nevertheless the mother shall have died, the offspring living in the womb, she ought to be opened, that he may be baptized.* That saying — the eternal salvation is to be preferred to the life of the body — does not infer that anyone can inflict bodily death upon himself or upon others, but it pertains to this, that for another's eternal salvation death is sometimes to be sustained.

Chapter II — On the form, and on the threefold Baptism

I. QUESTION I. *Is the form of words which the Latin Church uses lawful?* ANSWER. The form of the Latin Church is this: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* That this form is very ancient many ancient documents prove — the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great, the Roman Ordo, and the Gothic-Gallican Missal in Thomasius, and the Gallican Liturgy edited and illustrated by the illustrious Mabillon, title 25.

II. Similarly valid is the form of the Greeks, which is of this kind: *The servant (or handmaid) of God, N., is baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* This form of the Greeks is not

optative, as formerly many contended, but enunciative, namely *is baptized,* as Arcudius, Goar, and Martène prove.

III. QUESTION II. *Is it required for the validity of Baptism that the act of the baptizer be expressed by the word "I baptize" or "is baptized"?* ANSWER. All affirm it, and this Alexander III defined in Book 5 of the Decretals, title 42, chapter 1. Against this pontifical definition and the common doctrine of the Church some of the younger authors dared to scribble, whose error Alexander VIII condemned in this thesis 29: "Baptism was valid which was sometimes conferred under this form: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, those words being omitted, I baptize thee." The Church drew her form from the evangelical words: *Baptizing them in the name,* and so forth. By the same reason by which all gather from these words the necessity of invoking the most holy Trinity, the same necessity of expressing the action of the baptizer is inferred.

IV. QUESTION III. *Would one who should deliberately omit the particle "I" in the form of Baptism sin gravely?* ANSWER. All affirm that the aforesaid particle does not pertain to the substance of baptism; but that he sins who should deliberately or through negligence omit it, all likewise affirm. They dispute only of the gravity of the fault. Some affirm it to be grave, others slight. I confess that I do not hold the degree of malice. A deliberate omission seems unable to be excused from contempt of the ecclesiastical rite: in which case the fault would be grave. Here the particle *thee* pertains to the essence of Baptism, because the person to be baptized must be designated. *Baptizing them.* He would sin who in the form of Baptism should express the name of the baptized, saying, *I baptize thee, Peter,* and so forth. Since nothing ought to be added to and nothing subtracted from the form of Baptism. Ratified and valid would the Baptism be if anyone, the word *baptize* being omitted, should say *I plunge, I dip, I lave, I wash,* provided he did not depart from the intention of the Church, which intends a sacramental and not a profane washing; the minister nevertheless would always sin who changed the words appointed by the Church. The particle *in* more probably pertains to the essence of baptism: it is therefore a heinous thing to omit it.

V. QUESTION IV. *Would one who should baptize with this form — "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, in the name of the Son, in the name of the Holy Ghost" — confer valid Baptism?* ANSWER. Martin Bonacina with others denies it. Why is this Baptism not valid? The repetition of the noun in no way changes the sense of the form instituted by Christ. But if anyone should say: *I baptize thee with the Father, with the Son, with the Holy Ghost,* it is to me more probable that the Baptism is not valid, because in the aforesaid form the unity of essence is not clearly expressed.

VI. Would one who should omit *in the name* and substitute *in the power* confer valid Baptism? Some affirm, others deny. The matter therefore is doubtful. Therefore the negative opinion is the safer and the more probable. Similarly I judge invalid Baptism conferred in this manner: *I baptize thee in the name of the most holy Trinity,* or *in the name of the One and Three,* or *in the name of the three persons.* Since the three divine persons are not expressly uttered. Much more would Baptism be invalid conferred in this manner: *I baptize thee under the name of Jesus Christ.* The common and true opinion also denies that Baptism is valid conferred with this form: *I baptize thee in the name of the Begetter, of the Begotten, and of the One proceeding from both:* because in sacramental matters one must adhere to the more common and the safer opinion. But I should reckon valid Baptism conferred with this form: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost;* because Jesus Christ is truly the Son of the Father. Similarly I should hold as ratified Baptism conferred with this form: *I baptize thee in the name of the*

Father almighty, and of the only-begotten Son, and of the Holy Ghost the Paraclete. That one who should use this form — *I baptize thee in the name of the Father; I baptize thee in the name of the Son; I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Ghost* — does not confer valid Baptism, Fr. Paul Comitolus defends. But the more probable opinion affirms it, which theologians commonly defend. Valid also would the Baptism be if anyone should omit the particle *and.* All those nevertheless would sin who should add anything to or omit anything from the form prescribed by the Church and drawn from the Gospel itself. Baptism conferred by a stammerer, who at the end of a word should take away or change one letter, would be valid, as if he should say *batizo* for *baptizo,* or *In the name of the Father* [with a defective ending]. But these questions are arbitrary, and scarcely ever occur. Therefore they are to be passed over.

VII. QUESTION V. *Of how many kinds is Baptism?* ANSWER. Threefold: of *water,* of the *Spirit,* and of *blood.* The Baptism of water is the sacrament hitherto explained. That of the Spirit is perfect contrition with the desire of Baptism. That this baptism suffices for salvation, when the Baptism of water cannot be had, all teach. The Baptism of blood, or martyrdom, excels the Baptism of water and of the Spirit, not by reason of the sacrament, but by reason of charity and grace, since the Baptism of water alone is a sacrament. But the Baptism of blood includes the Baptism of the Spirit, but not conversely. Wherefore all affirm that in adults martyrdom supplies for the Baptism of water. The same they affirm in respect of little ones. For of the little ones slaughtered by Herod the Church sings: *Whose heralding the Innocents confessed as martyrs not by speaking but by dying.*

VIII. Theologians dispute whether martyrdom supplies for the Baptism of water *ex opere operato.* Many deny it; but the common and true opinion defends that martyrdom justifies both adults and little ones *ex opere operato.* For the Baptism of blood is compared to the Baptism of water. Therefore if the latter justifies *ex opere operato,* why not the former? This opinion St. Thomas defends in Book 4, distinction 4, question 3, article 3, question 3, reply 1.

IX. QUESTION VI. *What dispositions are required in adults for undergoing martyrdom?* ANSWER. The following. First, a voluntary acceptance of death inflicted by a persecutor in hatred of the faith. For martyrdom is an act of fortitude and of charity. Therefore a deliberate choice is necessary. Second, that martyrdom be accepted for the faith of Christ, from a supernatural motive proposed through faith. Third, there is necessary charity at least initial and imperfect, which afterwards becomes perfect by force of the martyrdom itself. Adults who are conscious to themselves of some sin ought to purge their conscience, in that manner in which they would dispose themselves for the Baptism of water or for Penance. If he be a catechumen, and there be opportunity, he ought to send Baptism before; if he have been washed with Baptism, confession, if opportunity be at hand. All which things could be confirmed by the discipline of the Church: for, persecution raging or threatening, the bishops animated all to receive Baptism, to perform penance, and to partake of the Eucharist, that, strengthened by these safeguards, they might become more eager and stronger for sustaining the contest.

Chapter III — On the minister of Baptism, its institution, obligation, and necessity

I. QUESTION I. *Of how many kinds is the minister of Baptism?* ANSWER. Threefold. First, *ordinary* by office. Second, *extraordinary* by delegation. Third, of *necessity.* The ordinary minister of the solemnity is the bishop, then parish priests, thereafter presbyters. When formerly the bishops solemnly baptized,

it was not lawful for presbyters or parish priests to do the same. And even now, if the parish priest be at hand, a priest ought not to baptize without consulting him. A deacon can administer Baptism not by office but by commission. Laymen are ministers of necessity, who baptize without the solemn rite. A layman would sin mortally if, a priest being present, he should baptize, because in a grave matter he would usurp to himself a right proper to the priest. Gravely also would a layman sin if, a deacon being present, he should baptize; because, a priest being absent, this devolves upon the deacon, as the more probable opinion teaches. A layman baptizing without necessity, with the solemn rite, incurs irregularity.

II. QUESTION II. *Can one minister by a single aspersion baptize several?* ANSWER. They commonly affirm it, because the sense of the form is not changed by using *you* for *thee;* and they confirm it by the example of St. Peter, who in one day baptized a great multitude. He nevertheless who without necessity should so baptize would sin, and indeed gravely. It is besides to be observed that such an aspersion must be of a kind that can truly be called a washing, so that the water flow upon the baptized: for one drop or another does not suffice. If two, of whom one lacked a tongue and the other hands, should baptize, the baptism would be null, as St. Thomas teaches, III, q. 46, art. 4, reply 4. If to a boy in danger there were present an excommunicated priest and a midwife, she would be preferred to the excommunicated priest, cut off from the body of the Church. Nor is it an objection that an excommunicated priest can absolve in extreme necessity, because in no case can a layman absolve. No one can baptize himself. Therefore, says St. Thomas, III, q. 66, art. 5, reply 4, Christ willed to be baptized by John. The same man cannot be baptized by several: wherefore the Baptism would not be valid if several should say, *We baptize thee,* as St. Thomas teaches, III, q. 47, art. 6: because *we* is not the same as *I,* but *I and thou:* and thus the form would be changed.

III. A parish priest sins who, that he may consult the infant's salvation, privately administers Baptism at home, awaiting a godparent, that afterwards he may perform the solemn rite in the church. Since in the Council of Vienne under Clement V it was laid down, in the *Clementines,* Book 3, title 15, sole chapter, that baptism be conferred not in halls or in chambers, but in churches in which are the sacred fonts deputed to this.

IV. Parents who in extreme necessity baptize their own children do not lose the right of demanding the marriage debt. But outside extreme necessity, if they should baptize their own children, they would lose that right. Baptism conferred by a pagan or a Jew is valid. And this is today the universal doctrine of the Church.

V. QUESTION III. *When was Baptism instituted?* ANSWER. That Baptism was instituted by Christ the Lord all confess, both Catholics and heretics. Concerning the time of the institution there is dispute. Many contend that Christ instituted Baptism after the resurrection, when he said, Matthew 28: *Going therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them,* and so forth. The more probable opinion to me is that Christ instituted this sacrament when he himself was baptized in the Jordan, as St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Thomas, and the Roman Catechism itself teach. The law of Baptism began to oblige as soon as it was promulgated after the resurrection: *Going therefore, teach ye … baptizing,* and so forth. But when it was sufficiently promulgated, so as to oblige all, some assert after Pentecost, others protract it somewhat longer. See Vol. VI, dissertation 5, *On Laws,* where all these things are explained.

VI. QUESTION IV. *What is the necessity of receiving Baptism?* ANSWER. A twofold necessity: of *means* and of *precept*. Without that which is necessary in the first way, salvation cannot be obtained unless it

be had either in fact or in desire. And of this kind are Baptism for all, and Penance for sinners who are adults. That is said to be necessary in the second way which is imposed by a precept, and which cannot knowingly be omitted without sin. Salvation nevertheless can be had without it, either through ignorance or through some other obstacle which hinders the observance. But no ignorance and no impossibility avails in respect of those things which are necessary with the necessity of means. Again a twofold necessity of means is distinguished. One exterior, as is the baptismal washing; and this can be supplied by faith and charity with the desire. The other intrinsic, as is sanctifying grace; and this can be supplied in no way. Unless it be really had, eternal salvation is impossible. The desire likewise is twofold. One implicit, as is the general desire or wish of observing all the precepts of Christ, which cannot be separated from perfect charity. The other is an express desire or wish, which arises from knowledge of the thing, and is required when the thing is necessary with the necessity of means.

VII. Wherefore without baptism either in fact or in desire no one can enter into Paradise. To infants themselves begotten of faithful parents Baptism is necessary in fact, whatever Calvin may prate to the contrary. But to all adults it is necessary either in fact or in desire. And this desire or wish of receiving Baptism in adults must be express, as the more probable opinion teaches.

VIII. QUESTION V. *At what time ought Baptism to be received?* ANSWER. Many examples of the ancients occur concerning the deferring of Baptism. St. Ambrose before his ordination, St. Paulinus of Nola in his eighteenth year, St. Augustine in his thirty-third, were baptized. Holy men for the sake of humility persevered a long time as catechumens. Others, that they might lead a voluptuous life, deferred Baptism. The reasons why Baptism ought not to be deferred are obvious. What prudent man would wish to procrastinate the loosing of the bonds of his own servitude, or the antidote of his own infirmity?

IX. QUESTION VI. *Does the precept of receiving Baptism oblige adults to receive Baptism as soon as they conveniently can?* ANSWER. Those things which are necessary with the necessity of means are by a stronger right necessary with the necessity of precept. It is disputed whether according to the present discipline of the Church the precept obliges under grave sin, so that adults are bound to receive Baptism as soon as they conveniently can. Some deny it; but the common and certain opinion affirms it. Wherefore parents gravely offend when without reasonable cause they defer the Baptism of infants, because they expose them to the danger of eternal damnation.

X. The ancient heretics the Anabaptists or Rebaptizers, the Waldenses, and the Cathari asserted that little ones before the use of reason are not to be baptized, whose error Trent condemned, session 7, canons 12 and 13. Those conceived from a brute and human seed are not to be baptized. A monster procreated from a man and a woman, if a person appear, especially in the head, is to be baptized. If there be doubt, let the bishop be consulted. If the doubt persist, he can be baptized with a condition added.

XI. QUESTION VII. *Can the infants of unbelievers be baptized, the parents resisting?* ANSWER. The discourse is of infants destitute of reason. St. Thomas denies it, to whom theologians commonly subscribe, and this custom of the Church obtains: namely, that the infants of unbelievers, although living under the civil power of Christian princes, are not to be baptized while the parents resist. Benedict XIV in a letter given in the year 1747 to the Archbishop of Tarsus set forth this controversy in full light. The chief reason of our opinion is the custom of the Church and the danger of apostasy

to which baptized infants are exposed, the parents resisting. There is added the paternal power, to which infants are subject.

XII. In these days here at Rome it was disputed who come under the name of parents. All affirmed that the father and the grandfather are to be preferred to the mother, because the male line prevails over the female. In the disputation it was asked whether a grandmother ought to be preferred to a mother. A Jewish grandmother, become a Christian, consented that her grandson be baptized. The Jewish mother resisted the baptism of her son. Some contended that the grandmother's consent was to be preferred. Others maintained that one must stand by the mother's dissent. The matter was brought to the Supreme Pontiff Benedict XIV, who in a letter given to the most illustrious William, Assessor of the Holy Office, decreed that the grandmother's consent was to be attended to, and the boy to be baptized, the Jewish mother resisting.

XIII. In proximate danger of death the sons of unbelievers are to be baptized, because then there is no danger of apostasy. In confirmation of this opinion Benedict XIV reports a decree of the Holy Office of the year 1678, and another given in 1701. Similarly to be baptized are the sons of unbelievers who are called exposed, or cast forth — namely, abandoned by their parents — because then injury is done to no one. Likewise the children of unbelievers taken captive by Christian pirates, because they have been drawn out of the parents' power. If one of the unbelieving parents consent, although the other resist, the boy is to be baptized, because consent in favour of religion is to be preferred. Valid also is baptism conferred upon boys whom unbelievers offer to be baptized, not that they may be regenerated to eternal life, but that they may be cured of infirmity, as St. Augustine teaches, Epistle 98 to Boniface. The demented from birth are to be baptized in the faith of the Church, says St. Thomas, III, q. 68, art. 12. Of adults who from a sound mind fall into dementia, the will is to be regarded which they had while they were sound. The sleeping are not to be baptized unless proximate danger of death threaten.

Chapter IV — On the dispositions of adults for receiving Baptism, and on its effects and ceremonies

I. QUESTION I. *Are faith, sorrow for sins, and inchoate charity required in adults for rightly receiving Baptism?* ANSWER. That faith is necessary St. Mark declares, chapter 16, saying: *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* The necessity of penitence St. Peter manifests, Acts 2, where he says: *Do penance, and be baptized every one of you.* Of love at least initial, of which there shall be discourse below, St. John says, Epistle 1, chapter 3: *He that loveth not abideth in death.*

II. QUESTION II. *What are the effects of Baptism?* ANSWER. The first and chief effect of Baptism is to blot out both original sin and all other sins, and to sanctify the soul, as is had in Acts 2: *Be baptized every one of you unto the remission of sins.* And St. Paul to the Romans 8: *There is now therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.* Basely therefore do the Protestants err who blurt out that through Baptism sins are only not imputed, but not otherwise taken away and utterly blotted out: which error Trent condemned, session 5, chapter 5.

III. Nor is it to the purpose that they object that concupiscence remains in the baptized, which by the Apostle's testimony is sin; since concupiscence is called sin by the Apostle not because it is properly

and formally sin itself, but because it proceeds from sin and inclines and allures to sin, as Trent defined, session 5, chapter 5, out of the tradition of the Fathers.

IV. Another effect of Baptism is the remission of the eternal and temporal penalty, as the Council of Florence defined in the Decree for the Armenians, and Trent in the place cited confirmed. The third effect of Baptism is the impression of a character, as is had from the perpetual tradition of the Church, and Trent defined, session 7, canon 9.

V. Baptism rightly administered is never to be repeated. If anyone has been baptized in heresy, it must be examined whether he was baptized according to the true form of the Church or the evangelical one; and if he was baptized according to this form, he ought not to be rebaptized. If we detect that the evangelical form was not observed, he is to be baptized anew. Those nevertheless who were baptized by heretics ought to be attentively examined.

VI. Those who have been baptized by a midwife ought not to be rebaptized, when the parish priest detects the midwife to be prudent, awake, and constant in an examination upon the exact observance of the form. Are exposed infants having a certificate of the Baptism conferred hung upon the neck to be rebaptized? A precise resolution cannot be given. When even the least suspicion arises concerning the Baptism validly conferred, they are to be rebaptized under a condition, as the Roman Ritual, published by order of Paul V, lays down.

VII. QUESTION III. *Does Baptism received with fiction, the fiction receding, blot out sin?* ANSWER. Fiction is twofold. One by which a man simulates that he receives Baptism, but within neither intends, nor believes, nor wills to receive Baptism. Of this there is no question. The other fiction is that by which a man really wills to receive Baptism, yet does not detest his sins, nor believes, nor hopes; yet nevertheless receives Baptism, because he really wills to receive it, but does not receive its effect on account of the indicated impediments. It is asked whether, this fiction receding, he obtains the remission of sins. The negative opinion many defend; but the affirmative St. Augustine and St. Thomas and theologians commonly defend. Because a cause productive by its own nature of an effect produces it when the impediment is removed.

VIII. QUESTION IV. *What are the ceremonies of Baptism?* ANSWER. Many, of which I shall touch upon a few. Certain ones go before, as the presentation of those to be baptized before the door of the church, which they cannot enter, since through the original fault they are children of wrath. Then the priest inquires what they seek from the Church of God; and they reply, Baptism. There succeeds the exorcism for the expelling of the demon. Salt is put into the mouth of the one to be baptized, that, the putrefaction of vices being driven away, the baptized may taste the savour of good works. With the sign of the cross are marked the forehead and the eyes, the ears, the shoulders, and the breast; the nostrils and the ears are anointed with saliva, and *Ephphetha,* that is, *Be opened,* is pronounced.

IX. The ceremonies which accompany and follow baptism are the following. The priest leads the one to be baptized to the sacred font, and thrice interrogates him: *Dost thou renounce Satan, and all his pomps, and all his works?* The one to be baptized answers, either by himself if he be an adult, or through the godparent if he be an infant, to each interrogation, *I renounce.* Then the priest asks: *Dost thou believe in God the Father almighty?* He answers, *I believe;* and again concerning the other articles of the symbol the priest asks, and the one to be baptized answers, *I believe.* At last he is asked: *Wilt thou be baptized?* and, he consenting either by himself or through the godparents, the priest baptizes him. The ceremonies

which follow baptism are the following. The priest anoints the crown of the baptized man's head, clothes him with a white garment if he be an adult; if an infant, he places a little linen cloth upon the head, saying: *Receive a white garment, which thou mayest carry unstained before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest have eternal life.* A burning candle the priest delivers into his hand as a symbol of faith and charity. In Baptism a proper name is imposed upon each.

X. There is required someone who may receive the baptized from the sacred font, as St. Thomas declares, III, q. 67, art. 7, and assigns congruous reasons. Nor is anyone indiscriminately to be chosen, but a Catholic, and as far as may be of the best morals and instructed, and who can supply the parts of a pedagogue, of a master teaching and instructing. Parish priests administering baptism without godparents sin mortally, urgent necessity being removed. Since these rites are of the necessity not of the sacrament but of the precept. One man or one woman suffices, or at the most one man and one woman can be admitted, as Trent lays down, session 24, chapter 2. Monks and mendicant regulars are excluded from this office, as the more probable opinion teaches. Godparents contract a spiritual kinship with the baptized, and with his father and mother, as Trent declares, session 24, chapter 2.

Chapter V — On the obligation of the baptismal profession

I. I should have need of Tully's eloquence, that I might be able to lay open according to its worth the incredible sluggishness and drowsiness of certain parish priests in setting forth to adults and young men the most grave burdens and obligations which the baptismal profession carries with it. Very few among Christians will you meet who hold the force and signification of the Christian profession which by a solemn rite they uttered to God in baptism. Before we enter the Church of Christ, or are received into the society of Christ's faithful, first of all we renounce the devil, his pomps, works, and spectacles. What does this renunciation betoken? What are these pomps, what these works, what these spectacles upon which you have declared war, O Christian? Answer. Are you dumb, because you have not been instructed? Hear, and fix it in your heart. The profession made in baptism is that which separates Christians from the world, which is contrary to flesh, blood, pomps, and carnal delights, which distinguishes Christians from the pagans. The pagans observed justice, chastity, equity, and all those things which are necessary for fostering a tranquil society. What therefore do Christians renounce in the baptismal profession, that they may be distinguished from the pagans? Declare it. All the Fathers answer with one mouth, none excepted — especially Tertullian, Cyprian, Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Salvian, and, to omit the rest, St. Charles Borromeo — that Christians renounced theatres, comedies, tragedies, dances, and the other spectacles of a raving world, vain, opposed to modesty and shame, such as are the naked display of the breasts in women, paint, curls, and other prestiges of this kind. The testimonies of the Fathers I have given in the Book *On Theatrical Spectacles*. One or another for brevity's sake I shall now transcribe.

II. In the Book *On the Catechizing of the Uninstructed,* chapter 6, St. Augustine instructs an uninstructed man to abstain from theatres if he wishes to be a Christian. *But when those are instructed against whom a perverse crowd bodily fill the churches, at the same time also the precepts of Christian and honourable conversation are briefly and becomingly commemorated; lest by drunkards, the avaricious, defrauders, gamesters … lovers of spectacles … and others of this kind he be seduced, and reckon it perhaps unpunished for himself. Because he sees*

many who are called Christians to love these things, and to do them, and to defend them, and to persuade and prevail upon others.

III. Do you see? Even then carnal Christians dared to persuade and prevail that the frequenting of theatres was lawful — Christians who bodily, as now, filled the churches — from whose lies Augustine endeavours to preserve the uninstructed Christian. Again in chapter 25 he instructs the same uninstructed man against the frequenting of theatres, adding: *You will also observe that those crowds fill the churches on the feast days of Christians who fill the theatres on the solemn days of the pagans, and you will be tempted to imitate them.* At last, toward the end of the Book, he thus addresses his uninstructed man: *Do thou therefore, believing these things, beware of temptations; for the devil seeks companions to perish with him, so that not only through those who are outside the Church — whether pagans, or Jews, or heretics — does that enemy seduce, but also through those whom you shall see within the Catholic Church itself living ill, or immoderate in the pleasures of the belly and the throat, or given to unchaste or vain curiosities, or to unlawful things, whether of spectacles … or in the pomp of pride and avarice. Do not imitate them, but rather be joined with the good, whom you will easily find, if you yourself shall be such.*

IV. Unless dances, which are performed even in the theatre, and unless comedies and tragedies be pomps and spectacles of the devil, what will they be? Opportune are the things which Salvian writes, Book 6: *In spectacles there is a certain apostasy of the faith, and a deadly prevarication of its very symbols and heavenly sacraments. For what is the first confession of Christians in baptism? What, namely, but that they protest that they renounce the devil and his pomps and spectacles and works? Therefore spectacles and pomps are, even according to our profession, works of the devil.*

V. But let us hear a Father of the last age, St. Charles Borromeo, who in his homily on the seventh Sunday after Pentecost writes these things, treating of spiritual blindness: *And what — woe is me! — do I hear? That in this city there lies open so savage a workshop of lusts and unchastities, that frequent comedies are recited, and on the stages actors, most unworthy men, masked, lead innumerable incautious young men of this city into the nets of the devil. … I confess indeed, my sons, that while I perhaps slept an enemy man oversowed these tares, and that without my knowing this plague crept in. But we shall certainly endeavour hereafter, God granting, to repress it. … The mime and the actor have invited you by bills fixed to the wall to a satanic invention, which they call a comedy; but hear me: a tragedy it is, and always will be. … Christ calls you through us … and yet his calls are contemned. … The time will come, most beloved, when you will desire to approach and will not be able … but to the mimes and actors of the fathers … prepared for unchaste women … and to the transit of men you will be sent.* Read, I pray, the whole.

VI. What say they here who assert that the theatres of that age were different and more obscene, which the Fathers disapproved, from those which flourish in our age? The Fathers condemn that men come forth on the stage clothed in womanly garb, whom they call *bufalloi, femellae.* They condemn that women with shame cast off act as mimes. They condemn dances, they condemn the music which they call meretricious, they condemn the song which they call stimulating. The truth is inescapable, to which even the patrons of the theatres themselves subscribe: namely, that the music of our age is softer and the song more effeminate. Therefore on this side the theatres of our age are baser than the ancient ones. What of this, that in the ancient ones Christian women (and rarely pagan ones) did not come forth upon the stage? Therefore wrongly are all the theatres of our age traduced as honourable.

VII. Having therefore renounced pomps, spectacles, comedies, tragedies, dances, and all those things which cannot be referred to the glory of Jesus Christ, those to be baptized are admitted into the

Church to profess the Christian religion: because a rebel, before he be reconciled to his prince, must first turn his back upon the enemy. In the Church they profess the symbol of faith and the Christian life. What is the Christian life? It is the imitation of the life of Jesus Christ; it is a perpetual war against the devil, the world, the concupiscence of the flesh and of the eyes, the pride of life, ambition, feigned luxury, pomps; it is a perpetual contest against the flesh, an interminable struggle against human appetites; it is a life of penitence, of humility, and of patience; it is the bond of charity, by which all Christians are joined both to God and to one another in an intimate union; it is a profession of singing praises to God, of praying, beseeching, and asking the divine grace; it is the toleration of injuries, persecutions, and calumnies. Not all these things suffice here: one must pray for persecutors and calumniators. Nor is all this enough: not in secret ought a Christian to serve God with an undaunted breast, but openly and publicly to confess — what? The Unity and Trinity of God, the Incarnation of Christ, the symbol, the sacraments. He ought to hold all these things, and it does not suffice. He ought moreover to profess Christian moral integrity and sanctity, which in this our age, no otherwise than formerly the articles of the symbol, suffers no light persecution. Nor ought the hatred and persecution of worldly men to deter a Christian from a profession of this kind: for unless he undergo such a danger, he cannot be Christ's servant. Christ's disciples complained that the world hated them; to whom Christ himself replied: *Know ye that it hath hated me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own: but because you are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you. The servant is not greater than his lord.* He who shall have blushed at me, my words, my precepts, my examples, my patience and humility, my fastings and persecutions — I too will blush at him before my Father. *He that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before my Father. You shall be hated by all the followers of the world for my name's sake.* By these few things the image of the Christian profession has been delineated. If here there be lacking little devotions, frequenting of churches, and pious booklets, they profit nothing. The promise made in Baptism, the baptismal vow, is first of all to be observed. And that this observance may be carried through, there are to be added devotions, spiritual exercises, and the reading of pious books. But the Gospels — again I say the Gospels — are to be read with a profound humility and lowliness of mind, and continuously. Concerning this Christian profession read more in Vol. VIII, dissertation 2, chapter 17.

Chapter VI — On the sacrament of Confirmation

I. QUESTION I. *Is Confirmation a sacrament of the new law?* ANSWER. All Catholics affirm it, and that by the clearest testimonies of the Scriptures and by the perennial tradition of the Fathers: which truth against the Protestants Trent defined, session 7, *On Confirmation,* canon 1.

II. QUESTION II. *What is the matter of this sacrament?* ANSWER. All Catholics against Luther, Calvin, Dallaeus, and the other innovators teach that it is either the chrism, or the imposition of hands, or both together. To me the more probable opinion is that which lays down that the adequate matter of this sacrament is the imposition of hands and the chrism, which is confected of oil and balsam. Theologians dispute whether balsam be necessary in the confection of the chrism, with the necessity of the sacrament or of precept. Some affirm, others deny. Each opinion can be defended without loss of faith. To me the more probable opinion is that which defends that oil mixed with balsam is necessary with the necessity of the sacrament. That that chrism be consecrated is necessary with the necessity of the sacrament, as the more probable opinion defends. The minister of the consecration is

the bishop. Theologians dispute whether the faculty of blessing chrism can be committed by the Apostolic See to a simple priest. Suárez, Salmerón, Toletus, Sylvius, Gonet, and many others deny it. Sirmond, Cajetan, Soto, Vitasse, and many others affirm it. This second opinion is to me the more probable.

III. QUESTION III. *What is the form of the sacrament of Confirmation?* ANSWER. The form which the Latin Church uses is this: *I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* The form which the Greek Church uses is this: *The seal of the Holy Ghost*. The Latin Church holds this form as ratified. Many things theologians dispute concerning each form; but they are not of such moment as to be discussed.

IV. QUESTION IV. *Who is the author of this sacrament?* ANSWER. Various disputations being dismissed, with the common opinion of Catholics I say that Christ the Lord is the immediate or proximate institutor of that sacrament. And this has been shown above. Concerning the time at which he instituted it — whether before his death, or after the resurrection, or on the day of Pentecost — nothing certain can be laid down.

V. QUESTION V. *Is the bishop alone the ordinary minister of this sacrament?* ANSWER. All Catholics affirm it, and this was defined both in the Council of Florence in the *Instruction for the Armenians* and in Trent, session 7, canon 3. The faculty of confirming can nevertheless be granted by the Supreme Pontiff to a simple priest, as several examples prove. This faculty cannot be granted by bishops, as the more probable opinion defends. A bishop sins mortally who omits the administration of this sacrament, because a shepherd is bound to feed his own flock.

VI. QUESTION VI. *Who are capable of receiving this sacrament?* ANSWER. All the baptized, whether men or women, or infants, are by right capable of that sacrament, as the custom both of the Latin and of the Greek Church proves: for formerly for many centuries chrism was conferred upon infants after baptism. Since nevertheless that sacrament is not necessary with the necessity of means, it was fittingly laid down in several councils that it be administered to the baptized after the use of reason has been attained. Whether the demented are to be confirmed is remitted to the prudence of the bishops. To the sick and to the possessed this sacrament ought to be administered, that they may become stronger in their struggles.

VII. QUESTION VII. *What dispositions are required in adults to be confirmed?* ANSWER. First, they ought to be in grace. Second, if they are conscious to themselves of mortal sin, they ought to send sacramental confession before. Third, they ought to be versed in the apostolic symbol. Fourth, it is very fitting that they be fasting. It is the part of parish priests to instruct them and to teach them the dignity of so great a sacrament. Let them above all imbue them with this: that they are sealed on the forehead with the sign of the cross, that, fortified with this sacred token, they may dare openly and in the sight of the whole world, human respects and petty reasonings being trodden underfoot, to confess the faith of Christ and the sanctity of his evangelical morality against all corruptions. These things are to be fixed more deeply in their minds by the parish priest.

VIII. QUESTION VIII. *What are the effects of Confirmation?* ANSWER. Two: grace and a character, as is plain from divine Scripture. *Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost:* Acts 8. The communication of the Holy Ghost is not made without the infusion of grace. There is added that all the sacraments of the new law confer sanctifying grace. Confirmation confers the second, not the

first grace, since it is a sacrament of the living, not of the dead. This grace renders the baptized man intrepid, strong, and robust. In the first centuries of the Church, while the most monstrous persecutors raged against the Church of God, confirmed Christians feared not the rack, not the burning furnaces, not the raging beasts to whose jaws they were delivered; but with incredible fortitude they suffered the harsher torments and the most monstrous butchery of their own bodies, that they might maintain the faith of Christ. What now is the struggle, who the enemies to be overcome? Human respects, political reasonings, love of the age, pomps, luxury, the enticements of a raving world. *All who will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.* There are therefore in every age persecutors, and indeed within, not to say outside, the Church, as all the Fathers testify. The dogmas of faith are liable to no persecution within the Church. Therefore the precepts, and indeed chiefly those of charity, suffer persecution — not open, but crafty and enticing. Put on therefore fortitude, O Christian, unfold the sign of the Cross impressed upon thy forehead. Openly confess evangelical morality, not in word only but in morals. Thou bearest a character impressed upon thy soul from this sacrament, as St. Paul testifies, 2 Corinthians 1: *God … hath anointed us, and hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts.* See more in Vol. VIII, Book 2, dissertation 1, chapter 3.

IX. QUESTION IX. *Is there given a precept of receiving this sacrament?* ANSWER. Many kindly probabilists deny any precept whatsoever, whether divine or ecclesiastical, of receiving this sacrament. Fr. Leander, tract 3, disputation 1, question 5, answers *more probably* that no such divine precept is given; and at question 6 he similarly answers *more probably* that no ecclesiastical precept is given. At last at question 7 he determines it *more probable* that he sins venially who through negligence should omit this sacrament.

X. Fr. Viva goes further in his *Course of Theology,* tract 5, question 3, article 1, no. 6, where he lays down that, scandal and contempt being cut off, he does not sin even venially who omits this sacrament, because, he says from Trullench, *nowhere is there a precept concerning receiving it.*

XI. Fr. Claude La Croix, Book 6, part 1, doubt 3, no. 395, question 72, asserts from Dicastillo that there was formerly an ecclesiastical precept, but that through desuetude that precept has now ceased. Fr. Thomas Tamburini, Book 3, chapter 3, § 4, keenly inveighs against Leander for having taught that he sins venially who omits this sacrament through negligence: *because concerning this no precept appears: which is the opinion of Suárez against Cajetan.*

XII. Here the opinion of the casuists is false. I have transcribed in Vol. VIII, Book 2, dissertation 2, chapter 6, the testimonies of the Fathers, the decrees of councils, and especially the testimony of the Tridentine Catechism, which in part 2, *On Confirmation,* §§ 16 and 17, inculcates with a vehement exhortation the reception of that sacrament.

XIII. It is agreed among all that this sacrament is not necessary with the necessity of means. But a precept, both divine and ecclesiastical, although it has not been brought in express words, is nevertheless gathered from the common tradition and consent of the Church. It is permitted to add the words of Benedict XIV, happily reigning, who in his Constitution *On the Rites of the Greeks,* § 5, says that *it is to be admonished by the bishops that they are held guilty of grave sin, if, when they can approach to confirmation, they refuse and neglect it.* Let all the synods and catechisms be turned over — those of the latest age, not to say the ancient ones — and it will be plain to everyone with what zeal and study the Fathers and bishops and the more celebrated theologians inculcate the reception and administration of that sacrament. Wherefore all the councils nearer to us, especially that of Worms, and the Fourth

of Milan, of Bordeaux, and of Aix, and the Tridentine Catechism, prove that the doctrine of those who excuse from venial fault the faithful who neglect the reception of that sacrament is a figment injurious to the councils themselves. Wherefore by right the University of Paris in the year 1625 proscribed this opinion: *All theologians say that confirmation is not commanded, except when it can be conveniently had, or, as others say, most conveniently, when without any, or with the very least, inconvenience.* Upon which opinion the Sorbonne passed this censure: *That proposition is scandalous, and put forth with a malign mind, to the greatest contempt of the sacrament of Confirmation.*

XIV. QUESTION X. *What are the rites of receiving that sacrament?* ANSWER. First, a godparent is to be chosen, who may present the neophyte to be confirmed. Second, those are not to be chosen as godparents who are not themselves confirmed, because they are not perfect members of Christ. Third, parents ought not to stand as godparents, on account of the spiritual kinship which they would contract; nor those who have not attained the fourteenth year; nor women for males, nor males for females; nor ought young men to present the old in the receiving of the sacrament of Confirmation, or act as co-sponsors, unless necessity compel otherwise. Fourth, the time of Confirmation was formerly Pentecost. This discipline is subject to change. Most excellently nevertheless will bishops act if at this time, when opportunity is at hand, they administer that sacrament. In any church whatsoever the bishop can administer this sacrament. These things being disposed, the bishop approaches to sign the neophytes, kneeling and holding their hands before the breast. He pronounces the form: *I sign thee with the sign of the cross,* and so forth, anointing them with chrism. He strikes the confirmed lightly with a blow on the cheek, that he may hence gather that he ought to be prepared for injuries, contumelies, and persecutions to be sustained for the name of Christ. Afterwards the forehead of the confirmed is bound about with a fillet, or a little band of white linen, lest the chrism flow down, and that the confirmed may understand with how great study he ought to guard the grace received. This ceremony the Roman Pontifical prescribes. Formerly the forehead of the confirmed remained bound for seven days. Then the time was contracted to three days, at last to twenty-four hours; but in this let the customs of each Church be observed. Those fillets cannot be converted to profane use, but ought to be burned.

Dissertation III — On the most august Sacrament of the Eucharist

Chapter I — The notion of the Eucharist, and its matter and form

I. QUESTION I. *What is the Eucharist?* ANSWER. Various acceptations being omitted, it is *the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ really contained under the species of bread and wine, for the spiritual nourishment of the faithful, instituted by Christ himself.* The body and blood are at once the thing and the sacrament, which are signified by the consecrated species; and moreover they signify the spiritual nourishment of the soul. Whence it is plain that the Eucharist is a sacrament, since to it belongs the character of a sensible sign divinely instituted, and it has annexed the promise of grace and the divine mandate of observing that sign: which three things are proved from divine Scripture to belong to the Eucharist. Bread and wine are the sensible sign: Matthew 26, *Jesus took bread,* and so forth. To those observing this sign grace is promised: John 6, *He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.* There is the mandate of using that sign: *Do this for a commemoration of me.* Luke 22.

II. QUESTION II. *Are wheaten bread alone and wine of the vine the matter of the Eucharist?* ANSWER. All affirm it, because this is the matter instituted by Christ. *Jesus took bread,* and so forth, Matthew 26. And of the matter of the chalice he adds there: *I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine,* and so forth. There is added the universal and perpetual tradition of the Church. Any quantity of the matter is apt for consecration. That quantity nevertheless the priest ought to consecrate which he shall prudently have recognized as suited to the use of the faithful.

III. This matter must be present to the consecrating priest. This presence is moral, not physical. Wherefore the practice of certain priests is to be disapproved who are wont to move their mouth and lips to the bread and the chalice, and to breathe into the chalice itself. Such a presence is required as that it can be demonstrated by saying *This is,* or *Here is.* Some raise innumerable questions upon this presence, all of which as useless and arbitrary I pass over. They dispute also whether bread confected of almonds, chestnuts, beans, lentils, spelt, or barley be matter of consecration. And the common opinion denies it. Concerning *siligo* they dispute on either side. But a distinction must be made. If *siligo* be taken with Pliny for a kind of white grain, or for selected wheat, then it is a matter apt for consecration; but if it be taken for rye, commonly *segala,* it is an inept matter, and cannot be consecrated.

IV. QUESTION III. *Ought the bread to be consecrated to be unleavened or leavened?* ANSWER. The Council of Florence in the Decree of Union laid down these things: *We define that in unleavened or in leavened wheaten bread the body of Christ is truly effected.* That the Eucharist is validly confected in unleavened bread is established by the example of Christ the Lord, to which is added the perpetual tradition of the Church. That it is validly confected also in leavened bread is plain, because the Latin Church has never protested against the rite of the Greek Church consecrating in leavened bread. Neither ought the Latins to consecrate in leavened nor the Greeks in unleavened bread; but both Greek and Latin priests are bound to observe the rite of their own Church, as so many decrees enjoin, and most recently Benedict XIV, happily reigning, in the Constitution upon the Rites of the Greeks published in the year 1742, confirmed.

V. QUESTION IV. *Is wine of the vine the matter of the Eucharist?* ANSWER. All affirm it, as is plain from the evangelical text already adduced and from the perennial tradition of the Church. So great a quantity of wine ought the priest of the Latin Church to consecrate as he can take according to the custom of his own Church. Wine of the vine alone therefore — whether white or black, whether sweet or harsh — is the matter of the consecration of the chalice. It is fitting nevertheless that the wine be white, for the avoiding of the stains which black or red wine leaves in the purificator, which present an unseemliness. Frozen wine is not an apt matter, because it cannot be drunk. Wherefore it ought to be liquefied, if it should become frozen in the chalice.

VI. QUESTION V. *Is water to be mingled with the wine in the consecration of the chalice?* ANSWER. Luther reputed this mixture a human figment; but by the perpetual tradition of the Church it is established that water was always mingled with the wine. The Third Council of Carthage in the year 397, canon 24, and the Quinisext or Trullan Synod in the year 692, testify that this rite descended from the Apostles. There are added the testimonies of all the Fathers, and at last Trent, session 22, chapter 4, canon 9, confirmed all the earlier decrees. This admixture is necessary with the necessity of ecclesiastical precept, not of the sacrament. The water to be mingled must be natural. A small quantity also is to be mingled. That this water is by force of the consecration converted into the blood of Christ all Catholics hold. But theologians dispute whether this small quantity of water be first converted into wine and afterwards into blood. Some maintain that it is immediately converted into blood. The more common opinion defends that it is first converted into wine. And this second opinion the Tridentine Catechism adopted, part 2, *On the Eucharist,* § 17. Reason also favours it, because water is in no way matter, even partial, of the chalice. And therefore, that the conversion may be easier, a little water is enjoined to be mingled. Neither opinion nevertheless pertains to faith.

VII. Theologians dispute whether one species can be consecrated without the other, urgent necessity pressing, by dispensation of the Supreme Pontiff. Diana with some others affirms it. It is certain that one species can validly be consecrated without the other. But it is disputed whether it be sometimes lawful, urgent necessity pressing, to do this. St. Thomas denies it, III, q. 74, art. 1, to whom the graver theologians subscribe. And this doctrine Trent seems to confirm, session 22, chapter 1. For the sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted after the manner of a spiritual banquet, and as a sacrifice. Further, this sacrifice cannot be immolated under one species alone, since it is the commemoration of the bloody Sacrifice, in which the blood was separated from the body.

VIII. QUESTION VI. *Are these dominical words alone — "This is my body" — essential to the consecration of the eucharistic bread?* ANSWER. The affirmative opinion is certain, and defined in the Council of Florence in the Decree for the Instruction of the Armenians, and in Trent, session 13, chapter 3, where it is laid down that the consecration is made by the words of Christ. But Christ uttered these words: *This is my body.* Hence it follows that the words *who the day before he suffered,* and so forth, do not pertain to the essence of the consecration, because the aforesaid words are not dominical, that is, Christ did not utter them, but they are the Evangelists'.

IX. QUESTION VII. *Are these words alone — "This is the chalice of my blood," or "This is my blood" — of the essence of the consecration of the chalice? Or do the others also which follow — "of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins" — pertain to the essence of the consecration?* ANSWER. Theologians dispute on either side, even Thomists. The more probable opinion to me is that these words alone — *This is my blood,* or, what comes back to the same, *This is the*

chalice of my blood — constitute the essential form of the consecration of the chalice. For as these words alone — *This is my body* — constitute the essential form of the bread, so the other aforesaid words effect the essential form of the chalice. Since indeed these words alone express and effect the conversion of the wine into blood, just as the former signify the transubstantiation of the bread into the body of Christ. But these words are not uttered by the priest historically, as the Protestants contend, but assertively and significatively.

X. The particle *for* Christ did not use, as some contend; but it was added by the Church. Authors dispute whether he would sin mortally who voluntarily should omit this particle. The more probable opinion teaches that he sins mortally who voluntarily should omit this particle. Since although in itself it be something slight, nevertheless in the sacramental form it is of great moment. More gravely would he sin who should omit that particle out of contempt, whether formal or interpretative.

Chapter II — Certain questions which are wont to be raised concerning the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist

I. Many are the errors of the heretics against this Sacrament, from which a Catholic ought to beware. Passing over the Capharnaites, Manichees, Marcionites, Phantasiasts, Messalians, and Enthusiasts, who denied the flesh of Christ, the first who thought ill of the Eucharist in the ninth century was John Scotus Erigena; in the eleventh century Berengarius, whose doctrine was proscribed in the year 1050 in the Roman Council. Berengarius offered a retractation of his error to Gregory VII. Having many times relapsed into his errors, and many times retracted them, he died a Catholic in the year 1088. There succeeded the Petrobrusians, the Henricians, and the Albigenses, who attempted to take away the Sacrament of the Eucharist out of the midst. Among the innovators nearer to us the first was Carlstadt, who in the year 1524 denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Him Zwingli followed, who blurted out in this same year that the Eucharist is a mere figure of the body of Christ. Zwingli's doctrine Bucer embraced; but that he might decline the odium of Luther, who keenly maintained the real presence, he studied to temper it with various emollients.

II. Calvin, more fraudulent than the Arians and all cunning men, now recedes from Bucer whom he cultivates as his master, now adheres to him and to Zwingli, now refutes both, now inclines to the Lutherans; now with crafty artifice he feigns to maintain the doctrine of the Catholic Church; at last, the mask being laid aside, he detests the Catholic dogma.

III. Those errors the Council of Trent, session 13, canon 1, condemned in these words: *If anyone shall deny that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but shall say that he is in it only as in a sign, or figure, or power: let him be anathema.* This canon Trent drew from the perpetual tradition of the Church.

IV. Luther with us demands the heresy of the Calvinists, because they deny the true, real, and substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist. But he contends at the same time that together with the substance of the body of Christ the substance of the bread remains. Hence his followers were called *Impanators* or *Panists*. This error Trent condemned, session 13, chapter 4, and confirmed the perpetual dogma of the Catholic Church in these words: *But since Christ our Redeemer said that that was truly his body which he offered under the species of bread, therefore it has always been the persuasion in the Church*

of God, and this holy Synod now again declares it, that by the consecration of the bread and wine there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood: which conversion is fittingly and properly called by the holy Catholic Church Transubstantiation.

V. The Catholic dogma being in few words set forth, Trent expounds the manner in which Christ exists in this Sacrament. By force of these words, *This is my body,* the body of Christ is directly placed. By these other words, *This is my blood,* the blood of Christ is directly placed. But by force of concomitance all those things are placed which are united to the body of Christ; and because the body is united to the blood, the soul, and the divinity — nay, the body itself subsists by the subsistence of the Word — therefore where the body of Christ is, with it all these things are. And thus in the Eucharist by concomitance the soul, the substance of the Word, and the divinity are in this Sacrament in a special manner, as Trent, session 13, chapter 3, plainly sets forth.

VI. QUESTION I. *Is Christ whole in every part of the species?* ANSWER. If the parts be separated, that the whole Christ exists in each Trent defined, session 13, canon 3. But theologians dispute whether before the separation of the host the whole body of Christ is in the whole host, and whole in every part. The affirmative opinion St. Thomas defends, III, q. 76, art. 6. The body of Christ is not in this Sacrament as in a place, because it is there in a sacramental manner. But this manner escapes the edge of our talent.

VII. QUESTION II. *Can the accidents, or sacramental species, be corrupted and nourish?* ANSWER. It is certain that after the consecration the accidents remain which affected the bread and wine. And it is established by experience that they can be corrupted after the consecration, just as before. How much time is required for the corruption in the stomach of one receiving the Sacrament nothing certain can be laid down. That not even half an hour is required all affirm. In one they are corrupted more quickly, in another more slowly. Wherefore for at least a quarter of an hour a priest ought to recollect himself after celebration, in reverence of so great a Sacrament.

VIII. QUESTION III. *Is Christ in the Eucharist to be adored with the worship of latria?* ANSWER. All Catholics affirm it, and the truth was defined, session 13, canon 3, by Trent. Religiously also and holily is the Eucharist kept in the churches, and, whatever the Protestants may prate, it is piously and holily exposed to the public adoration of the faithful.

Chapter III — On the minister of the Eucharist, and on those to whom it ought to be administered

I. QUESTION I. *Is a priest alone the ordinary minister of dispensing the Eucharist?* ANSWER. Bishops and priests are the ordinary ministers of administering the Eucharist, as St. Thomas proves, III, q. 82, art. 3, and Trent confirms, session 13, chapter 8. The extraordinary ministers are deacons, in each Church, the Eastern and the Western. In the early centuries deacons dispensed the chalice of the Lord's Blood, even necessity being removed. According to the present discipline of the Church, only for a just cause can bishops and priests commit to deacons that they administer the Eucharist. It is not lawful, however, for clerics inferior to deacons, and much less for laymen, to administer communion either to themselves or to others in the Latin Church, because several canons forbid it. In a case of extreme necessity a priest can communicate himself, and likewise a deacon. Nay, many

contend that for the sake of devotion alone priests and deacons can communicate themselves, if a fit minister be lacking. But the discipline of today is to be regarded.

II. QUESTION II. *Is a parish priest bound in time of plague to communicate his parishioners with danger to his life?* ANSWER. All having the care of souls — the Pope, archbishops, bishops, parish priests, rectors, superiors — are bound in time of plague or epidemic to administer to their subjects the Sacrament of the Eucharist with danger to life. They dispute whether the aforesaid ministers can at such a time administer the Eucharist to the sick with a silver spoon. Some affirm, others deny. The circumstances are to be regarded, and it must be deliberated at the bishop's judgment. Then instruments can lawfully be used chiefly when a scarcity of ministers presses. Superiors who in these cases should greatly fear the danger of death would betray themselves not as shepherds but as hirelings.

III. In the urgent article of death it is lawful to seek the Eucharist from an excommunicated, schismatic, or heretical priest, many theologians teach, provided scandal and contempt of religion be absent. Gravely do priests sin who administer the Eucharist without surplice and stole, as the common and true opinion teaches. Let the rites of the Church therefore be most exactly observed in the administering of this most august Sacrament.

IV. QUESTION III. *Is the Eucharist to be administered to little ones?* ANSWER. It is certain that formerly in each Church, the Eastern and the Western, the Eucharist was administered to little ones together with Baptism; which discipline even now obtains in the Eastern Church. Five centuries ago this discipline was abrogated in the Latin Church. Each discipline Trent commends, session 21, chapter 4.

V. That holy communion was denied to the possessed, who were vexed by a long-lasting disturbance from the malign spirit, is gathered from canon 29 of the Council of Elvira: at the term of life it was granted to them. Several examples relate that the possessed were healed by the force of this Sacrament. Of these and of the demented St. Thomas speaks at large, III, q. 80, art. 9. That this Sacrament is not to be administered to those demented from birth, but that it is to be administered to those who before they fell into dementia gave signs of penitence and are constituted in the last danger, they commonly teach. But as regards this, the circumstances are to be regarded, nor can a general rule be prescribed.

VI. To those to be punished with the extreme penalty the Eucharist is not to be denied, as was formerly done in Spain, whose custom Dominic Soto disapproves. The discipline which now obtains is to be observed.

VII. QUESTION IV. *Is the Eucharist to be granted to public sinners?* ANSWER. St. Thomas observes, III, q. 80, art. 6, that in a twofold manner a sinner is called public. First, by the confession of the offender himself, by the deposition of a third party, and by the sentence of a public judgment; and he is called public by the publicity of law. Second, by the evidence of the fact, as are usurers, plunderers, mimes, women mimes, actors, and dancers. That the Eucharist is to be denied to public sinners asking for it all confess. For ministers are instituted as prudent dispensers of the mysteries of God. To these it was said, Matthew 7: *Give not that which is holy to dogs.* To a public sinner secretly amended the Eucharist is to be denied if he ask publicly, until he take away the public scandal. To a hidden sinner asking the Eucharist publicly it is to be granted, when it cannot be denied without his infamy. If he ask secretly, it ought to be denied. If nevertheless the sin be known from confession, the Eucharist cannot be denied; and the opposite opinion Innocent XI condemned. If a sinner public in this place go

elsewhere where he is hidden, the Eucharist ought not to be denied him, as the opinion more probable to me defends.

VIII. QUESTION V. *Can a priest, on account of fear of death or of notable infamy to himself, administer the Eucharist to a public sinner?* ANSWER. The affirmative opinion is to me false. For it is not lawful to give what is holy to dogs, even for the sake of avoiding death. Nor less false is the opinion teaching that a priest can hold out an unconsecrated host to a hidden sinner. Since, says St. Thomas, III, q. 80, art. 6, that priest makes those commit idolatry who believe the host to be consecrated. No less does a priest sin who, for the avoiding of a sinner's infamy, simulates that he puts the host into his mouth. This lying simulation, whether of the Eucharist or of Penance, is sacrilegious and full of scandal.

Chapter IV — On the necessity of this Sacrament and its effects

I. The divine mandate I shall set forth in few words. It is of faith that the Sacrament of the Eucharist received in fact is not necessary with the necessity of means, as Trent defined, session 21, canon 4. Theologians dispute whether at least it be necessary in desire with the necessity of means. Turnely denies it, if the discourse be, he says, of a desire properly so called. The disagreement is rather about the word than about the thing. The more probable opinion is that which St. Thomas teaches out of Augustine, III, q. 73, art. 3: that the Eucharist is necessary in a desire not explicit but implicit. The Eucharist is the end of all the sacraments, which joins us to Christ with a stricter bond, and makes us his members in a peculiar manner. Therefore when a man receives Baptism, he has at least an implicit desire of receiving the Eucharist.

II. QUESTION I. *Is the Eucharist necessary by force of a divine precept?* ANSWER. All commonly affirm it with St. Thomas, III, q. 80, art. 11, and it is proved by Christ's words: *Unless you eat the flesh,* and so forth; and this was defined by the Council of Trent, session 13. Which precept binds all adults. Since the divine mandate is absolute and universal. Therefore it comprehends all. But this precept presses especially when the article of death is urgent. That the custom of carrying the Eucharist to the sick is most ancient Trent asserts, session 13, chapter 6.

III. QUESTION II. *Is one who communicated a little before he fell into danger of death bound to take the sacred Viaticum again?* ANSWER. The more probable and more common opinion affirms it. He nevertheless who on the same day communicated out of devotion, if he fall into danger of death, is not bound on the same day to take the Viaticum, because it is the custom of the Church that the Eucharist be not taken twice on the same day. But if anyone, kindled with fervour, being constituted in extreme straits should ask the sacred Viaticum, that he might more securely consult his own salvation, I for my part would administer it to him, although formerly I was doubtful.

IV. He who has once taken the Viaticum, if afterwards he fall into sin, is not bound on the same or on the next day to take the Viaticum. But if he survive several days — say eight or ten — it can be administered to him again.

V. QUESTION III. *Does this divine precept oblige more than once?* ANSWER. All affirm it. A general rule cannot be prescribed. The Church for the community of the faithful has laid down that communion is to be made once in the year. Each of the faithful, conscious of his own infirmity and fervour, and a prudent confessor who directs his conscience, can determine the frequency of that sacred medicine.

VI. QUESTION IV. *Does this divine precept oblige that the Eucharist be taken under both species?* ANSWER. The discipline of the Church is to be distinguished from the obligation of the precept. In the Latin Church up to the twelfth century, and in the Greek even now, the discipline obtains of communicating under both species, even as regards laymen. In the fourteenth century certain Bohemians dared to carp at the discipline of the Latin Church, and were called Calixtines, whose audacity the Council of Constance repressed in the year 1415, and laid down that the introduced discipline was to be observed; and at last the Council of Trent, session 21, canon 1, defined that communion under both species is not necessary to laymen, or to those not sacrificing, either with the necessity of the sacrament or with the necessity of a divine precept. For John says, chapter 6: *If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.* The tradition of the Church also supports it. See Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 1, chapter 9.

VII. QUESTION V. *What are the effects of the Eucharist?* ANSWER. First, the increase of grace. Second, an intimate conjunction with Christ and with the brethren. Third, the delight of the spirit and an inward sweetness of heart. Fourth, spiritual strength against the temptations of the demon, the prestiges of the world, and the enticements of sins. Fifth, the remission of venial sins. Sixth, the remission of punishment. Seventh, the repression of the senses and appetites. Eighth, the seed of immortality and of resurrection. Ninth, final perseverance, upon which eternal life follows.

Chapter V — On the dispositions for the Eucharist, and on frequent Communion. Several opinions of certain men are refuted

I. There is a twofold kind of dispositions. The first removes impediments, namely mortal sins; the other adorns the soul with virtues. Of the first at present. The innovators require faith alone for a disposition; but their error Trent proscribed, session 13, canon 5. The first disposition is cleanness from mortal fault. He who after absolution remembers that he committed some crime which through inculpable forgetfulness he did not confess, ought before communion to confess it, as the common and true opinion teaches. There are not lacking theologians, and indeed of great name, who require immunity from affection to venial sins, that the fruits of the Eucharist may be perceived. Others teach that affection to venial sins diminishes indeed the fervour, but does not hinder the fruits of the Eucharist. This disagreement ought to stir us up to detest venial crimes themselves, since according to all they diminish the fervour of charity.

II. QUESTION I. *Is the precept of sending confession before, on the part of one who is in mortal sin, divine or human?* ANSWER. Many contend that it is merely human. Theologians commonly affirm that it is divine, declared by St. Paul, 1 Corinthians 11, saying: *But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice;* and again, *Holy things are to be handled holily.*

III. QUESTION II. *What is to be thought of the interpretation of some upon the Tridentine precept of confessing as soon as possible?* ANSWER. If a priest, urgent necessity pressing, celebrated in mortal sin being contrite, Trent commands that he confess as soon as possible. Not a few began after their manner to dispute whether this be a precept or a counsel. Some affirmed it to be merely a counsel; but their opinion Alexander VII condemned, no. 38: *The command of Trent made to a priest sacrificing of necessity in mortal sin, that he confess as soon as possible, is a counsel, not a precept.*

IV. QUESTION III. *What is to be said of the interpretation of Frs. La Croix, Viva, and others upon the aforesaid decree of Trent?* ANSWER. Fr. Claude La Croix, Book 6, part 1, *On the Eucharist,* no. 546, § 4, writes here: "Suárez, Vásquez, Sayrus, Marchant, Nuño, de Lugo, Diana, Dicastillo, Aversa, John Sánchez, Gobat, Pellizzari, and Leander teach — in this almost all agree, says Moya, citing very many — that a priest is not bound by this precept, if he has the opportunity of a confessor and has not confessed out of malice: because although he sin more gravely, nevertheless in positive precepts the argument does not hold from the lesser to the greater, or to the like, as de Lugo with the common opinion teaches. … But Trent speaks of him who, urgent necessity pressing, celebrated without previous confession. But if there was an opportunity of a confessor, there was no urgent necessity of celebrating without previous confession. Therefore then he is not bound to confess as soon as possible. This opinion is more probable." Hence the same opinion Fr. Viva defends in his *Treatise on Proposition 38 of Alexander VII,* no. 12, and in his *Course of Theology,* question 7, no. 3.

V. Trent commands that a priest who, urgent necessity pressing and destitute of the opportunity of a confessor, celebrated in mortal sin, confess as soon as possible: since by natural and divine law *holy things are to be handled holily.* But he who, no necessity urging, having the opportunity of a confessor, out of mere malice celebrates in mortal sin, confession being neglected — he, say the cited probabilists, is not bound to confess as soon as possible, because *in positive precepts the argument does not hold from the lesser to the greater, or to the like, as de Lugo with the common opinion says.* Unless this be an unheard-of paradox, I confess that I know nothing. The precept of Trent declares natural and divine law, that *holy things are to be handled holily,* and defines that if, urgent necessity pressing and the opportunity of a confessor being lacking, a priest cannot confess before the celebration of Mass, he confess as soon as possible. This Tridentine precept, as I have said, is a declaration of natural and divine law. Therefore if a priest is bound to confess as soon as possible who, compelled by necessity, for the avoiding of scandal and that he might succour the faithful people, celebrated in mortal sin, by a far and by the very greatest right is that priest bound to confess as soon as possible who, pressed by no necessity but out of mere malice, celebrated in mortal sin. And this is so evident that a common sense void of prejudices suffices for perceiving this truth. Further, if in a truth so clear prejudices bewitch even pious and learned authors themselves, what is to be expected in questions ambiguous and entangled with a coil of difficulties?

VI. QUESTION IV. *What of the contrition which Fr. Tamburini teaches is to be sent before by a layman conscious of mortal sin, urgent necessity pressing?* ANSWER. Fr. Tamburini in the place cited, § 7, no. 56, writes the following opinion: "Concerning a layman there is no difficulty. For it is enough if he elicit it (contrition) immediately before the taking itself: and because the taking or eating is substantially made when we swallow or transmit the food, but not while it is in the mouth, when the taking is only inchoate — therefore I think it MOST PROBABLE that it is enough that the act of contrition be made while the most holy host is held in the mouth. So de Lugo, and Hurtado, and others."

VII. While we set forth these and like opinions, now to be derided, now to be deplored, outcries against us are redoubled. But I beseech and adjure even the prudent probabilists themselves to determine whether it is to be permitted that these unheard-of paradoxes be read by Christian readers without a previous warning by which they may beware of them. What? The most holy Host of Christ in the mouth, and the devil reigning in the heart? In the same man God and the devil? Shall a wicked man receive the Sacrament in his mouth before he transmits the host into his stomach, and then

elicit an act of contrition — because while it is in the mouth the taking is inchoate, and when we transmit it the eating is substantially made? Who can bear without tears that these things are proposed and persuaded to the Christian people as most probable, not to say probable, documents of morals? Tamburini teaches with the other probabilists that even imperfect contrition itself, formed by charity merely inchoate, is so difficult that he brands with the note of Rigorism the opinion requiring contrition of this kind; and now he reckons it so easy that between the taking of the host *inchoatively* and the swallowing *consummatively* he judges that not an imperfect but a perfect contrition can be elicited. It is enough to have described the deplorable figments of those opinions: for they do not deserve to be confuted at greater length.

VIII. QUESTION V. *What is to be said of the opinion of Frs. Vásquez and Leander asserting that a priest sinning mortally in the very celebration of Mass is not bound to confess as soon as possible?* ANSWER. Fr. Leander, tract 7, disputation 7, question 1, proposes this question in these words: "Whether a priest who in the very act of sacrificing remembers a mortal sin, or perhaps commits it, is bound afterwards by force of the said precept to confess as soon as possible? I answer probably that he is not bound by that precept, because the Council spoke of a priest who, urgent necessity pressing, celebrated without previous confession — that is, of a priest who, compelled by necessity, did not send confession before, before he approached to celebrate the sacrifice … but not of a priest who in celebrating commits a sin, or remembers one. Therefore however much he then consecrate and communicate without confession, he will not be bound afterwards to confess as soon as possible. So Vásquez, Sayrus, Diana."

IX. What law can stand, such interpretations being admitted? He who in the very celebration of Mass perpetrates a mortal crime is not bound to confess as soon as possible? That paradox is unheard-of by me. Nor less lax is the other opinion of Tamburini, *On the Method of Communicating,* chapter 1, no. 63, and of Leander, question 8, who teach that a layman standing at the table of communion can receive the Eucharist without sending before the confession of a mortal sin which he remembers, even if he could withdraw without scandal: because, says Leander, *since the sacred action has been in a manner begun, he ought not out of reverence for the Eucharist to withdraw from that divine table.* So teach and resolve the cases of the times the Doctors of the times. But in very truth the Gospel of Christ cries out — or rather Christ by the mouth of the Evangelist Matthew, chapter 5: *If therefore thou offer thy gift at the altar, and there thou remember that thy brother hath anything against thee; leave there thy offering (N.B.) before the altar, and go first to be reconciled to thy brother: and then coming thou shalt offer thy gift.* What say the cited casuists to this? Here the discourse is not of the taking of the most sacred body of Christ, but of the offering of a gift. The discourse is not of a mortal sin of the offerer, but of anger and indignation against another brother. Oh how far distant is the Theology of Christ from the theology of those casuists! Tamburini and Leander teach that one is not to withdraw from the sacred table, even if no scandal be feared; others more cautious teach that then one is not to withdraw when scandal is feared. But that scandal which the casuists exaggerate Christ teaches in the praised text is to be contemned. Do not we all approach the tribunal of Penance? Is the sacrament of Penance to be passed over, lest men say that we are guilty of crimes? That a Christian man or woman withdraw from the sacred table exhibits not scandal but an argument of uprightness. For bystanders infer: that man remembered some fault, or became doubtful, and was unwilling with a perplexed conscience to receive the most sacred body of Christ. Therefore the scandal which many casuists obtrude is chimerical. So many priests, so many Christian men and women bring in the most grave scandal by

their frequent celebrations and communions, from which they exhibit no fruit and no reformation of morals. So many forward women, shameless and stripped of modesty, who continually sport with their little lovers, who frequent dances, theatres, games, and comedies, and at the same time approach the altars, who attempt to join Christ with Belial and light with darkness — these bring in the most grave scandal to the Christian people. This is the scandal in the taking away of which we must be wholly engaged.

X. QUESTION VI. *What is to be said of the opinion of Fr. Tamburini teaching that a case can be given in which one communicating in mortal sin does not commit a new sin?* ANSWER. Fr. Tamburini, *On the Method of Communicating,* chapter 1, § 10, no. 71, that he may open a way for himself to making sacrilege honourable, animates his reader with these words: *So kindly are the bowels of the Lord's mercy that he does not disdain sometimes to excuse our obstinacy. For I find one case or another in which a man can take the most pure communion in sin without sin.* But lest my adversaries after their manner should be able to impose upon the unskilled, as though I reported the opinions of the casuists truncated, I shall transcribe in just so many words Tamburini's decision, which is of this kind.

XI. "For from the things said above it is established that a priest who, Mass having been begun in good faith, remembers himself guilty of a mortal fault, ought to elicit an act at least of what he reckons contrition. But now if he cannot, or experiences that act to be exceedingly difficult for himself, what shall he do? He cannot confess, he is by no means able to be contrite, and it is most difficult to leave the sacrifice begun on account of the infamy resulting to him. What therefore remains to be extorted from a soul so affected? I judge it probable, from the opinion of some, that this man will not sin mortally if with a conscience of this kind of mortal sin, and with that sorrow which he can then elicit, he pursue the Mass, consecrate, and communicate. So Vásquez, Hurtado, de Lugo. The reason is, because the precept of communicating worthily does not seem to bind the faithful so closely as to compel a priest with so great disgrace to himself to withdraw from a sacred rite begun. But then a priest of this kind will not acquire grace; yet nevertheless he will not sin."

XII. It is a truth of faith that God does not command impossible things, as Trent defined, session 6, chapter 11. If the cited authors assert that the precept of contrition is impossible, they teach Lutheranism and Jansenism. If they grant that the precept is possible, then those who do not fulfil it sin. Therefore false and full of scandal is the doctrine of Tamburini and of the others asserting that *a case is given in which a man can take the most pure communion in sin without sin.*

XIII. Fr. Tamburini proceeds in the same place, no. 73: *And the same will hold of a layman who, now about to receive the sacred synaxis before the cloth, and unable under any pretext to remove himself, should remember a mortal sin, and could not be contrite: so there; for the reason is the same.* LET THE SCRUPULOUS AND THOSE TIMOROUS OF MIND NOTE THIS DOCTRINE. Here the doctrine, which Fr. Viva himself adopts, is not to be refuted with words, but to be deplored with tears.

XIV. QUESTION VII. *What is to be said of the other dispositions necessary for the Eucharist?* ANSWER. First, the natural fast prescribed by the statute of the Church is necessary; and this discipline has a most ancient origin. The very many disputations which some raise I pass over. The sick, urgent danger of death pressing, can communicate not fasting, as also a priest on account of the necessity of completing a sacrifice left imperfect by another seized by death or by some other unexpected chance.

XV. QUESTION VIII. *Is it lawful to approach the Eucharist after conjugal intercourse?* ANSWER. Several councils and the Fathers commonly persuade that for a day before communion spouses observe continence. Very many testimonies being omitted, I shall bring forward one or another. St. Paul, 1 Corinthians 7, says: *Defraud not one another, except perhaps by consent, for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer.* Like things St. Peter teaches, Epistle 1, chapter 3. The Tridentine Catechism, part 2, chapter 4, § 58, says: *The dignity of so great a Sacrament demands that those who are joined in matrimony abstain some days from the company of their wives, admonished by the example of David, who, being about to receive the loaves of proposition from the priest, professed that he and his young men had been pure from wives for three days.* Extremes in the adornment of the body are also to be avoided. Squalor is unbecoming and savours of irreverence. An honourable cleanliness ought to shine in the garment, in the countenance, and in the hands. But those women are altogether to be kept from holy communion who with bared bosom, and with vain garments displaying luxury, pride, and worldly pomps, do not blush to approach so great a Sacrament. Their odours, powders, and counterfeited beauty exhale from afar the stench and filth of their souls.

XVI. QUESTION IX. *What is to be said of frequent communion?* ANSWER. There came forth in the year 1745 at Paris a book entitled *The Spirit of Jesus Christ and of the Church upon Frequent Communion.* This work, published by Fr. Pichon, several most learned bishops proscribed by their letters, and the Roman See condemned it. To refute its lax paradoxes in this compendium is not expedient. Extremes in this matter, as in the rest, are to be declined. The Council of Trent, session 22, chapter 6, says: *The holy Synod indeed would wish that at each Mass the faithful standing by should communicate not only by a spiritual affection but also by the sacramental reception of the Eucharist, that thereby a more abundant fruit of this most holy Sacrifice might come to them.* Would that the morals of Christians were such that the wishes of that Council could be committed to execution.

XVII. Lax paradoxes in this matter also some have taught, as is plain from the following proscribed theses. Venerable Innocent XI condemned the following, no. 56: *Frequent confession and communion, even in those who live in the manner of the heathen, is a mark of predestination.*

XVIII. Into another extreme others have fallen, whose error Alexander VIII condemned, no. 22: *They are to be judged sacrilegious who claim a right to receiving communion before they have done condign penance for their offences.*

XIX. Similarly: *They are to be kept from holy communion in whom there is not yet the most pure love of God and free from every admixture.*

XX. The rules of frequent communion Innocent XI prescribed in his decree *Cum ad aures,* which you can read in Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 1, chapter 11, as also several testimonies of the holy Fathers for a full instruction in this matter, which you can read in the place cited; there you will find the clearest arguments against sacrilegious communions.

Dissertation IV — On the Sacrifice of the Mass

Chapter I — The notion of sacrifice, and its necessity

I. QUESTION I. *What is a sacrifice, and of how many kinds is it?* ANSWER. Sacrifice in its ample signification comprehends every good work, whether internal or external, which is directed to the glory of God. The notion of sacrifice strictly taken is this: *an external oblation, made to God alone, by which, in recognition of his supreme dominion, some sensible and permanent thing is consecrated by a lawful minister with a mystical rite.* Oblation holds the place of the genus. It is called external or sensible, because it is an act of religion in which men come together. But they cannot come together save by sensible signs, by which they manifest that which inwardly they bear in mind. It is called a sacrifice *of a sensible thing,* that it may be distinguished from the sacrifice of a contrite heart. *Made to God alone.* For God alone is the founder and governor of men, the beginning and the end. *In recognition of his supreme dominion.* By this exterior sacrifice a man protests his servitude to God, and that he has received from him whatever of good he has. For the primary end of sacrifice is the worship exhibited to God. *By a lawful minister* the oblation must be immolated, namely by a person designated to this office.

II. Sacrifice is divided, first, by reason of the matter, which is either solid, as an animal, which was offered in the old law after a victory gained over the enemy: therefore it was called *hostia,* from a victim of victory. Solid things also are bread, salt, incense, ears of corn, and wheat. Another matter is liquid, as wine, oil, blood, and water, which were sometimes offered and were called a libation. Second, by reason of the form it is distributed into holocaust, and into a sacrifice or victim for sin, and a peace-offering. The most perfect of all sacrifices was the holocaust, which was wholly consumed. The sacrifice for sin was partly consumed, and part passed to the use of the priests. Third, by reason of the end it is divided into latreutic, eucharistic, impetratory, and propitiatory.

III. QUESTION II. *Is it a dogma of faith that the Mass is a sacrifice?* ANSWER. By various names the Sacrifice of the Mass is called. First, it is called *Liturgy.* Second, *Synaxis,* or the conjunction of the faithful with Christ. Third, *Oblation,* which is offered in expiation of sins. Fourth, *Collect,* or the congregation of the faithful people. Fifth, it is called *Missa* from the verb *to send,* either because Christ is the victim sent to us by God, or because the sacrifice was made from the gifts sent by the faithful people, or because, the sacrifice being performed, the people is sent away, the deacon singing: *Go, it is the dismissal.*

IV. By a threefold canon Trent defined, session 22, that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice. Canon 1: *If anyone shall say that in the Mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice,* and so forth, *let him be anathema.* Like things are had in canons 3 and 4. By these three canons Trent routed the errors of the innovators. There is added the perpetual tradition of the Church and the consent of the Fathers, whose testimonies I have given in Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 2, chapter 2.

V. QUESTION III. *Is the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass set in the oblation?* ANSWER. The oblation which precedes the consecration is a mere preparation for the sacrifice: for it is an oblation of bread and wine. But bread and wine are not the victim of the sacrifice; but the victim is Christ the Lord

himself. The oblation which follows the sacrifice similarly does not pertain to the essence of the sacrifice, since it was not instituted by Christ but by the Church, as also was the first.

VI. The oblation made in the consecration constitutes the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass. For a sacrifice consists in the oblation and immolation of a sensible victim. Further, it is certain that in the consecration there is a true oblation. Since indeed Christ by force of the consecration is placed upon the altar as a true lamb and victim under the species of bread and wine, and is constituted in a certain state of death, inasmuch as, through the spiritual sword of the words, under diverse and separated species he is immolated and offered to God the Father. But this mystical separation, which is made by force of the words, of the body and the blood, aptly represents the bloody separation of the blood from the body accomplished on the cross.

VII. The communion of the priest is at least an integral part of the Sacrifice of the Mass, as all confess. Some maintain that it is an essential part. Since the Sacrifice of the Mass is the most perfect of all, and obtains the character of a holocaust. Further, as in a holocaust the whole victim was consumed, so in the Sacrifice of the Mass by the communion of the priest the whole victim is consumed. But that disagreement is of small moment. For the consumption of the sacrifice is of divine right. Wherefore if a priest die after the consecration, another priest, even one not fasting, ought to consume the sacrifice. Therefore the consecration is essentially ordained to the consumption. Similarly the consecration of both species pertains to the essence of the sacrifice, as all theologians affirm. For in the consecration is made the representation of the Lord's passion. Therefore the body ought not to be consecrated without the blood. Hence if a priest die after the consecration of the bread, another priest is to be substituted who may complete the sacrifice begun.

VIII. If after the consecration poison be detected, it ought not to be taken, but ought to be preserved in a fit little vessel, and other wine to be consecrated and taken. If an animal should fall in, it ought cautiously to be taken and washed and burned, and together with the ashes sent into the sacrarium, as St. Thomas teaches, III, q. 83, art. 6, reply 3.

Chapter II — On the value of the Mass; for whom, and by what minister, the Sacrifice can be offered

I. QUESTION I. *Is the value of the Sacrifice of the Mass infinite?* ANSWER. There is a twofold value: one *ex opere operato,* which proceeds from the work itself immediately instituted by Christ; another *ex opere operantis,* which is the effect of the merit and dignity of the minister. Theologians dispute on either side whether the value *ex opere operato* be infinite: for that the other is finite we all maintain. In few words I resolve the question. If the value be regarded absolutely, and inasmuch as it expresses power and sufficiency, without doubt it is infinite: since the Sacrifice of the Mass is the same as regards sufficiency as the Sacrifice of the Cross; the manner only of offering is diverse. But if it be regarded as it is offered by ministers and in second act, thus it is limited and finite. What of this, that the Sacrifice of the Cross itself as regards the application produces a limited effect in us, because the disposition of the subject is finite? If the effect of the Sacrifice of the Mass were infinite, it would profit all equally as much as one or another; a single Mass would free all the souls of Purgatory; and yet the Church never ceases from offering sacrifices for the dead.

II. QUESTION II. *What are the effects of the Sacrifice of the Mass?* ANSWER. The Council of Trent, session 22, chapter 2, teaches here that *the Sacrifice of the Mass is rightly offered, according to the tradition of the Apostles, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the living faithful, but also for the dead in Christ not yet fully purged.* Since the Sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory, it avails for the pardon of sins and for satisfaction, as the same Council in the same place, canon 3, defined. Through the Sacrifice sins are remitted mediately, inasmuch as God bestows upon the sinner actual graces by which he is stirred up and disposed to penitence. Upon the just it confers an increase of grace, and profits them for the remission of venial sins. By this Sacrifice also we obtain temporal goods, inasmuch as the use of them conduces to eternal life. The Sacrifice of the Mass therefore is ordained to temporal goods not as to an end, but as to means whose use marks out the way to the end.

III. QUESTION III. *To whom and for whom is the Sacrifice of the Mass offered?* ANSWER. All Catholics teach that the Sacrifice of the Mass is offered to God alone, and that as temples and altars are erected and consecrated to God alone, as Trent defined, session 22, chapter 3.

IV. But the Sacrifice of the Mass can be offered for all men — pagans, Jews, schismatics, heretics, the excommunicated — but especially for catechumens, and for the faithful. And this is drawn from St. Paul himself, who in 1 Timothy 2 says: *For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.* Christ suffered for all: therefore for all the Sacrifice can be offered. By a stronger right it is offered for the faithful, who are joined to Christ by the bond of faith. That the sacrifice is not to be offered for the damned all teach. Neither is sacrifice offered for the saints reigning with God, because there is nothing to be sought in them.

V. QUESTION IV. *Can the Sacrifice be offered for the pious souls detained in Purgatory?* ANSWER. All Catholics affirm it, and this is gathered from the perennial tradition of the Church and from holy Scripture, especially from 2 Maccabees, chapter 12. And this Trent defined, session 22, chapter 2: *that the Sacrifice of the Mass is offered not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the living faithful, but also for the dead, rightly, according to the tradition of the Apostles.* This same it declared in canon 3. The testimonies of the Fathers and of other councils I pass over for brevity's sake.

VI. QUESTION V. *Who is the minister of the Sacrifice of the Mass?* ANSWER. That priests alone are the ministers of this Sacrifice the Catholic Church has always taught, and against the innovators Trent defined, session 7, canon 10: *If anyone shall say that all Christians have power in the word and in administering all the sacraments, let him be anathema.* And again, session 22, canon 2, it adds: *If anyone shall say that by those words, "Do this for a commemoration of me," Christ did not institute the Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be anathema.* Christ the Lord, as the eternal priest according to the order of Melchisedech, is the principal offerer. Priests offer as ministers and vicars of the same Christ. They offer indeed as true priests ordained to this ministry, but ministerially. The faithful people offers by desire, by will, and by spiritual conjunction with the offerer.

VII. QUESTION VI. *Do wicked priests — heretics, schismatics, the suspended, the excommunicated, the degraded — validly perform the sacrifice?* ANSWER. That priests stained with mortal sin validly consecrate all Catholics teach. That the others recounted also validly perform the Sacrifice all theologians teach with St. Thomas, III, q. 82, art. 7, reply 3. Since although the exercise of the order can be suspended by a lawful superior, the power of the order nevertheless cannot be blotted out. It is not lawful

nevertheless either to assist at the Sacrifice or to seek communion from excommunicated, suspended, degraded, heretical, or schismatic priests.

VIII. Private Masses, in which the priests alone communicate, are lawful, as the Council of Trent defined, session 22, chapter 6, against the innovators.

Chapter III — On alms for Masses to be celebrated

I. The most wise Pontiff Benedict XIV set this argument in full light both in his treatise *On the Sacrifice of the Mass* and in the work *On the Synod*. I have reported entire in Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 2, chapter 6, the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs and of the Sacred Congregation of the Council of Trent upon this argument, which you can see there. Now I shall resolve certain little questions.

II. QUESTION I. *By whom is the alms to be conferred upon a priest celebrating Mass to be fixed?* ANSWER. By the bishop, as the Congregation of the Council determined, since a general rule cannot be prescribed. If a priest exact more alms than the bishop's fixing prescribes, he injures not only the law of the Church but commutative justice itself. Nor is it required, as all theologians teach, that the alms suffice for the entire sustenance of one day, because the action of the Sacrifice does not require the whole day but half an hour. Wherefore secular priests are not promoted to sacred Orders without a title either of patrimony or of benefice.

III. QUESTION II. *Is it lawful for a rich priest to accept an alms that he may celebrate Mass?* ANSWER. If several ancient canons be consulted, they seem to grant an alms to a priest about to celebrate on account of sustenance; but the universal custom of the Church, by which one must always stand, permits to all priests indiscriminately an alms for a Mass to be celebrated. Which custom rests upon holy Scripture, since St. Luke says, chapter 10: *For the labourer is worthy of his hire;* and St. Paul, 1 Corinthians 9: *Know you not, that they who work in the holy place eat the things that are of the holy place; and they that serve the altar partake with the altar?* Let the Apostle's whole chapter be read. That priests are rich or poor is, as regards this, by accident. *He that serveth the altar, let him live by the altar.*

IV. QUESTION III. *What priests in celebrating afford a suspicion of simony?* ANSWER. Those who, the alms being lacking, desist from celebrating. For the author of the opusculum *On the Office of a Priest,* chapter 1, once attributed to St. Thomas, says: *A priest nevertheless cannot celebrate with this intention, that from it he may obtain money, for he would sin mortally.* Very easily do many flatter themselves, and study to disguise this intention with various pretexts. But let priests consult their own fervour, and the profit which they take from celebration, and hence, when they will not lie to themselves, they will gather whether they celebrate principally for the end of the Sacrifice, or for the gaining of bread.

V. QUESTION IV. *Can a priest celebrate through another, retaining for himself part of the stipend accepted?* ANSWER. Many affirm it, whose opinion Alexander VII condemned, no. 9: *After the decree of Urban, a priest to whom Masses to be celebrated are delivered can satisfy through another, a lesser stipend being conferred upon him, another part of the stipend being retained for himself.* Fr. Viva upon this proposition 9, no. 8, reports the lax opinion of Bordoni asserting that the aforesaid priest does not sin against justice, but only against the obedience owed to the Pontiff: upon which opinion Fr. Viva brings forth this most probabilistic judgment: *Although this is not without its own probability, it seems nevertheless more probable,*

and so forth. If that opinion is not without its own probability, then by force of Probabilism it can be committed to execution.

VI. Fr. Tamburini, Book 3, *Method of the Mass,* chapter 1, § 5, no. 15, says: "If a man, being a procurator that a hundred Masses, for example, be celebrated, which Masses in this city are wont to be said for, say, two hundred *julii:* if a man, I say, by his own industry send or go to another city, where within the demanded time they may be said for a hundred *julii,* I think it not improbable that such a procurator can retain for himself the other hundred. The reason is that a parity can be taken from a servant who by extraordinary industry (for to the ordinary and moral he is obliged by his very service), by his own labour buys things at less than they are commonly worth in the market: for he can retain what is over, as being the fruit of his own industry. In a like way therefore in our case." A most witty comparison of profane service with the procurators to whom the care of Masses to be celebrated is committed! All things become lawful by the probable and by the non-probable. The filthiest gain is insinuated in the very celebration of Masses. A Christian man would scarcely think such things, did he not meet those writings. Servants let out their labours to their master. Wherefore it can scarcely, or at least rarely, happen that they can gain for themselves by extraordinary industry, since the time to be laid out in extraordinary industry has been sold to the master. But even granting the servant's gain, to extend it to procurators of Masses seems to abhor from truth and honesty.

VII. Fr. Dominic Viva in his *Treatise on Proposition 9 of Alexander VII,* no. 8, says: "If collectors of alms for Masses be priests, and Masses to be celebrated be not delivered to them, but they bear themselves as laymen who take care of the celebration of Masses, they will be able, from Navarrus, Córdoba, and Tamburini, probably against Pellizzari and Soto, to take a moderate wage for their labour out of what is given for the Mass, since this seems lawful by the law of nature." Good heavens! The law of nature permits that out of the offerings conferred by the faithful for the most sacred Sacrifice of the Mass to be celebrated, priests take a wage, provided that in collecting the alms they bear themselves as laymen and not as priests! The practice of both opinions, of Tamburini and Viva, Benedict XIV prohibited in his Constitution 21, whose beginning is *Quanta cura,* where among other things these things are had: *There are forbidden traffickings upon the alms of Masses; that is, those who collect alms in those places in which the stipends or alms for Masses are of a greater price, but take care that the Masses be celebrated in places in which they are wont to be celebrated for a lesser price: if they be laymen, let them incur excommunication; but if clerics or priests, suspension to be absolved by the Roman Pontiff alone.* See also what the same Pontiff writes, Book 5, *On the Synod,* chapter 8, no. 9, and chapter 9, no. 2.

VIII. A beneficiary, when he is compelled to celebrate through another, can lawfully afford the accustomed alms, although he himself perceive a greater one from the benefice, as the Sacred Congregation determined. In those Masses therefore which they call *manual,* it is forbidden to celebrate through others, a lesser stipend being conferred than was accepted. When a man commits a Mass to be celebrated to a priest instructed with singular uprightness, a greater stipend being conferred, he ought not to celebrate through another, even the whole stipend being conferred. Several other little questions some raise here, which savour of trafficking and bring in disgust.

IX. A priest who accepts scanty stipends from several, promising a Mass to each, cannot satisfy with one Mass alone. Fr. Viva, question 5, last article, no. 9, says: "But Trullench and Tamburini, Book 3, chapter 1, § 3, think probable the opinion of Suárez teaching that in that case this can be granted to a poor priest, when, compelled by poverty, he consents." This opinion was disapproved on the 14th by

a decree of the Sacred Congregation. Fr. Viva heaps up many things from Tamburini and other probabilists, to show that the decree of the Sacred Congregation is not opposed to the opinion of Suárez; but at no. 10 he confesses with de Lugo that by the decree of the Congregation it is forbidden that the opinion of Fr. Suárez be reduced to practice. And at last, contrary to his custom, he concludes: *I judge in the third place that the opinion of Suárez is false.*

X. QUESTION V. *Can a priest accept a twofold stipend — one for the attendance, as it is called, at a designated church, the other for the application?* ANSWER. De Lugo and Tamburini affirm it, provided it be established that the one willed only the presence, the other only the application. Fr. La Croix reports for this opinion Suárez, Vásquez, Pasqualigo, Aversa, and others, and himself after his manner brings forth nothing.

XI. But the Supreme Pontiff Benedict XIV, Vol. 5, note 15, reports a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council of the 9th of January and the 6th of February in the year 1617, which contains this. *Whether priests who under no other obligation celebrate in confraternities or in monasteries of nuns than for the adornment of the church, or that the confraternity brothers or the nuns may satisfy the precept of hearing Mass, can accept beyond the stipend which they receive from the confraternities or the nuns another stipend? The Sacred Congregation of the Council on the 9th of January and the 6th of February in the year 1617, in the Traguriensian case, answered that they cannot.*

XII. A priest cannot receive a twofold stipend, one for the fruit of impetration of the Mass, another for the fruit of satisfaction, whatever some may formerly have devised to the contrary. He who accepted a stipend for a Mass to be celebrated where and when he shall have willed, if someone afterwards ask him to celebrate at a certain place or time, can he accept something for such an obligation? There are those who affirm it: to me subtle figments of this kind seem tinged with the soot of a base trafficking. Similarly I do not approve the opinion of Fr. La Croix, Book 6, part 2, no. 141, which he reports from Fr. Gobat in these words: *If nevertheless it be agreed concerning the most special fruit, or another part of the fruit not sought, to be applied to a third party, that it may profit him as much as it can, that something can therefore be taken Gobat notes, no. 52, provided he warn the giver of the uncertainty whether such an application profit him.* Distinctions of this kind in a most grave matter I do not approve.

XIII. QUESTION VI. *Can several obligations be satisfied by a single Mass?* ANSWER. Although Urban VIII, Supreme Pontiff, forbade this, there have not therefore been lacking those who maintained the opposite. Their opinion Alexander VII proscribed in this thesis 10: *It is not against justice to accept a stipend for several sacrifices and to offer one sacrifice; neither is it against fidelity, even if I promise, by a promise confirmed even by an oath, to him who gives the stipend, that I will offer it for no other.* Let the reader observe that this thesis was maintained and devised by certain Catholics, and let him seriously consider what can be expected from them in controverted matters, if against a truth so clear they could write such things. You promised, you swore that you would sacrifice for no other; nevertheless you sacrifice, and do not sin even against fidelity? Did Socrates, Plato, Cicero, Seneca, or Plutarch ever write such things?

XIV. When a man has accepted stipends for Masses to be celebrated, he ought not long to defer the celebration. Diana, de Lugo, and Pasqualigo teach that it cannot be deferred beyond three months. Urban VIII forbids in his decree that more Masses be accepted than can be celebrated *within a small time.* But the time of three months does not seem small. The quantity of time cannot be defined; but the circumstances, and especially the wills of the offerers and the necessities for the relieving of

which the Masses are prescribed, are to be attended to. He who cannot celebrate the Masses for which he accepted stipends ought to furnish that which he can. He ought to admonish the offerers, if circumstances permit, that they take care that the Masses be celebrated. But his reputation is injured. Alas, wretched man! You squander your reputation by iniquitous actions which misbecome a priest of Christ; and when satisfaction must be made to God and to your neighbour, do you set your reputation against it?

XV. He who has vowed to offer a sacrifice for thanksgiving cannot accept a stipend, because he is presumed to have had this intention. He who accepted a stipend that he might celebrate a Mass of Requiem does not gravely sin if he celebrate another Mass; nevertheless, when the rubrics permit, faith is to be kept with the offerer, and he is to be warned that such a Mass cannot be celebrated. The anticipated celebration of Masses — namely, that a Mass to be celebrated tomorrow be celebrated today — since it is to the offerer's advantage, lacks fault, unless the offerer's intention be otherwise. He who is bound to celebrate every day can once in the week for reverence' sake omit it; he cannot nevertheless accept a stipend and celebrate for another. He who by the burden of a chaplaincy is bound to celebrate daily, if on account of the crimes of pollution, fornication, drunkenness, and so forth he be suspended by his confessor as unworthy, ought to fulfil his burden through another priest.

XVI. When a testator of a chaplaincy does not prescribe the number of Masses, it is better to consult the bishop. If a chaplain be sick, for about two months authors commonly free him from celebrating through another. But that priests may be freed from every doubt, the synodal laws or approved customs of each diocese are to be consulted. Too lax is the opinion which frees a chaplain from the burden of celebrating for the whole time in which he is sick. He who labours under the falling sickness ought to abstain from celebration. If he fall rarely, let the bishop be consulted, who, all things being regarded, may decide.

XVII. The intention of applying the Mass for the offerers is required. A habitual one does not suffice, whatever some may say; nor is an actual one necessary; but a virtual one suffices. Neither lawful nor valid is the application of a Mass for him whom God knows will first give a stipend; and La Croix says from Bassaeus that Clement VIII forbade this, which decree I have not seen.

XVIII. The reduction of Masses Benedict XIV set in full light, Book 5, *On the Synod,* chapter 10, where after many indicated decrees of Pontiffs he concludes: "Nevertheless after Urban VIII other Roman Pontiffs — namely Alexander VII, Clement X, Clement XI, Innocent XII, and Benedict XIII — granted to almost all religious institutes the privilege that the superiors general, mature counsel being employed and certain rules being observed which are expressed in the letters of the same privileges, could each in his own religious order moderate the burdens of Masses previously left and accepted: and the same faculty was made by Benedict XIII of holy memory to all bishops who by themselves or by their procurators were present at the Roman Council held in 1725, as may be seen in the same Council, title 15, chapter 8."

XIX. QUESTION VII. *On what days ought those who bear the care of souls to apply the Mass for the flock committed to them?* ANSWER. Various disputations were formerly among authors upon this matter. All these the most learned Pontiff Benedict XIV, happily reigning, took away in his encyclical letter upon the parochial and conventual Mass, whose beginning is *Cum semper oblatas,* given in the year 1744. I have reported the entire letter in Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 2, chapter 6. Now I transcribe a few

words. *We think it opportune to declare to your Fraternities that it will be abundantly enough for us, and consequently can be enough for you, that those who exercise the care of souls celebrate and apply the sacrifice of the Mass for the people on Sundays and on the other days of precept throughout the year.* Read the entire letter, in which you will find most wholesome documents for parish priests. There are also rejected the excuses of those pastors who omitted to apply the Sacrifice on the said days for the flock committed to them on account of the slenderness of their revenues.

XX. QUESTION VIII. *At what hour is it lawful to celebrate?* ANSWER. From dawn until noon, as the common opinion teaches. Various causes can occur for anticipating or protracting this celebration by an hour. He who without cause violates the law of the prescribed time sins. I reckon that in this matter one rarely sins gravely, on account of the various customs of places.

XXI. QUESTION IX. *When is it lawful to celebrate several times on the same day?* ANSWER. Formerly priests celebrated several times. At present it is granted only on the day of the Nativity of the Lord to celebrate three Masses. No one nevertheless is bound to celebrate three. Several cases are wont to be assigned in which it is lawful to repeat Masses. If a parish priest have several parishes, and unless he celebrate several Masses some parish would lack a Mass, then, they say, he can double. But in our age, in which the supply of priests is most abundant, this necessity scarcely occurs.

XXII. QUESTION X. *In what place is one to celebrate?* ANSWER. In a church either consecrated, or at least blessed by the bishop, at an altar either consecrated or in which there is a consecrated stone. The bishop can impart a faculty of celebrating outside a church in some honourable place for a just cause. A bishop on a journey can celebrate at a portable altar, both in his own and in another's diocese. Upon which matter Clement XI published a decree in the year 1703, which I have reported entire in Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 2, chapter 7. In a ship also it is lawful to celebrate, provided there be no danger of the blood being spilled.

XXIII. QUESTION XI. *What is to be said of private oratories?* ANSWER. The Council of Trent, session 22, *On the Celebration of Mass,* forbids that bishops permit celebration in private houses. Fr. La Croix, Book 6, part 1, no. 267, relates that bishops exercise the power of granting private oratories. In Italy this faculty of erecting oratories in the houses of seculars is granted by the Supreme Pontiff alone.

XXIV. In oratories of this kind it is forbidden to celebrate on the feasts of the Nativity of the Lord, of the Epiphany, of Easter, of Pentecost, of the Annunciation, of the Assumption, of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and of All Saints, unless it be otherwise expressed in the privilege.

XXV. They satisfy the precept of hearing Mass on a feast day in these private oratories all who dwell in the house of the privileged person, as father, mother, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, wife, sons, daughters, grandsons, great-grandsons, and others descending by the direct line and remaining under the government of the privileged person: in one word, all those and those alone who are expressed in the privilege. It were to be wished that Christians would sustain this inconvenience of visiting the supreme Lord in his own house. Not a few extort these privileges out of ostentation and out of sloth.

XXVI. Many probabilists — Azor, Castropalao, Pellizzari, Busembaum, Burghaber, Gobat, whom Fr. La Croix reports, Book 3, part 1, no. 618 — teach that even those who are not of the family satisfy the precept of hearing Mass on a feast day in private oratories of this kind, and La Croix himself calls their opinion probable. But this opinion is not probable but utterly false, and the Pontiff disapproves

it in these words contained in the Bull: *But we will that others who are not of the family be not reckoned free from the obligation of hearing Mass in a church.* Many other interpretations I pass over.

XXVII. QUESTION XII. *What is to be held concerning the consecration of a church and its pollution?* ANSWER. A church can be blessed by a simple priest by commission of the bishop; it can be consecrated by the bishop alone. The Supreme Pontiff can commit to a simple priest that he consecrate a church.

XXVIII. A church is polluted: first, on account of a homicide perpetrated in it, even without the shedding of blood, or if a wound be so deadly that there or elsewhere death must follow. Second, by a public shedding of blood or of seed mortally evil, and consequently by a sacrilegious conjugal act. Third, by the burial of an excommunicated person to be shunned, or of an unbeliever. Fourth, by the destruction of the church, or the demolition of the greater part.

XXIX. An altar apt for sacrifice ought to have been consecrated by its own bishop, whether fixed or portable. The notable breaking of the same renders it execrated. If the stone be broken into two parts, of which each is apt to sustain the chalice, paten, and host, either can serve for an altar.

XXX. QUESTION XIII. *Is a priest bound to offer Mass?* ANSWER. All the faithful are bound by natural, divine, and ecclesiastical precept to offer sacrifice to God through public ministers. Therefore by the same right priests are bound, since these two things are reciprocal. See Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 2, chapter 8. Cajetan on 3, question 82, article 10, taught that priests who rarely or never perform sacred rites sin only venially. This opinion as false and lax St. Pius V commanded to be struck out of Cajetan's commentaries.

XXXI. Parish priests and all who have the care of souls are bound by themselves, or, if they be hindered, through others, to celebrate as often as the faithful are bound to assist at Mass. Nor hence gather that these ought to celebrate on feast days alone: for since they are pastors, they are bound to celebrate if not daily, yet frequently, that by their example they may allure their sheep to receive the divine pasture. The other priests ought to celebrate at least on Sundays and the other feasts, as the Council of Trent, session 13, chapter 14, prescribes. On the other days let them celebrate more or less according to their greater or lesser fervour. Although formerly in time of persecution priests celebrated without a minister, nevertheless, persecution ceasing, the opposite discipline has always obtained of celebrating with a minister. Therefore of St. Sixtus St. Laurence said: *Thou wast never wont to offer sacrifice without a minister.*

Chapter IV — On the rite, or ceremonies, and rubrics with which Mass ought to be celebrated

I. QUESTION I. *Of how many kinds is the ceremonial of the Mass?* ANSWER. Twofold. Certain ceremonies go before, which regard the place, the time, and the person; others accompany, and are parts of the sacred Liturgy itself. Under the name of place are understood temples, altars, sacred vessels, and lights. The time indicates the hour of celebrating. To the person pertain the sacred vestments, and they are six: the amice, the alb, the girdle, the maniple, the stole, and the chasuble or planet, the use of which is most ancient. Those vestments ought to be blessed.

II. Outside a case of urgent necessity it is never lawful to celebrate without the sacred vestments. While the sacred vestments are put on, the prescribed prayers are to be recited devoutly.

III. Sacred vessels are necessary for the lawful celebration of Mass, namely a chalice and paten consecrated by the bishop. Necessary also are the linens, namely the corporal, the pall, and the purificator, similarly blessed by the superior. The corporal and the pall ought to be of linen, white, and clean. Upon the altar there must be three cloths, and a cross in the middle of the altar which bears the image of the Crucified, not painted but carved. The sacred vessels cannot be touched by laymen. There is required besides a veil with the burse, which can be touched by all. The host to be consecrated among the Latins ought to be of circular shape, whether large or small. The Greeks use a host of quadrangular shape. No one relying on memory ought to celebrate without a missal. If a missal be lacking, it is enough that he have the Mass written out.

IV. Priests ought to go to the church in a long garment. *They do not dare,* says Benedict XIV, Vol. 1, note 14, *to sit before great men without a long garment; and afterwards they are not ashamed to depart from home clothed in a short garment, and with it to approach the temple of the Lord about to celebrate!* See Vol. VIII, Book 3, dissertation 2, chapter 9. Concerning the periwig, commonly *parrucca,* many things would have to be said. In a few words I shall say that priests ought to celebrate with head bared. Some teach that some cause suffices for priests to celebrate with head covered. This Urban VIII forbids in the reformed Missal. The periwig Innocent XI expressly forbade in encyclical letters given to the Nuncios of the Apostolic See in the year 1689, which Fr. La Croix reports, Book 6, part 2, no. 401, who nevertheless adds: "Those things notwithstanding, we see daily priests celebrating in a false periwig, who think that by this they satisfy their conscience if they so celebrate, the judgment of one or another honest physician being had, that otherwise they could not without danger of grave inconvenience." Nor does Fr. La Croix mutter anything against so great a corruption. We see also daily several priests celebrating Mass precipitately, or rather profaning it with unworthy gesticulations, reading most swiftly with a stammering tongue; and many other absurdities we behold daily. Why are physicians obtruded upon the scene? Has the nature of rich and noble priests been changed in our age, that they need false periwigs? Before these periwigs, which assuredly are not ancient, were introduced, did not noble and rich priests celebrate? And do not plebeian priests of middling condition celebrate today? Let those who cannot celebrate unless they be long-haired abstain from celebration. The rites of ecclesiastical discipline, not the vain axioms of flattering physicians, are to be consulted in the celebration of Mass.

V. QUESTION II. *Into how many parts is the Mass distributed?* ANSWER. It is distributed into four parts. First, from the beginning up to the offertory, and this is called the Mass of the Catechumens. Second, from the offertory up to the consecration. Third, from the consecration up to the communion. Fourth, from the communion up to the end.

VI. QUESTION III. *Is it a mortal sin to neglect the rubrics in celebrating Mass?* ANSWER. The affirmative opinion is common, unless smallness of matter excuse. Since by a grave precept from the Supreme Pontiffs, and especially from St. Pius V, the observance of them is commanded. There is a twofold kind of rubrics. Some are called *preceptive,* others *directive.* Preceptive are called those which command that celebration be made in a sacred place, on an altar, in sacred vessels and vestments, in the prescribed matter and form, with fasting going before, and many others. Directive are called those which according to the common sense of theologians do not oblige under mortal sin, as to pray before and after Mass, the number of collects, and many other things of that kind.

VII. QUESTION IV. *Would one who should omit some part of the Mass sin mortally?* ANSWER. The ordinary parts of the Mass are the confession, the introit, *Dominus vobiscum,* the collect, the epistle, the gospel, the offertory, the preface, the whole canon, and so forth. Not ordinary are the *Gloria in excelsis,* and so forth, the number of prayers, the Creed, the plurality of epistles, and so forth. He who deliberately omits a notable part of the canon sins mortally. He who should omit a light matter, even of the canon — say the name of one saint — would sin venially. He nevertheless who should deliberately omit something in the canon which would corrupt the sense would sin mortally. Nothing therefore is to be added and nothing omitted. But all things are to be pronounced clearly and distinctly. Many things would have to be said here of priests who are too hasty, who muttering within their lips truncate the words, who recite with a raised voice what is to be said with a lowered one, or the contrary. The congruous time for the celebration of Mass ought to be neither shorter than a third part of an hour nor longer than half an hour. The brevity of a compendium does not permit a fuller discourse upon this argument.