

THEOLOGIA MORALIS SANCTI ALPHONSI

Reduced into a Compendium, and Adapted to the Use of the Venerable American Clergy
by Anthony Konings, C.SS.R.

BAPTISM

The Treatise on the Sacraments in General and the Treatise on Baptism, from Volume II

New York: Benziger Brothers, fifth edition, 1885 · The Latin is in the public domain.
The English translation is our own, made from the Latin
for the Morals of the Church library, where the text may be read and searched online.

CONTENTS

TREATISE ON THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL	4
CHAPTER I: ON THE DEFINITION, NUMBER, AND DIVISION OF THE ...	5
SACRAMENTS	
ON THE MATTER AND FORM OF THE SACRAMENTS.	6
I. On the Nature and Union of Matter and Form.	6
II. On the Change of Matter and Form.	8
III. On the Repetition of the Sacraments in Doubt Concerning the Valid Application of ...	8
Matter and Form.	
CHAPTER III: ON THE MINISTER OF THE SACRAMENTS	10
ARTICLE I: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ...	10
SACRAMENTS, OR ON THE ATTENTION, INTENTION, FAITH, AND PROBITY	
OF THE MINISTER	
§ I. On the Attention of the Minister	10
§ II. On the Intention of the Minister	10
§ III. On the Faith and Probity of the Minister	13
ARTICLE II: ON THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTER	15
§ I. On the Obligation of Ministering Sacraments	15
§ II. On the Obligation of Denying Sacraments to the Unworthy Who Ask	16
§ III. On the Mode of Conferring Sacraments	22
CHAPTER IV: ON THE SUBJECT OF THE SACRAMENTS	24
ARTICLE I: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE VALID RECEPTION OF THE ...	24
SACRAMENTS	
ARTICLE II: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE LICIT RECEPTION OF THE ...	26
SACRAMENTS	
APPENDIX: ON SACRAMENTALS	29
TREATISE ON BAPTISM	33
CHAPTER I: ON THE NATURE, PROPERTIES, AND NECESSITY OF BAPTISM	34
CHAPTER II: ON THE MATTER AND FORM OF BAPTISM	35
ARTICLE I: ON BOTH THE REMOTE AND PROXIMATE MATTER OF BAPTISM	35
§ I. On the Remote Matter of Baptism	35
§ II. On the Proximate Matter of Baptism	37
ARTICLE II: ON THE FORM OF BAPTISM	38
CHAPTER III: ON THE MINISTER OF BAPTISM	40
CHAPTER IV: ON THE SUBJECT OF BAPTISM	43
CHAPTER V: ON THE ACCESSORY SOLEMNITIES OF BAPTISM, NAMELY ON ...	51
PATRONS AND CEREMONIES	
ARTICLE I: ON PATRONS	51
ARTICLE II: ON THE CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM	52

TREATISE ON THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL

We must treat concerning the Sacraments: 1° their nature and division; 2° matter and form; 3° the Minister; 4° the subject.

CHAPTER I: ON THE DEFINITION, NUMBER, AND DIVISION OF THE SACRAMENTS

1206. - I. Definition. A Sacrament is a sensible sign instituted by Christ for signifying and conferring grace.

Hence three things are necessarily required in every Sacrament, namely: 1° a sensible sign; 2° divine institution; 3° the power of producing the grace promised by Christ.

All Sacraments are perfected by three things: 1° by things as matter; 2° by words as form; 3° by the person of the Minister confecting the Sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does. - This is clear from the Council of Florence in the Decree of Union.

Sacraments, besides sanctifying grace, produce grace which is called sacramental, i.e. they confer, if due conditions are not lacking, helps for obtaining the special end for which each Sacrament was instituted. Sacraments operate *ex opere operato*, i.e. by force of the divine institution independently of the work of the one operating, namely of the Minister and subject of the Sacraments.

1207. - II. Number. The Sacraments are seven, as is clear from Trent:¹ If anyone shall have said that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that there are more or fewer than seven, namely Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or that even some one of these seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament, let him be anathema.

III. Division. Sacraments according to various properties are thus distinguished:

1° **Necessary, or not necessary.** Again, necessary Sacraments are necessary either by necessity of means, or by necessity of precept. By necessity of means, at least in implicit vow, Baptism is necessary, which is the gate of the Church and of the kingdom of heaven; Penance is necessary for those who have fallen into mortal sin after Baptism; and, according to St. Alphonsus,¹ probably also the Eucharist, both on account of the words of Christ:² Unless you shall have eaten, etc., you shall not have life in you; and because the Eucharist is the end of all the Sacraments. - By necessity of precept all the others are necessary, with the last two excepted, which are not necessary for private persons, but only for the community.

2° **Imprinting, or not imprinting,** character in the soul. Baptism, Confirmation, and Order imprint character; the others do not imprint. - Trent.³

3° **Formed, or unformed,** according as they produce grace while they are received, or, with an obstacle intervening, suspend their effect until the obstacle is removed.

4° **Sacraments of the living or of the dead,** according as they already suppose sanctifying, or first, grace, and only increase it; or, from their primary institution, confer that same grace.

Notes to n. 1207 - note sequence 1. (1) Session 7, Canon 1. Notes to n. 1207 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 192. (2) John 6. 54. (3) Session 7, Canon 9.

1208. Questions. - Query 1° Can the Sacraments of the dead confer second grace?

Resp. Affirmatively. But this can happen in a twofold case: 1° when venial sins alone are subjected to the keys, which frequently

happens; 2° when a penitent, guilty of mortal sin, approaches the Sacrament of Penance with perfect contrition; because perfect contrition with the vow of the Sacrament, even before reception of the same, justifies a man: therefore then the Sacrament confers not first grace, but second grace only.

Query 2° Can Sacraments of the living sometimes avail to confer first grace?

Resp. Affirmatively, more probably; not indeed *per se*, as is clear from their institution, but *per accidens*, or by means of Charity infused by force of the Sacrament in a subject not voluntarily opposing an obstacle. The case would be if someone of good faith, about to approach a Sacrament of the living, approaches in mortal sin, either because he is ignorant of this, or because he thinks himself contrite, or because he thinks that he approaches licitly in that state; now, in these circumstances the Sacrament of the living infuses grace into the soul, and therefore blots out the sin. For Sacraments always confer grace on those not placing an obstacle.¹ But an obstacle is not placed by him who approaches thus in good faith.²

1209. - Query 3° Is attrition required or does it suffice, that Sacraments of the living may confer first grace?

Resp. Affirmatively to each: 1° indeed it is required, because first grace cannot be infused except by the destruction of mortal sin; but the destruction of mortal sin cannot happen without detestation of the same, namely without contrition or at least attrition; 2° it suffices, because from the things said Sacraments of the living can sometimes confer first grace: but this could not happen if attrition did not suffice, since a sinner justified by perfect contrition would always approach the Sacrament.³

Query 4° Is original sin blotted out in Baptism valid indeed, but unformed because of defect of disposition in the adult baptized?

Resp. Negatively. The reason is, because no sin dissolving from the friendship of God is forgiven except through reconciliation with God, i.e. through justification. But this cannot happen unless first grace is infused; but this first grace is not infused if dispositions are lacking. Therefore. But once the obstacle has been removed, whether by perfect contrition with the vow of the Sacrament, or by the Sacrament with attrition, the sacramental grace of Baptism revives, or its suspension ceases, and it blots out original sin, and at the same time all actual sins committed before Baptism. But the Sacrament of Penance blots out sins committed after Baptism, and, according to the sentence which St. Alphonsus¹ calls most common, but whose foundation does not seem convincing to him, the sin of fiction, or of depraved disposition, with which the Sacrament of Baptism was received. Yet insofar as this depraved disposition persevered after Baptism, it is certainly blotted out through the Sacrament of Penance.

Notes to n. 1209 - note sequence 1. (1) Trent, Session 7, Canon 6. (2) L. VI. 6. 269. St. Thomas, Part 3, q. 72, a. 7 ad 2; q. 79, a. 3. (3) L. VI. 6. Notes to n. 1209 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 142. ## CHAPTER II.

ON THE MATTER AND FORM OF THE SACRAMENTS.

I. ON THE NATURE AND UNION OF MATTER AND FORM.

1210. - Definitions. Matter is a sensible thing to be determined to the notion of a Sacrament through form. Hence matter is that which in the Sacrament is more indifferent, and has a less perfect signification; and therefore it must be determined through another thing for signifying.

Matter is twofold: one remote, and another proximate. The former is the sensible thing itself, which is employed in the Sacrament, or the thing about which the sacramental action is exercised. The latter is the very application, or use, of the remote matter in the sacramental action. Thus in Baptism water is the remote matter, ablution the proximate matter.

But form is the part of the Sacrament which determines the matter for effecting the Sacrament, and which ordinarily (n. 1554. II.) consists in words uttered by the Minister.

1211. Principles. - I. Matter and form are altogether necessary for the validity of a Sacrament; therefore, with either one lacking, Sacraments cannot be confected. The reason is, because a Sacrament cannot be confected except in that mode in which Christ instituted it, who alone is the author of the Sacraments. It is of faith. It is clear besides from dogmatic definitions, especially from the Council of Florence in the Decree of Union, etc.¹

II. In confecting a Sacrament, outside the case of necessity, matter and form ought to be employed morally certain. The reason is, because, unless necessity urges, it is not lawful to use probability which does not remove the danger of invalidity. Cf. n. 60. I.

III. Matter and form ought to be united, or applied, by the same Minister and toward the same subject. "The reason is, because if one should place the matter, and another the form, the words of the form would not be verified; for the Minister, who, for example, should say: I baptize thee, while another pours out the water, would utter what is false, since he himself would not baptize.

IV. That a Sacrament be valid, there ought to be so great a conjunction or simultaneity between matter and form that one affects the other. The reason is, because otherwise the words would not fall upon such a thing, nor therefore with it constitute one total sign.

1. In the Eucharist physical simultaneity is required between matter and form; for the demonstrative pronoun THIS and HERE cannot be verified unless the matter is present.

2. In the other Sacraments moral simultaneity suffices, and that diverse according to the diverse nature of the individual Sacraments. Hence:

a) In Penance absolution can be deferred for some little time, for example for an hour; for it was instituted in the manner of a forensic judgment, in which sentence is not always immediately pronounced.

b) In Matrimony the consent of one party can follow the consent of the other for as long as this is morally judged to endure, as happens in contracts, whose nature Matrimony imitates.

c) In the other Sacraments, for validity, it suffices that the matter be applied immediately (i.e. within a space less than one *Pater*) before the form is pronounced, or immediately after it has been uttered. - In practice, however, as safer, the sentence of Cajetan is to be advised, which requires that the form be begun before the application of the matter is completed, or conversely.¹

Notes to n. 1211 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 427. Notes to n. 1211 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 9.

II. ON THE CHANGE OF MATTER AND FORM.

1212. - There is given a twofold change both in matter and in form, namely substantial and accidental.

The change will be substantial in matter, if according to the use and estimation of men this cannot be called the same as that which was determined by Christ, as if in Baptism you should employ wine instead of water; but in form, if the sense of the words intended by Christ is changed into another, as if in Baptism you should say: I anoint thee in the name, etc. But the change is called accidental which is concerned only with the qualities of the thing, as if you baptize with water not blessed; or which does not change the sense of the words, as if in place of: I baptize, you should say: I wash.¹

Principles. - **I.** Every substantial change in the matter and form of a Sacrament invalidates the Sacrament, because it is no longer the rite instituted by Christ; and, if it is voluntary, constitutes grave sin, because it inflicts grave injury upon the author of the rite.

II. No accidental change in the matter and form invalidates a Sacrament; yet it induces grave or light sin, according as it is, or is not, notable.

The form of the Sacraments can be changed substantially in many ways:

1° By subtraction of an essential syllable or words, as if you say: I baptize, omitting that word thee; but not of accidental words, as if in Latin you say: I baptize thee, omitting that word I.

2° By addition, by which the truth of the Sacrament is taken away, as: I baptize thee in the name of the greater Father, of the lesser Son; but not by that addition by which only the error of the Minister is expressed, in a separate proposition, and not as an explicit or implicit condition, as: by the authority conferred upon me by Calvin, I, etc.

3° By variation of words through others not synonymous, as if in place of: I absolve, you say: I change.

4° By transposition of words, which ordinarily is only accidental, as: Thee I baptize.

5° By corruption of the same, for example by changing letters, which will more easily be substantial at the beginning than at the end of the words; because more easily for hearers the sense will be changed, for example in "in the name of the mother" for "of the father," than in "of the chalice" for "of the cup."

6° By interruption, by which the unity of the sentence is taken away, as if, after having said: This is, you should recite a Psalm or delay long; but not if, after having said: I thee, you should cough, impose silence, saying: Be silent, chatterers, and then at once conclude: baptize, etc.

Notes to n. 1212. (1) L. VI. 11.

III. ON THE REPETITION OF THE SACRAMENTS IN DOUBT CONCERNING THE VALID APPLICATION OF MATTER AND FORM.

1213. - A threefold rule must be established:

I. Sacraments can be repeated whenever there is a prudent doubt concerning their value. The reason is, because if perchance the Sacrament were not valid, those who approach to receive it would be deprived of its fruit. But that a prudent fear of so great an inconvenience is a sufficient reason why

the Sacrament should be repeated is clear from the very well-known axiom: Sacraments are on account of men.

II. Sacraments generally cannot be repeated without grave sin, when there is no prudent doubt concerning their value. The reason is, because without cause they would be repeated, and therefore a grave injury would be inflicted upon them.

III. Sacraments ought to be repeated whenever, a prudent doubt concerning their value having arisen, charity, justice, or religion demands this; that is, whenever from justice, charity, or religion they ought to have been conferred or administered. The reason is, because the nullity of the Sacrament, if perchance it were present, would turn to the harm of the neighbor, and sometimes to contempt or irreverence of Religion. But then they are to be repeated only conditionally, that reverence for the Sacrament may be provided for.¹

Notes to n. 1213. (1) L. VI. 27 sq.

1214. Resolves. - 1° The Sacraments more necessary, and those which are conferred only once, namely Baptism and Order, are more easily to be repeated, even if a much greater probability makes for the value of the Sacrament against doubtful or only slightly probable reasons in the opposite direction. - Thus commonly.

2° Absolution is to be repeated with a penitent guilty of mortal sin, if there is prudent doubt concerning the due utterance of the form. But if the penitent is not in the state of mortal sin, it will not be necessary to repeat the form, since Communion can be permitted to him even without absolution.

3° The Minister who doubts lightly, and does not know why he fears, or only does not reflexively remember that he pronounced the words of the form, sins mortally *per se* if he repeats the form, or even one word three or four times. The reason is, because he changes the form, and introduces a new rite concerning the gravest action of all. Moreover he exhibits Christ, whom he represents, as speaking ridiculously. In practice, however, the scrupulous who repeat the form are for the most part excused from mortal sin, indeed often also from venial sin, because, too much agitated by scruples, from perplexity or without advertence, they act so foolishly. - Thus Voit.¹

4° If in Mass after the Consecration a doubt arises for you concerning the due utterance of the form, or concerning its total omission, you ought not, nor can you, repeat anything, since otherwise you are not accustomed to omit these things; for one must judge from things commonly occurring, unless nevertheless you doubt very probably, as the Rubric speaks. - See St. Alphonsus.²

Notes to n. 1214. (1) P. 2. n. 27. 31. (2) L. VI. 224.

CHAPTER III: ON THE MINISTER OF THE SACRAMENTS

The Minister of the Sacraments is he who, in the name of Christ, whose place he bears, performs the sacramental action.

We must treat: 1° of the requisites in the Minister for conferring the Sacraments; 2° of the office of the Minister in the administration of the Sacraments.

ARTICLE I: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS, OR ON THE ATTENTION, INTENTION, FAITH, AND PROBITY OF THE MINISTER

§ I. ON THE ATTENTION OF THE MINISTER

1215. - Definition. Attention is the application of the mind to the things which are being done, or it is an act of the intellect by which a man considers that which he is doing.

Division. Attention is distinguished as twofold: one internal, which consists in the advertence itself of the mind to that which is being done; another external, which excludes every action physically incompatible with internal attention. - See the things said at n. 402.

Principles. - I. For the validity of the conferral of Sacraments no other attention is required except that which is found in every truly human act. Therefore Sacraments can be validly ministered even by a distracted Minister, or one thinking at the same time about other affairs. The reason is, because in order that an act be and be considered human, what is looked to is not actual attention, but the procession of the act itself from an act of the rational will. Moreover attention often does not depend upon the will of man; but Christ could not require in the Minister of the Sacraments a condition which is sometimes impossible.¹

II. For the licit conferral of Sacraments attention is required, so that every voluntary distraction be absent. The reason is, because the reverence due to the Sacrament demands that it be treated diligently, and that the danger of erring be avoided. Nevertheless, according to the common sentence of theologians, voluntary distraction ordinarily does not exceed venial sin, unless one exposes himself to a danger of gravely erring in the form.²

They except the Eucharist, i.e. the canon, and especially the Consecration and Communion, during which every notable voluntary distraction, on account of the greatest dignity of the Sacrament, is probably mortal. Others, however, deny this. St. Alphonsus adheres rather to the former sentence.³

Notes to n. 1215. (1) Ib. (2) Ib. (3) Ib. and n. 410. Dub. 5. Exam. Ord. n. 125.

§ II. ON THE INTENTION OF THE MINISTER

1216. - Definition. Intention is an act of the will tending toward some end, or an act of the will by which one intends to do or omit something.

Division. It is manifold, namely: 1° actual, virtual, habitual, and interpretative (n. 5. 4°); 2° internal or true, or external, which regards only the external act; 3° determinate or indeterminate, or in a

confused way; 4° absolute or conditioned.

Principles. - I. For the validity of a Sacrament there is required in the Minister some true and serious will at least of doing that which the Church does. - It is clear from Trent.¹

II. Nevertheless an actual intention is not required, but a virtual one suffices. The reason is, because actual intention, although best and desirable, is sometimes morally impossible; but a virtual intention sufficiently flows into the action of the Minister, so that this can be called truly human and deliberate. - Thus all.

III. A habitual intention does not suffice, nor an interpretative one; not the first, because it is neither actually elicited by the will, nor, although sometimes elicited, does it endure in some effect or in a series of actions; not the second, because it is neither actually elicited, nor was it ever actually elicited, but it would only be elicited if the mind were thinking about the thing to be done (n. 5. 4°).

Notes to n. 1216. (1) Session 7, Canon 11.

1217. Questions. - Query 1° Is an internal intention required?

Resp. Affirmatively; because, if the Minister should intend only the external act, that act - for example, ablution, which can be referred both to cleansing stains and to baptizing - would not be determined to its being.¹

Query 2° Is there required in the Minister the intention of doing what the Roman Church does?

Resp. Negatively, provided he has the intention, at least implicit, of doing that which the true Church does, even if from error he should think his own heterodox church to be the true Church.²

Query 3° Is there required in the Minister the intention of confecting a Sacrament?³

Resp. Negatively, at least explicitly, provided this intention is not excluded. For it suffices that he intend in general and implicitly to do what the Church does.⁴

Notes to n. 1217. (1) L. VI. 16. (2) Ib. 20. (3) Ib. 21. (4) Ib. 22.

1218. - Query 4° Must the intention of the Minister be determined to a certain matter and person?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is: 1° as regards the matter, because, as was said above in q. 1°, otherwise it would remain in a state of indifference; for it cannot be drawn from that state and determined to the Sacrament except through the intention of the Minister; 2° as regards the person, because the effect of the Sacrament cannot be applied in general, but to some subject; otherwise no application would be made. - Nevertheless an error in the person does not stand in the way of the validity of the Sacrament, except in Matrimony, or unless the Minister should bind his intention exclusively to a certain person. But even in this case he would validly administer the Eucharist, as is clear.¹

Query 5° Is a Sacrament valid when conferred with a conditioned intention?

Resp. 1° With Matrimony excepted, as being a contract (concerning which later), negatively, if the condition added is either concerning an impossible thing and is seriously added, as: I absolve thee, if thou hast touched heaven with thy finger, because then no intention of absolving is present; or concerning a future contingent thing, because such a condition suspends the intention of the Minister, and prevents the form here and now from being applied to the matter; nor afterward can it

be applied, the condition having been verified, since then the matter and form have already ceased to be present.

Resp. 2° Affirmatively, if the condition is either concerning a future necessary thing, and the suspension of the Sacrament is not really intended, because the intention under such a condition passes over into an absolute intention; or concerning a past or present thing, and in fact this exists, because even then a conditioned intention passes over into an absolute intention; but if the condition is not verified, then there is no intention, since it has been restricted to a non-existing condition.²

Notes to n. 1218. (1) Ib. 19. (2) L. VI. 26.

1219. - Query 6° Is it lawful to confer Sacraments with a conditioned intention, in doubt whether they have been validly conferred?

Resp. 1° As regards Sacraments imprinting character, it is certain that this is lawful. For it is established by Canon Law, where in doubt of Baptism this form is indicated: If thou hast not yet been baptized, I baptize thee, etc.¹

Resp. 2° Also as regards other Sacraments it is lawful, if a sufficient cause adds the condition. The reason is, because Sacraments are on account of men, and, by adding a condition, reverence due to the Sacrament is sufficiently preserved, provided also that the consultation of the Sacrament itself be looked after as much as can be done, and with the good of those who receive the Sacrament, if perhaps they are capable of it, and with reverence toward the Sacrament. - Thus more commonly with St. Alphonsus, against some.² But it is certain that in extreme necessity, where nothing is present except doubtful matter, the Minister not only can, but also is held under grave obligation, to minister the Sacrament conditionally.³

Query 7° Must the condition be expressed in words?

Resp. Negatively. The reason is, because it is enough for reverence toward the Sacrament if it is conceived in the mind. Indeed Gobat thinks that it is not necessary for him who administers the work to have the condition explicitly and formally in mind, but it is enough if it is held implicitly and virtually, as he who wishes to hear Confessions according to the institution of Christ or the intention of the Church has it; because thus also reverence due to the Sacrament is sufficiently preserved. Yet it is to be added by mouth also where the Rubric prescribes this, as in conditioned Baptism, especially if it is conferred publicly, lest, namely, bystanders believe Baptism to be repeated absolutely, and, on account of the sentence, although little probable (and contrary to the Rubric of the Missal), of those who hold that the value of a Sacrament does not depend on the intention of the Minister, but only on the serious conferral of it, it is more right to express the condition also in words.⁴

Note. - 1° More rightly, according to St. Alphonsus, it is held that Sacraments are invalidated by a condition humanly unknowable. - 2° If the Minister has two intentions contrary to each other, and at the same time, the predominant one prevails; and so, whatever uniting incompatibles may have been chosen beforehand, if neither is predominant, the Sacrament does not subsist. - But if they have been successive, the later one prevails, unless the first, not revoked, had virtually excluded any subsequent one beforehand. - If doubt remains, the Sacrament will be doubtful.⁵

Notes to n. 1219. (1) Decr. L. III. T. XLII. c. 2. (2) L. VI. 27. 28. (3) L. VI. 29. H. A. Tr. XIV. 8. Quaest. Retr. Rec. n. 17. Miss. de def. V. 2. (4) L. VI. 24. 26. (5) Session 7, Canon 12 on Sacraments in general, and Canon 4 on Baptism.

§ III. ON THE FAITH AND PROBITY OF THE MINISTER

1220. Principles. - **I.** For the value of the Sacraments neither faith, nor probity, or state of grace, is required in the Minister. It is clear: 1° from the perpetual practice and tradition of the Church, which has never wished those baptized by heretics and the wicked to be rebaptized. It is clear: 2° from the definition of the Church. - Trent.¹

II. For the licit administration of the Sacraments, however, faith and probity are required in the Minister, at least if he has been consecrated for conferring Sacraments, and confects solemnly, i.e. with the whole rite prescribed by the Church. Therefore he sins gravely who ministers Sacraments in mortal sin; for a Minister destitute of faith, or unworthy, inflicts grave injury on God and Christ, by treating sacred things unworthily, and, as much as is in him, by contaminating them. Moreover, since the Minister of the Sacraments represents Christ, the primary Minister, who is the Saint of saints, and bears his person, it is necessary that he himself also be holy.

Notes to n. 1220. (1) Session 7, Canon 12 on Sacraments in general, and Canon 4 on Baptism.

1221. Questions. - **Query 1°** Does a Minister sin gravely who confers a Sacrament in mortal sin, in a case in which he has not been specially ordained or consecrated for this, for example, if a woman ministers Baptism in the state of sin?

Resp. Negatively, probably; because the obligation of having holiness in a Minister does not arise precisely from the very holiness of Christ and of the Sacrament according to itself, but from the consecration of the Minister for conferring the very holiness of Christ and of the Sacrament. - Billuart,¹ St. Thomas,² and many others.

Yet not a few others affirm, both on account of the reason diametrically opposed to the negative sentence, namely on account of reverence due to Christ, whose minister also in this case is a lay person, although he is not a minister of the Church, and on account of the Sacrament, since here too sacred things, and indeed in a grave matter under grave obligation, are being handled. Thus Collet, Lacroix, Lugo, etc. - St. Alphonsus adheres to the affirmative sentence as intrinsically and by far more probable.³

Query 2° Does a priest, or consecrated Minister, sin gravely when he ministers indeed a Sacrament in mortal sin, but not solemnly, for example, Baptism without ceremonies in a case of necessity?

Resp. It is disputed, as in the preceding question; but St. Alphonsus adheres to the affirmative.⁴

Query 3° Does a Minister sin gravely in mortal sin, if grave necessity urges?

Resp. Negatively, speaking rigorously, namely if the danger is so urgent that no time is allowed for an act of contrition to be elicited by him. But this hypothesis must generally be denied. Moreover, a Minister conscious of mortal sin is not excused who can foresee such a case of necessity, as a Pastor and others (for example, priests exercising the care of souls subsidiarily, or ministering in large hospitals or in camps), who by office are bound to minister the Sacraments, and by an almost special obligation are held to remain habitually in the state of grace.⁵ Resolve the same concerning midwives.

Notes to n. 1221. (1) Diss. 5. a. 4. (2) Part 3, q. 64, a. 6; and in 4 Dist. 5, q. 2, a. 2. (3) L. VI. 32 and Retract. 61. Conf. diretto per le genti di campagna, cap. 17. n. 7. Vind. p. 928. 2. Ed. 2a. T. II. p. 587. LXXXIII. (2). (4) L. VI. 32. (5) L. III. 27.

1222. - Query 4° Does he sin who, outside the celebration of Mass, ministers the Eucharist in mortal sin?

Resp. Affirmatively, probably. The reason is, because grave injury is done to the Most Holy Eucharist. For although he does not act as an efficient cause in confecting the Sacrament, nevertheless he is its dispenser, and for this is specially consecrated, and he undertakes a ministry by which he cooperates immediately in sanctification (n. 219. § Otherwise).¹

Query 5° Do they sin who in mortal sin touch or carry the Most Holy Eucharist, whether mediately or immediately?

Resp. It is disputed. There is a threefold probable sentence:

I. It affirms in each case, because the thing is most holy, or the Body of Christ, which they handle unworthily. St. Alphonsus calls this very probable.²

II. It denies, because here there is no administration of a Sacrament, nor does matter so grave appear that it would induce mortal sin. - Thus Lacroix,³ Salmant.,⁴ Busemb.,⁵ and St. Alphonsus says that this is not improbable.⁶

III. It thus distinguishes: They who immediately touch the Most Holy Eucharist in mortal sin do indeed sin gravely, but not they who touch mediately. The reason is repeated from the very diverse grade of irreverence between the first and second case. - Thus Billuart.

Notes to n. 1222. (1) L. VI. 38 and Retr. 62. (2) L. VI. 35. (3) L. VI. 35. (4) n. 101. (5) Tr. I. c. 7, p. 11. n. 106. (6) L. VI. 37.

1223. - Query 6° Do they sin gravely who exercise other sacred functions in mortal sin?

Resp. Negatively; because all other exercises of Orders besides the confection and administration of Sacraments do not seem to require holiness under grave obligation, since they are not proximately ordered to the sanctification of the soul. - Thus more commonly and more probably Salm., Mazzotta, and St. Alphonsus says that this is sufficiently probable.¹ - Nevertheless a preacher exercising from office is with difficulty excused from mortal sin, who from office preaches, and inveighs against that very vice of which he is publicly defamed, since the scandal impedes the fruit of doctrine.²

Query 7° Is a Minister confecting a Sacrament held to confess beforehand, if he is guilty of mortal sin?

Resp. 1° Affirmatively, if there is question of the celebration of Mass, and the availability of a confessor is not lacking to him; because all the faithful who are guilty of mortal sin and about to communicate must first make Confession, from the Decree of Trent.³

Resp. 2° But negatively, more probably, if there is question of other Sacraments; because by no law is he obliged to Confession; and therefore it suffices that he elicit an act of contrition.⁴

1224. - Query 8° Does he sin gravely who hears Confession in mortal sin, but does not absolve, or with the purpose of eliciting contrition before he absolves?

Resp. Negatively, more probably; because a confessor, by hearing Confession, does not confect the Sacrament.⁵

Query 9° How many sins does a confessor commit by absolving several penitents successively in mortal sin?

See the response at n. 219.

Notes to n. 1224. (1) L. VI. 41. (2) L. VI. 41. (3) Session 13, cap. 7. (4) L. VI. 34. (5) L. VI. 36.

ARTICLE II: ON THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTER

1° As regards the obligation of ministering Sacraments; 2° as regards the obligation of sometimes denying them; 3° as regards the mode of conferring them.

§ I. ON THE OBLIGATION OF MINISTERING SACRAMENTS

1225. Principles. - I. Those who have the care of souls are held under grave obligation from justice to minister the Sacraments to their subjects reasonably asking. For by taking up the care of souls they have obliged themselves to this by a tacit contract entered into with the subjects, from whom they receive support or at least honor.

Therefore they are held if the common precept of receiving them urges, or if the private necessity or utility of the one asking demands the administration, for example, if the one asking foresees some danger, or is placed in temptation and needs the grace of the Sacrament, or if he wishes to exercise a devotion suitable to his state, or to gain an Indulgence, etc.

II. Others not having the care of souls are not held to minister Sacraments from justice; yet sometimes they are held from charity, namely in a grave necessity of the neighbor.¹

1226. Questions. - Query 1° Who are considered to have the care of souls?

Resp. All those who from office, or by a special title of spiritual jurisdiction or delegation, ought to feed or care for some part of the fold of Christ. Therefore such are Bishops, Pastors, and whoever have subsidiary care of souls from a commission or public office, as among us are quasi-pastors and their coadjutors. Likewise, with respect to Regulars, their own Prelates or Superiors.²

Query 2° Which Sacraments are to be ministered in necessity, even with danger of death, whether by those having the care of souls or by others?

Resp. 1° Those who do not bear the care of souls certainly are held only to minister the Sacraments absolutely necessary for salvation, namely Baptism and Penance, or Extreme Unction when someone can in no way confess, and is more probably known to be in mortal sin. The reason is, because they are held only from charity alone to assist the neighbor in the gravest danger of salvation. But only the aforesaid Sacraments are necessary for salvation. Therefore, etc. - Thus most commonly theologians with St. Alphonsus.³

Resp. 2° Even those bearing the care of souls are very probably held to minister only the aforesaid Sacraments with any danger whatsoever. The reason is, because the other Sacraments are not of such necessity that one is held to confer them with grave danger of life. - Thus St. Alphonsus,⁴ relying on the Declaration of Gregory XIII (12 Oct. 1576), and the Declaration of the S. C. C. approved by the same Pontiff. (O) p. 399. Nevertheless those who bear the care of souls are held to expose life not only in extreme necessity, but also in grave necessity, while other Ministers are obliged to this only in extreme necessity.⁵ Cf. the things said at n. 279. 3rd Rule.

Query 3° Is one held to expose life for ministering the aforesaid Sacraments with probability only of success or of necessity?

Resp. It seems it must be denied, because it is too hard to exact so heroic an act for aiding the neighbor, unless there is morally certain hope of success and the necessity is sufficiently certain. Hence you are not held to expose life in order to baptize or absolve someone, if you probably must perish before you can fulfill this, or if you legitimately presume that he is baptized, or is not placed in the state of mortal sin, or even that he can easily assist himself by an act of perfect contrition.¹ Cf. n. 279. 2nd Rule.

Notes to n. 1226 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 58. (2) Ib. (3) H. A. Tr. VII. 28. L. VI. 58, 233, 729. (4) L. VI. 233. (5) L. III. 27. Notes to n. 1226 - note sequence 2. (1) L. III. 27. Appendix annotation (omicron), to n. 1226. q. 2°. R. 2°. p. 10. col. 2. Benedict XIV speaks otherwise in de Syn., L. XIII. c. 19, not mentioning the Decree of S. C. Conc. of the year 1576 approved by Gregory XIII, by which it is declared: "that the Pastor is held to minister to his parishioners laboring under plague only the Sacraments necessary for salvation, namely Baptism and Penance." But he adduces the Response to the postulate of the Vicar Apostolic of Julia Caesarea (Algiers), by which Viaticum also and Extreme Unction are declared to be ministered by them in time of plague. l. c. n. 1. 10.

1227. Resolves. - 1° Those having the care of souls sin gravely not only if they deny their ministry without reason, but also if they often show themselves morose and difficult; because thus they deter the faithful from the Sacraments, and the matter falls back to the same as if they denied the Sacraments.

2° Nevertheless it is not mortal to deny the Sacrament of Penance or of the Eucharist to one or another, or to the same person once or twice, asking without necessity; because the harm can easily be repaired, nor is the subject therefore judged to be gravely unwilling. Yet Confession is rarely deferred for men, especially those rarely confessing, particularly today, without grave danger to the soul.

3° If subjects ask irrationally, there is no sin. Hence the pastor is not held daily to spend time with a scrupulous person or little devout souls, nor is this expedient for them.

4° If the pastor has suitable coadjutors, he will not be held so rigorously to receive the Confessions of his subjects; yet he ought to satisfy the faithful who request him by name, unless either he is impeded, or the penitents are readily going to approach another confessor.

5° Generally speaking, those bearing the care of souls sin gravely who do not wish to receive the Confessions of their subjects except on a few determined days within the month; because they are the cause that the faithful remain long in the state of sin and are kept away from receiving the Sacraments.¹

See more where the individual Sacraments are treated; and recall the things said concerning the office of Pastors in the Treatise on States, n. 1141. IV.

Notes to n. 1227. (1) L. VI. 58.

§ II. ON THE OBLIGATION OF DENYING SACRAMENTS TO THE UNWORTHY WHO ASK

1228. Principles. - I. The Minister is held under grave obligation, *per se* speaking, to deny Sacraments to the unworthy, because the natural law obliges a dispenser faithfully and according to his will to dispense the goods of the Lord; but the certain will of Christ is that Sacraments not be conferred upon the unworthy, according to that saying of Matthew:¹ Do not give the holy thing to dogs, nor cast your pearls before swine.

II. Sacraments, in which the Minister acts the part of dispenser alone, can be ministered to those asking without prior inquiry into their disposition, and can be denied only to those concerning whose unworthiness it is certain. The reason for the first is, because in these he does not act the part of judge, and therefore is not held to inquire. The reason for the second, because each one is presumed good until he is proved evil.

I said: 1° *in which the Minister acts the part of dispenser alone*. For it is otherwise if at the same time he ought to act the part of judge, and thus in Penance he is held to inquire concerning the acts of the penitent; in the Baptism of adults, concerning consent and dispositions; in Order, concerning the dignity of the one to be ordained; in Matrimony, concerning impediments. 2° *concerning whose unworthiness it is certain*. But it is certain if a) the crime is certain, or public suspicion concerning it is so vehement that it is equivalent to moral certitude, which cannot be laid aside by a probable reason; b) the penance is doubtful.²

Notes to n. 1228. (1) 7. 6. (2) L. VI. 43. 48.

1229. Special Rules. - I. A Sacrament is not to be ministered to a public sinner, even one asking secretly, not even from fear of death, as St. Alphonsus thinks; because no reason is present why an exception should be made to the general rule; indeed a grave scandal of the faithful would follow. - Except: 1° Penance, unless someone is prohibited from it, for example, on account of reserved censures;¹ 2° if someone has given a sufficient indication of conversion, such as is Confession made at least before several by one who is not notoriously placed in an occasion or in habitual scandal.²

II. To an occult sinner, asking secretly, the Sacrament is likewise to be denied;³ because reverence toward the Sacrament and charity toward the neighbor in these circumstances entirely demand this.

III. To a truly occult sinner, asking publicly, the Sacrament is not to be denied. The reason is drawn from the inconveniences which would follow from the denial of the Sacrament; for scandals and disturbances would arise in the Church, and especially the faithful, having been led into suspicion, lest they be prohibited from the Sacraments, would withdraw from them. - Thus all with St. Thomas,⁴ St. Alphonsus.⁵

Except nevertheless: 1° the Sacrament of Order, from which, on account of the public good, the unworthy man is to be repelled even with his own infamy, if he cannot otherwise be kept away, and this although the offense cannot be proved juridically. Nor is the Bishop obliged to the manifestation of the cause of the repulse, nor does an appeal belong to the one repelled, but only recourse to the Holy See.⁶

2° Matrimony, if the pastor outside Confession knows some impediment, or knows that the spouses are ignorant of the rudiments of the Faith, and this on account of protecting the legitimation and education of offspring.⁷

Notes to n. 1229. (1) Scav. T. III. n. 40. (2) L. VI. 44-49. q. Ref. 63. (3) L. VI. 50. St. Thomas, Part 3, q. 80, a. 6. (4) Part 3, q. 80, a. 6. (5) L. VI. 50. (6) Ib. 52. Benedict XIV, de Syn. L. XII. c. VIII. n. 3. 4. (7) L. VI. 54.

1230. Questions. - Query 1° When is a sinner considered public or notorious, or occult; or secretly asking for a Sacrament?

Resp. 1° That sinner is called public whose crime or very bad life is notorious, either by law, or by juridical proof or sentence, or by fact, as if the crime was committed in a public place, or by fame

among many, arising nevertheless from sufficient indications.¹

Resp. 2° A sinner secretly asking is called one who is found alone with the Minister, or with a few others of whom deservedly no account is had, as are little children, etc. Otherwise he is considered to ask publicly. (X) p. 414.

Query 2° Is the Sacrament to be denied to an unworthy person asking publicly, whose crime is not simply public, but known nevertheless to most of those present, not to all?

Resp. Negatively, more probably; because he still possesses fame among those few who do not yet know his crime. Except if one or another upright person is ignorant, who is thought not likely to divulge it (n. 519. R. 3°).² - Hence only then is the Sacrament to be denied to an unworthy person publicly asking, when either his unworthiness is absolutely public (by fame, by law, or by fact), although perhaps known to none of those present; or respectively public, or known to all those present, which very rarely happens in great cities, especially ours, on account especially of the defect of personal knowledge; but it can happen more easily in small places.

Notes to n. 1230. (1) Ib. 44. (2) Ib. 45. Appendix annotation (X), to n. 1230. q. 19. p. 19. col. 1. Lest on account of notoriety, undeservedly judged to be such, a Sacrament be publicly denied, I have judged it useful to hand down a fuller exposition of notoriety. What the notorious is, in general, was said in n. 522, Resp. 2°. I say that something is notorious by law by juridical proof or sentence. Here proof is understood as full, such as that is called which produces as much faith as suffices for defining controversies; for example, the spontaneous Confession of the accused made in judgment and not revoked; the depositions of two witnesses greater than every exception, etc. - Sentence in this place is understood as definitive, or one which has passed into a thing judged. Something is notorious by fact when it is done so publicly that it cannot be concealed by any tergiversation. As that fact itself is, so this notorious is threefold: namely, notorious of a permanent fact, which continually presents itself to the sight of men, as the concubinage of one who is publicly seen retaining a concubine in his house; notorious of a fact immediately passing or momentary, as heresy publicly uttered; notorious of an interpolated fact, which is done publicly indeed, not continuously, but nevertheless is repeated rather often at intervals, as, for example, drunkenness by a drunkard. That something be notorious by fact, it is required that it be public by reason both of place, which must be public, for example a street, and not some private house; and of time, therefore not committed at night, unless on account of the multitude of those present in the public place where the crime is committed the night seems to be equated to day; and of the multitude of bystanders; for by defect of this the crime perpetrated by day and in a public place could be equated to one admitted at night. Fame, by reason of the notorious about which there is question here, is not that which is called fame of name, "reputation," and about which there was speech in n. 516, but fame among men, which is so called with respect not to the man made infamous, but to those among whom it prevails or is circulated, that which people say or tell; the common talk, report, saying. Therefore the notorious of fame is public insinuation or proclamation, from suspicion indeed alone, yet proceeding from a certain author; and this, in the present matter, not concerning the general quality of some man, that he is good or bad, but concerning some particular fact, for example, that Titius admitted such a crime. Fame of this kind, or fame arisen concerning some particular fact, by reason of its origin can still be distinguished in three ways: 1° As it is the vain voice of the populace and rumor among the people, which has no certain authors nor probable causes or reasons for believing thus, "rumor; hearsay"; 2° As it arises from some malicious, suspect persons, or those seeking their own advantage and utility. Neither the former nor the latter is to be attended to; 3° As it has drawn its origin from persons worthy of faith, grave, and concerning whose advantage there is no question, or, as St. Alphonsus says, from sufficient indications, so that it appears from what reason and cause the fame had its origin; and concerning this fame alone there is speech for the present. Fame accepted in such a way differs from rumor. For fame properly is when the whole city, or neighborhood, or the greater part of a community asserts something; but a community ought to consist of at least ten persons. But rumor is when some smaller part, for instance a half, a third, or a fourth part, speaks thus. Then fame proceeds from a certain author, for instance when it has arisen from certain and honest persons who said among the people that they had seen something and were present; but rumor proceeds from an uncertain author. Resolves. - 1° In order that some crime be held as notorious, and this, as is required in our matter, in the reason of crime or as formally criminal, it suffices, if there is question of the notorious by notoriety of fact, that the fact be permanent or even interpolated. But if the question is about a fact immediately passing or momentary, for example, someone publicly

utters heresy, from the very crime publicly perpetrated, from the very fact of heresy uttered, it is not yet established that he who perpetrated the crime, uttered the heresy, admitted the crime in the reason of crime, the heresy in the reason of heresy or as formally evil. Therefore in this case the Sacraments are not immediately to be denied, but inquiry must first be made whether, just as the fact itself, so also the formal malice of the fact is publicly certain. 2° In order that, on account of the notoriousness of an interpolated fact, for example in the case of a public customary sinner, a Sacrament can be publicly denied, it is required that perseverance in the evil custom be evident and publicly known. Wherefore the Sacrament is to be conferred if either the custom has been interrupted for a longer time, by the work of the customary sinner himself or even by some physical cause, for example illness, or nothing more has been publicly heard about it for a longer time. 3° The notorious of fame, in order to the denial of a Sacrament, is not to be attended to unless the fame, that is, the public insinuation or proclamation itself, is uniform, solid, constant, and perpetual, that is, not vague, light, or contrary, or, as Canonists have it, shaken by contrary allegations. It can be proved by two witnesses greater than every exception, deposing that they have heard it said so publicly, and indeed by the greater part of the people; for it does not suffice to depose that they heard it said so publicly, since it can happen that one alone said this publicly. Besides, they must express the certain persons, at least two, from whom they heard it, so that it may be known whether these are such that faith can be had in them. Finally, they must assign the probable causes by which the people was induced to believe: for example, because those persons, to whom faith can be had and from whom they heard it, asserted that they had seen it thus with their own eyes. 4° Before how many persons a crime ought to have been committed in order to be notorious by fact, and by how many, especially in a more populous community, it ought to be publicly insinuated or proclaimed in order to be notorious by fame, is defined rather by the judgment of a prudent man than by some general rule; compare nn. 522, 1564. But since this matter in practice is not without difficulty, and the judgment concerning the requisites for the notorious both of fact and of fame is also often arduous, in a matter of as much importance as the public denial of a Sacrament, the Ordinary is to be consulted if time permits; but if time does not permit this and the notoriety is doubtful, the Sacrament is not to be publicly refused. > Notes to appendix annotation - note sequence 1. > > 1 Reiffenstuel, L. 2. T. 19. n. 11. | 2 An apt, legitimate witness greater than every exception is one who can be repelled by no legitimate exception; and if anything differs here from those, it differs only as the comparative from the positive. Reiffenstuel, L. 2. T. 20. n. 7-11. But exception is the same as exclusion, for example of a witness, judge, etc. Id. T. 25. n. 1-5; and it is called legitimate if it is granted by law. | > Notes to appendix annotation - note sequence 2. > > 1 A sentence is said to have passed into a thing judged when it has not been appealed from. Reiffenstuel, L. 2. T. 27. n. 2 sq. | 2 Cf. Schmalzgrueber, T. 10. P. 1. Tit. 1. § 1. | > Notes to appendix annotation - note sequence 3. > > 1 Lib. VI. 44. | 2 Reiffenstuel, Lib. 2. T. 20. n. 387 sq.

1231. - Query 3° Is the Sacrament to be denied to a sinner when his crime is not public where he asks, but is public elsewhere?

Resp. Negatively, at least more probably; because on the one hand, by ministering the Sacraments to him, there is no scandal of others, and on the other hand, if they were denied, those inconveniences and harms would arise which proceed from denial made to an occult sinner. - But one must say otherwise if knowledge of that crime is easily about to come into that place.¹

Query 4° How ought Pastors to conduct themselves in the celebration of Matrimony of those who notoriously have incurred ecclesiastical censures?

Resp. The Sacred Penitentiary, 10 Dec. 1860, dub. 10: "Care is to be taken with all strength that those bound by ecclesiastical censures be reconciled with the Church in the due manner; but if they refuse to be reconciled, and unless the marriage is celebrated, grave harms seem to be imminent therefrom, the Pastor should consult the Ordinary, who, having considered the account of things and circumstances and weighed all things which are handed down by approved authors, and especially by St. Alphonsus (L. VI. 54), should declare those things which he shall have judged more expedient in the Lord." Namely, according to the Holy Doctor, the Pastor will be able to assist "in order to avoid death, or other graver evils of the community, or of the contracting parties themselves, for example, lest they themselves persevere in sin."

Query 5° Is it lawful to simulate the administration of a Sacrament, lest it be conferred on an unworthy person?

Resp. Theologians distinguish a twofold simulation: one formal, by which the Minister directly intends to deceive; another material, by which someone does not directly intend to deceive, but from another motive is induced to simulate, for example, if he is compelled by grave fear, etc.

I say: It is never lawful, not even materially, to simulate a Sacrament. The reason is, because every simulation is an injury and grave irreverence toward Christ, whom the Minister mocks by abusing sacred things instituted by him.

1232. - Query 6° In what precisely does simulation of a Sacrament consist?

Resp. Theologians do not agree. Some say that generally it consists in this, that it can lead those receiving or others into error. More probably, according to the common sentence, it seems to be present only when something is put fictively which pertains to the essence of the Sacrament, so that the neighbor is necessarily deceived; and thus they distinguish simulation from dissimulation, which is had when the fiction or defect is exterior and, *per se* speaking, can be recognized, as, for example, if in the confection matter or form is not placed, but something else is substituted in its place, so that something other than the Sacrament is done. This dissimulation is lawful from a licit cause, since thus truth alone is hidden, and the Sacrament is not treated irreverently, scandal, contempt, intention of deceiving, etc., being excluded. (Cf. the number immediately following, 1233. 6° and 8°.) Hence the C. S. O., if ever it happened that infidel parents offered infants for Baptism, not so that they might become Christians, but so that they might be preserved from certain diseases, never permitted the pouring of water without the utterance of the form, so that the parents might thus desist from importunate prayers, since "Baptism is the gate of all the Sacraments and the profession of the Faith, and can in no way be feigned."¹

1233. Resolves. - 1° Among those who, as publicly unworthy, are to be kept away from Communion, the Roman Ritual enumerates excommunicates, interdicted persons, and the manifestly infamous, as harlots, concubinaires, usurers (at least public by law, or condemned by sentence of a judge), magicians, sorcerers (among whom fortune-tellers also are to be held), blasphemers (as also are to be held those who by writings or words are accustomed to assail God, or the Saints, or Religion and the Church with calumnies). "But as often," says Kenrick,² "as the exterior composition of the body denotes a humble soul, it can be had as a retraction of those things which one has contumeliously uttered"), and other public sinners of this kind, such as public customary impenitents, those publicly known as enrolled in some condemned society, actors and actresses exhibiting impious or base plays. - "Public sinners," says Kenrick,³ "who resist the legitimate authority of their prelates, or behave badly with grave offense of the faithful, are unworthy to be admitted to the Eucharist; but whenever the manner of acting, even if unjust, can be extenuated from error of mind or some other reason, it is better to repel no one approaching, but to leave him to the judgment of God and of the confessor." - Nor are all those to be barred who have publicly committed some grave sin, since scandal is regularly removed by Confession made or presumed. Yet, as is clear *per se*, those are to be barred who are publicly and actually in sin, for example, those manifestly and here and now drunk, or women so immodestly denuded that the denudation is mortal *per se* (n. 295. 11°).

2° To a public sinner, even one dying but nevertheless still master of himself, the Sacraments are to be denied, unless he repents not only before God, or in Confession, but also before men, unless perhaps the matter has been erased by oblivion. But this penitence before men ought to be exhibited outside Confession, and in such a way (for example, before witnesses), that it can come to the knowledge of others. Cf. Rit. Rom. on the Communion of the sick.

3° If Sacraments are to be denied publicly, let them be denied in a prudent manner. Hence all those things must be guarded against by the Minister by which either he would become liable to laws punishing defamation, or a greater impediment would be put in the way of the conversion of the unworthy person. Hence the motives of the refusal are not to be publicly exposed; and the priest, as he is assisting at the Sacred Table with others, should pass by without signifying anything either by words or by a nod. But if he comes alone during Mass, the priest will remain at the altar, announcing to the unworthy person through another that he may go away, but not why.

4° A priest would sin most gravely who in Mass should pronounce the consecratory words over bread and wine while excluding the intention of consecrating. Nor can those be excused by good faith who, laboring under crass ignorance and celebrating in mortal sin, simulate Consecration lest they become guilty of sacrilege, even if they omit the words of Consecration altogether.

5° A confessor would sin gravely who should utter the words of absolution without the mind of absolving, even if he were doing this in order to free himself more easily from an indisposed penitent instantly and importunately asking absolution, or even exacting it by most grave threats. - Several say that in this case a confessor can say: I do not absolve thee..., pronouncing the word *not* so softly that it is not heard by the penitent. St. Alphonsus does not judge this improbable;⁴ but the confessor could more easily pronounce other words or prayers rather than the form of absolution; moreover this case seems to be almost chimerical.

6° A confessor, however, does not simulate the Sacrament of Penance when he recites prayers over an indisposed penitent, lest bystanders perceive that he is dismissed without absolution; for it is established among all that penitents are often dismissed by only a blessing, and sometimes without the intention of confessing or completing the confession they approach the sacred tribunal.⁵

7° A priest sins gravely who offers a host not consecrated for a consecrated one, even to a person knowing and consenting, as sometimes happens to miserable priests when an accomplice, who is a woman, comes to the Sacred Table to save reputation. The reason is, because thus a host not consecrated is exposed to adoration both by bystanders and by the one receiving herself knowingly with external reverence, which constitutes external and material idolatry, and therefore something intrinsically evil.⁶

8° Yet according to the common sentence they do not sin, at least not gravely, who from grave fear simulate entering Matrimony. The reason is, because since voluntary consent is lacking, according to the sentence now certain, which holds that spouses themselves are the ministers of this Sacrament, matter and form are lacking, and therefore there is no simulation of the Sacrament, but only of the matrimonial contract. Otherwise the error could be sufficiently perceived from the circumstances, and thus deception would not necessarily be present.

Notes to n. 1233. (1) Anal. J. P. Ser. 2. col. 1807. (2) Tr. XVII. 37. (3) Tr. XVII. 37. (4) L. VI. 59. (5) Ib. (6) Ib. n. 61.

§ III. ON THE MODE OF CONFERRING SACRAMENTS

1234. - It is not enough if the minister diligently observes those things which regard the matter and form; but he ought carefully to keep all the laws of the Holy Church concerning the administration of the Sacraments. Hence the Minister sins who contemns them, omits them without sufficient cause, or changes them;¹ and this according to the gravity of the matter, and therefore gravely, if either he neglects integral ceremonies (namely those which complete the sacramental action and indicate its effects more clearly, as exorcisms in Baptism), or even accidental ceremonies (which pertain to the ornament and decorum of the act, as genuflections), in great quantity, or with grave scandal, or from contempt.

1235. Questions. - Query 1° Is the use of the Roman Ritual of precept in the administration of the Sacraments?

Resp. Affirmatively, as regards our Provinces, yet with the modifications conceded by the Holy See,² it being forbidden:

1° That priests depart from it "under the pretext of custom or any other pretext whatsoever."³

2° That "if they have judged it expedient, for the sake of explanation, to add a version in the vernacular language of those things which" in administering the Sacraments and in the burial of the dead they recite in the Latin language, "they use any other than that which shall have been sanctioned by the Ordinary."⁴

3° That the Latin form of the prayers never be omitted.⁵ (I) p. 400.

I said: affirmatively as regards our Provinces; but whether the use of the Roman Ritual in the administration of the Sacraments is of precept everywhere, disputed on each side, see, if you please, in De Herdt.⁶

Appendix annotation (pi), to n. 1235. 3°. p. 14, col. 2. In a Capuchin case it was asked: "Whether the custom of saying Agnus Dei and Domine non sum dignus in the vernacular language is to be eliminated." ...? And S. R. C. responded: "The custom is to be eliminated," May 23, 1835, ad 5, n. 4748. - And most recently as regards the aforesaid custom S. R. C., in a Ratisbon case, April 15, 1880, ad 6, declared: "The formulae which pertain to the administration of the Sacraments must be expressed altogether in the Latin language, except the responses of the godfather and godmother in the Sacrament of Baptism, and the words of consent of spouses in the Sacrament of Matrimony." I believe the priest must recite in the Latin language, but the recipients can recite in the vernacular, as the same De Herdt notes, Pr. Rit. Rom. p. 32 under 9, from Martinucci.

1236. - Query 2° What sacred vestments are required for the administration of the Sacraments?

Resp. With the case of urgent necessity excluded, a stole and surplice are generally required. - It is said, *surplice*; for "the rochet is not a sacred vestment to be employed in the administration of the Sacraments, and therefore for administering them the surplice must necessarily be used."⁷

But the stole ought not to be worn except in the confectio of Sacraments and Sacramentals, and in the act of preaching where custom prevails, and also in certain other functions, as is prescribed in the Roman Ritual. But the use of wearing the stole as a sign of jurisdiction and preeminence is reprobated as an abuse.⁸

More things concerning the mode of administering Sacraments will be treated where the individual Sacraments in particular are considered. - Generally let the following admonition of the Second

Plenary Council of Baltimore be kept before the eyes:¹ "While they minister Sacraments, let the words be pronounced distinctly and articulately; let their approach, countenance, motions of the body, and modulation of the voice express consciousness of the most holy thing which is being done, and excite the faithful to firm faith and inward devotion. Moreover, according to their strength and the circumstances of things, let priests take care that those things which are required for the dispensation of the Sacraments be clean and becoming. Let Pastors instruct the flock committed to them concerning the Sacraments and the religious preparation to be put before these, as often as occasion is offered."

Notes to n. 1236 - note sequence 1. (1) Trent, Session 7, on the Sacraments, Canon 13. (2) Conc. Plen. Balt. II. a. 210-212. (3) Ib. a. 213. (4) Ib. a. 214, 215. (5) Ib. a. 215. (6) S. Lit. Prax. T. III. p. 369. ed. 1870. (7) S. R. C. 10 Jan. 1852. n. 5165. (8) S. R. C. 7 Sept. 1816; 11 Sept. 1847; 7 Sept. 1850. n. 4524. 5107. Notes to n. 1236 - note sequence 2. (1) a. 208.

CHAPTER IV: ON THE SUBJECT OF THE SACRAMENTS

1237. - The subject of a Sacrament is called he who receives the Sacrament, and is capable of the effect of the Sacrament.

The subject of the Sacraments is man alone as a wayfarer; because, as is clear from Sacred Scriptures and tradition, the Sacraments were instituted for wayfaring men alone. Yet not all men are capable of all the Sacraments. For neither can women receive the Sacrament of Order, nor can children not yet using reason receive the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction.

The reason *a priori* why man alone as a wayfarer is capable of the Sacraments is the will of Christ the Lord, the institutor of the Sacraments. But the reason of fittingness is, because, according to the order of the present Providence, man alone as a wayfarer is capable of first grace or of the increase of grace; but the Blessed or souls detained in purgatory are not of this kind, since for them there has already been determined a measure of glory corresponding to the grace which they had in mortal life. Much less are the damned capable of grace, as being now separated from God for eternity.

These things having been posited, we must treat of the requisites both for the valid and for the licit reception of the Sacraments.

ARTICLE I: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE VALID RECEPTION OF THE SACRAMENTS

1238. Principles. - **I.** For validly receiving the Sacraments no probity is required, nor properly Faith in the subject, if you except the Sacrament of Penance. This is clear from the practice of the Church, which has never permitted heretics and wicked men, duly baptized and ordained, to be baptized or ordained again. It is also clear, as regards Faith, from the express definition of the Council of Trent¹ concerning the Baptism of infants.

II. In infants or perpetually insane persons no disposition is required, nor intention, so that they may validly receive the Sacraments of which they are capable, namely Baptism, Confirmation, Order, and the Eucharist, which formerly was ministered to them. This is clear from the practice of the Church, and from the common sentence, etc.

III. In adults, for the valid reception of Sacraments, some intention is required; because it is not fitting that an adult be sanctified unless he wills it. Hence a neutral intention does not suffice, by which someone is so disposed in mind that he neither consents nor dissents.² For of such a one it cannot be said that he wills to receive the Sacrament. But for most Sacraments a habitual intention suffices, even sometimes one only confused, or implicit, with the nature of each Sacrament considered; because the conferral of Sacraments is a certain donation and benefit, for accepting which habitual intention suffices. I say: 1° *for most Sacraments*: on account of the exceptions concerning which n. 1240. I say: 2° *implicit*: i.e. contained in the will to live, or at least to die, as becomes a Catholic, and, as regards Baptism, in the will of doing all things necessary for salvation, but according to the things to be said at n. 1240. R. 1°.

IV. For validly receiving the other Sacraments, reception of Baptism is pre-required; therefore an unbaptized man is in no way capable of the other Sacraments.

The reason is, because the other Sacraments were instituted for the Church alone; but through Baptism alone men become members of the Church. Therefore, etc. Thus Eugene IV defined in the Decree for the Armenians.

Notes to n. 1238. (1) Session 7, on Baptism, Canon 13. (2) L. VI. 81 from St. Thomas, Part 3, q. 68, a. 7, c.

1239. Questions. - Query 1° Is attention required in the adult subject, that he may validly receive a Sacrament?

Resp. Absolutely negatively. For intention suffices, as has already been explained, even in Sacraments which require a virtual intention; the reason is, because a human act does not proceed from attention, but from the will or from intention. - Besides, most Sacraments, as was said, do not require even a virtual intention; therefore *a fortiori* they do not require attention on the part of the subject. Moreover attention is not required in the Minister for confecting a Sacrament, as is clear from the things said above at n. 1215; therefore *a fortiori* it is not required in the subject.¹

Hence penitents are sometimes tormented by scruples in vain from this, that they suffered distractions while they were being absolved, or that they were absolved without having noticed this.

Notes to n. 1239. (1) Sporer, n. 157.

1240. - Query 2° What intention is required in adults for the individual Sacraments to be received?

Resp. 1° For validly receiving Baptism in adults, there is required an intention at least habitual, which has been expressed beforehand and never retracted. Yet some say that an implicit will of Baptism suffices, such as would be in him who would have the will of doing all things necessary for salvation, provided nevertheless that this implicit will in an unbeliever is not likewise implicitly excluded through gravely culpable ignorance of the true Faith.¹

2° For Confirmation an interpretative will suffices. Thus it can be conferred upon a dying person deprived of his senses. - The same will suffices in one receiving the Eucharist.²

3° For Penance there is required either an actual intention, or at least a virtual one; and therefore a habitual intention does not suffice, at least in practice.³

4° For Extreme Unction there suffices a habitual, or implicit, or interpretative intention, as theologians commonly say, and as is clear from the Roman Ritual, where concerning it it is said: "This Sacrament is to be supplied to those deprived of their senses, who beforehand asked for it, or likely would have asked for it;"¹ "and the same," says St. Alphonsus,² "Lugo, etc., say concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist."

5° For Order, certainly in an adult an interpretative intention does not suffice, because without an explicit will no adult can undergo the gravest obligation of the Clerical State. Yet a habitual intention suffices. But in practice, in one receiving Order, there will always be an actual intention, or at least a virtual one.³

6° For Matrimony there is required an intention at least virtual, because Matrimony is perfected by a contract, for which deliberation and full will are necessary.⁴ (p) p. 400.

Notes to n. 1240 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 82. (2) L. VI. 82. (3) Ib. Notes to n. 1240 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 82. (2) Ib. (3) Ib. (4) Ib. (5) Ib. 86. Appendix annotation (rho), to n. 1240. 6°. p. 16, col. 2. To the question: Of what Sacraments, and of which ones, are deaf-mutes capable? Craisson responds, Manuale, n. 3239-3241. "Either they have been taught according to modern methods, or not; if the former, they can validly receive all the Sacraments just like other men, indeed also licitly receive them (Order excepted), provided no other impediments are present. "If the latter, the Sacrament of Baptism can validly and licitly be conferred on them" and Confirmation, "at least if, insofar as can be done, they are taught Christian doctrine. "As regards the other Sacraments: concerning Matrimony Innocent III speaks thus (cap. Cum apud sedem 23 de spons.): 'If such a person wishes to contract, it cannot or ought not be denied to him, since what he cannot declare by words, he can declare by signs.' "It is also supposed by most Doctors that other Sacraments can be administered to the deaf and mute, if in them the required dispositions appear, or nothing appears from which they are to be judged indisposed; but almost all those Doctors wrote before the time in which the modern method of teaching the deaf and mute was invented. Moreover, by many experiments it seems to be established that the deaf and mute who are not taught by this new method have no true knowledge of God and of the rules of morals, and a fortiori do not arrive at the knowledge of the mysteries and supernatural truths; consequently they cannot have any human will of receiving the Sacraments, nor the dispositions necessary for receiving them with fruit (see Montaigne, Recherches sur les sourds et les muets). Nevertheless the Ritual of Belley, at the end of the first volume, thinks that the Sacraments of Confirmation and the Eucharist can be conferred on them, since these were administered of old (and still today in the Eastern Church) to children; but it says that Penance and Extreme Unction can be conferred on them under condition; as regards Matrimony, that the question was solved by Innocent III above reported; but that it is not lawful to admit them to Orders, because they are irregular. "Although we would not wish to reject those who think the aforesaid solutions are to be embraced, nevertheless in practice we would not dare, especially, to join in Matrimony mutes and deaf persons not taught according to modern methods. For although Innocent III says that they ought not to be repelled from Matrimony, if they wish to contract, nevertheless the Pontiff supposes or requires that they wish to contract; but in this, today especially, is the difficulty: since, as we have already said, from many experiments it seems to be established that such deaf and mute persons, not taught, do not have a moral will, on account of defect of moral cognitions; but the contract of Matrimony is a human and moral act, for which true human will is required." (Yet not all agree with Montaigne. See Philosophia Christ. of Sanseverino, reduced into compendium, T. I. n. 82. 3°.) "Whatever may be the case concerning Matrimony, Penance and Extreme Unction are not to be administered to deaf and mute persons not taught except under condition."

ARTICLE II: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE LICIT RECEPTION OF THE SACRAMENTS

1241. Principles. - I. For receiving Sacraments of the living licitly and fruitfully, besides the intention of receiving them, the state of grace is pre-required. For these, from their primary institution by Christ, are ordered not to conferring first grace, but its increase, since they suppose first grace already in the subject. Hence they sin gravely who knowingly receive Sacraments of the living in the state of mortal sin, and indeed more gravely than those who unworthily minister or confect them.¹ But the state of grace must be procured through Confession, if one is to approach the Eucharist; or at least through perfect contrition, if there is question of other Sacraments, as was said above concerning the Minister. Yet it is safer, as much as can be done, always to put Confession before the reception also of other Sacraments.

I said: *for receiving Sacraments of the living licitly and fruitfully*, etc. For although in a case of grave necessity they more commonly assert that it is lawful to receive Sacraments of the living in the state of mortal sin even without contrition, when time for eliciting it is not available, nevertheless thus no fruit would be perceived from it. This would happen, for example, if a layman kneeling at the bench of communicants suddenly remembered a mortal sin not yet blotted out.² But the case, as it is posited, will be very rare, either because time remains for eliciting contrition, or because the sin has already been indirectly blotted out through Confession.

II. For Sacraments of the dead to be received licitly by adults, there are required acts at least implicit of Faith and Hope, according to the things said by the Apostle:³ He who comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder to those who seek him. Cf. the things said at nn. 257-261, 270. Moreover an act of sorrow concerning sins is required, because remission of sins is given to no one without retraction or sorrow for sins committed. But these things in the Sacrament of Penance are necessary also for validity, because they pertain to the disposition of the penitent.⁴ But attrition suffices, as will be said in its own place.

Notes to n. 1241. (1) L. VI. 86. (2) Ib. (3) Heb. 11. 6. (4) Trent, Session 14, on Penance, c. 4. St. Alph. L. VI. 86.

1242. Questions. - Query 1° Do Sacraments received validly but illicitly, the obstacle having been removed, revive, or produce the graces proper to them?

Resp. Affirmatively, at least for most Sacraments. The reason is, because it happens only *per accidens* that they do not produce their proper effects, namely on account of the obstacle; and therefore those effects indeed remain suspended while the obstacle remains; nevertheless, once this has been removed, they ought to be applied to the soul. This is admitted as certain for Sacraments imprinting character. The same must more truly be said also of the Sacrament of Penance (as will be said at n. 1348, q. 7°), and *a fortiori* of Extreme Unction (at least if the obstacle was involuntary) and Matrimony, which cannot be repeated in the same illness or the same marriage.¹

Query 2° What disposition is required in the subject, that an unformed Sacrament may revive?

Resp. This general rule is commonly established: that disposition is required which was lacking, and whose absence caused the obstacle to the effect of the Sacrament, or precisely that must be placed which was necessarily required in the reception of the Sacrament. Hence *per se* attrition suffices for the reviviscence of Baptism, Penance, and Extreme Unction. But perfect contrition, or attrition with Confession, is required for the other Sacraments, namely for Confirmation, Order, and Matrimony. - Likewise if Baptism was unformed on account of the defect of Faith alone, it will revive through an act of Faith with attrition for the sin of unbelief. The reason is, because, just as the obstacle was induced because of the lack of some required disposition, so it is removed through the placing of the same: for no reason then remains why the effect of the Sacrament should remain suspended. - Thus St. Thomas (for Baptism),² Lugo,³ Lacroix.⁴ But the Eucharist does not revive, unless perhaps while the obstacle is removed before the species are consumed. Otherwise, the more frequently someone had communicated sacrilegiously, so much more abundantly would he be enriched with graces when he became contrite, or, being attrite, confessed.⁵

Query 3° Does attrition suffice that unformed Baptism may revive, if the one receiving has committed other grave sins after Baptism?

Resp. Negatively; because sins committed after Baptism are the necessary matter of the Sacrament of Penance, and therefore cannot be remitted except through that Sacrament, or through perfect contrition with the vow of the Sacrament of Penance included in it. - Lugo,⁶ Lacroix.⁷

Notes to n. 1242. (1) L. VI. 6. 87. 444. 707. Exam. Ord. n. 4. (2) Part 3, q. 69, a. 10. (3) D. 9. n. 50 sq. (4) n. 207. (5) L. VI. 87. (6) D. 9. n. 55 sq. (7) n. 207.

1243. - Query 4° Is it lawful to ask for a Sacrament from an unworthy Minister?

Resp. 1° It is not lawful without cause; because thus without reason an unworthy Minister would be induced to sin gravely. But this is illicit *per se*, because charity demands that we impede the sin of the neighbor which we can easily impede.¹

Resp. 2° But it is lawful if the Sacrament cannot easily be asked from another priest, nor can its reception easily be deferred; for no one is held, with great inconvenience, to yield his right for impeding the free sin of another. Therefore then the one asking for the Sacrament simply permits the sin, but is not the cause of the sin. But a sufficient cause would be necessity or notable utility of the Sacrament, which will be present more easily in the Eucharist and in Penance, and a lesser cause suffices if it is asked from one prepared, or from a pastor.²

Note. - The faithful a) are not held to inquire concerning the dignity of the Minister; b) outside the case of danger of seduction, they can always ask Sacraments from a priest who is not certainly known to be unworthy, and who, with the Bishop knowing and approving, performs the functions of the sacred Ministry; nor c) are they held to abstain from asking precisely because they know that the Minister not long before fell into mortal sin; for it can be presumed (not, however, against the truth) that it was blotted out by penitence. See L. VI. 89. § fin.

Query 5° Is it lawful to ask for a Sacrament from a Minister unworthy on account of some censure or canonical inability?

Resp. Distinguish. Either there is question of ecclesiastical right alone, or of divine right. In the former case, subdistinguish. - If he has been publicly and by name censured or rendered unable, it will not be lawful except in extreme or very grave necessity, as if there is question of Baptism; of Penance; of Viaticum; of Extreme Unction, in the case in which the sick person could not receive another Sacrament; of Order, if the community needed priests; of Matrimony, if it were necessary either for the spiritual salvation of one dying, or for a great temporal utility of children. - If not publicly and by name, it is more truly lawful, because the Council of Constance absolutely conceded to the faithful communion with those tolerated.¹ (Which persons today are to be called tolerated, see n. 1673. § But.) Yet it is supposed that the Minister is not unworthy on account of sin, in which case the resolution handed down in the immediately preceding question holds.

If there is question of divine right, it must be said that ordinarily it is prohibited to receive Sacraments publicly from a Minister, even one tolerated, at least on account of the contempt and disdain of censures which would proceed from this. - This is to be extended by a stronger right to those excommunicated who are enrolled in some heretical or schismatic sect. For although it cannot be doubted that these same persons commonly ought to be numbered among the tolerated, nevertheless the Church has always judged communication in divine things with them illicit in general; since through it divine or natural right is almost always harmed, on account of the danger of perversion or participation in a heretical or schismatic rite, or on account of the danger and occasion of scandal.²

Notes to n. 1243 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 89. (2) L. III. 79. L. VI. 89. Notes to n. 1243 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 88. (2) Gury, Edit. in Germ. 4a P. II. n. 964 (1).

APPENDIX: ON SACRAMENTALS

"Besides the Sacraments properly so called, the Church also has other sacred things, which formerly, indeed in a broader and less proper sense, were also called Sacraments. But for many centuries it has come into usage that they be called Sacramentals."¹

1244. Various Species of Sacramentals. - Universally they are: 1. Rites and ceremonies which the Church uses in the administration of the Sacraments. 2. Blessings and Exorcisms outside the dispensation of the Sacraments. 3. Sacred things, to which, either from divine institution - as to the Most Holy Name of Jesus and to the Sign of the Cross - or from the blessing of the Church, as to lustral water, some salutary power is annexed. 4. Certain pious exercises, as the Lord's Prayer, striking of the breast, the *Confiteor*, almsgiving.

1245. The Power and Efficacy of Sacramentals. - "The origin of the name" of Sacramentals, says the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore,² "is from this, that although they are far inferior to the Sacraments in power and merits, nevertheless in effects they imitate them in a certain way."

It is said: 1° "they imitate them in EFFECTS." For a), like Sacraments of the living, they confer grace, namely actual grace and an increase of habitual grace; b), like Sacraments of the dead, they remit sins, especially light ones; c), like Sacraments imprinting character, so some Sacramentals constitute things strictly sacred.

It is said: 2° they imitate them in effects IN A CERTAIN WAY. For according to the more common sentence, and, according to St. Alphonsus,³ the truer one, they cause their effects, i.e. remission of sins and temporal benefits which we expect from them, not *ex opere operato*; and therefore not infallibly, but by way of impetration, i.e. on account of the prayers and blessings by which the Church obtains, for those using Sacramentals, pious motions of sorrow or charity, through which sins are remitted, and benefits, even temporal ones; but these only insofar as they are salutary for us.⁴

Notes to n. 1245. (1) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 341. (2) Ib. (3) L. VI. 92. (4) St. Thomas, Part 3, q. 87, a. 3, c.

1246. Administration of Sacramentals. - 1. The obligation of ministering them, according to Suarez,¹ is present "on the supposition of the necessity of a man possessed by a demon, or another similar necessity, ... because" the Ministers of the Church "are held to assist the necessities of their faithful by suitable remedies, and those instituted by the Church." Possevin also suitably admonishes:² "In remedies for the good of the people, for example against hailstorms, locusts laying waste the crops, not only should" the priest "be readily available, but even of himself, without being asked, he should propose them. Let him do the same in the mortality of animals and in like things; not because he is held to these things from precept, but because by acting thus he will acquire the benevolence of the people and will increase its devotion, and will merit by an act of charity."

2. They are to be ministered with faith and confidence; with a clean heart and pure intention; worthily and devoutly; lest the mockeries of unbelievers either be feared, or be provoked by an unbecoming mode of administering.

3. "Let preachers and rulers of souls especially take care that they explain to the faithful, and more often inculcate, the nature, signification, and right use of these things. Let them

persuade those who lean too much on their own wisdom and ability that these things, although they seem light and minute, are not to be contemned, since they profit not a little for living piously and obtaining salvation. But let them again and again warn the ruder common people, who are carried away by the contrary error, lest they attribute too much efficacy to the things themselves, and keep them with a certain blind and immoderate confidence, and pursue them with superstitious veneration, as if they could do very much of themselves, without a pious disposition of mind. But let them most sharply rebuke those who have sacred things of this kind, as will be the custom among the Heathen, almost in place of amulets, which would keep them, even when involved in the most foul mire of vices, immune from the anger of God and vengeance."³

Notes to n. 1246. (1) De Rel. Tr. V. L. IV. c. IV. n. 5. (2) Praxis Curae Past. c. XII. n. 47. (3) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 350.

1247. - Exorcisms hold the principal place among Sacramentals; these were treated at nn. 375-377; and Blessings. Of these, some are private, which are given also by lay persons, for example, by parents to children; others are liturgical, which are given by Ministers deputed for this. These are divided in various ways.

I. By Reason of Effects. Some blessings are invocative, namely of the benignity of God upon persons - for example, upon a woman after childbirth - or upon things - for example, upon foods - and are counted among transitory Sacramentals, because persons or things blessed in this way do not change their state, or from profane things do not become strictly sacred, and therefore can be applied to profane yet honorable uses, as before the blessing, as foods and drinks, a house, a ship, etc.; likewise, according to St. Alphonsus,¹ blessed water and blessed candles (I think, outside the day of Purification?) - others are constitutive or consecrative, which are numbered among permanent Sacramentals, because persons or things blessed in this way change their state and from profane things become strictly sacred, nor can they any longer be applied to profane uses, even honorable ones, as chalices, vestments, altar stones, Agnus Dei, etc.

Note. - Missals and Sacred Bibles, as also sacred images, ought not to be applied to a profane use; but one must say otherwise concerning other papers on which sacred names are incidentally and accessorially inscribed.²

II. By Reason of Rite. Some are verbal, in which anointing is not employed; others real, in which it is employed.

III. By Reason of Objects. Some are of persons, as of an Abbot; others of things, as of a Church.

IV. By Reason of the Minister.

A. Some are Papal, as the blessing of the Agnus Dei, of the Pallium, etc.

B. Others pertain to Bishops, and to them alone, and indeed in such a way that without Pontifical Indult they cannot be delegated to simple priests; but things which had been blessed with a faculty delegated without an indult of this kind ought to be blessed anew before use, if this can be done without scandal.³ They are real blessings, and are found only in the Pontifical. Of this sort are the consecration of a chalice, of an altar, of a bell. Which of these our Bishops can delegate, see p. LXXIII. n. 6. 12; and which things, when the See is vacant and in a case of necessity, are delegated to the administrator, p. LXXII. n. 28.

C. Others pertain to Bishops, but in such a way that they can be done also by others having the faculty. They are found in the Ritual and Missal under the title: "Blessings to be done by Bishops or by others having the faculty." They are the following:

1. Blessings of sacerdotal garments, of cloths and corporals, under which also are palls; of the tabernacle, i.e. the pyx and lunula (but by the rite of the Ritual, not of the Pontifical. S. R. C. 16 March 1876. Acta, t. 13. p. 33); of a solemn cross or images, which is done publicly, with a concourse of the people, with solemnity, chant, several ministers, etc.; but not the private blessing, which is done without the said apparatus by one priest with one minister.
2. The blessing and reconciliation of a church not yet consecrated, and of a public oratory and cemetery, and also the blessing of the first stone.

Note. - a) It is certain that a Bishop by his own right can delegate even a simple priest for the blessings enumerated under 2), because this faculty of delegating is specially expressed in the Ritual. But whether he can also delegate those which are listed under 1) is disputed;⁴ yet our Bishops have an Apostolic indult for this (see p. LXXI. n. 13).

b) By the Superiors of those religious Institutes which communicate in privileges with the Mendicants, the blessings concerning which under C. can be done, provided there is not question of churches, oratories, or cemeteries belonging to others, nor of garments, vestments, or vessels for the use of churches belonging to others, nor of crosses or images to be blessed solemnly in places not subject to them.

D. Others pertain to simple priests, which nevertheless again are of a twofold kind; for:

1° Every priest can give certain ones, namely those which in the Missal or Ritual are prescribed to be done by "a priest," with no addition. Yet a simple priest will not be able to impart these: 1) in another's church, or in chapels or oratories annexed to a church, against the will or contradiction of the pastor or rector; 2) publicly and solemnly in places of another's jurisdiction; 3) if in favor of the pastor there stand an immemorial custom, or a synodal law, or an agreement.

2° Certain ones only a pastor, or one delegated by him, can give, namely those which are marked in the Ritual as to be done by the Pastor, or by another priest; for then it is understood: by another priest with the permission of the Pastor.⁵ But by the right of the Pastor are: the blessing of houses on Holy Saturday; the common blessing over crops and fields, at least if it is done solemnly; likewise perhaps the blessing of houses to be done at another time outside Holy Saturday, because in the Ritual for this blessing mention is made of the Pastor; nevertheless Cavalieri denies this;⁶ finally the blessing of the baptismal font, of nuptials, and, except in the case of a legitimate contrary custom, of women after childbirth. - Moreover the distinction between parochial and non-parochial blessings can scarcely be of use here. Yet see n. 1138.

V. Finally, by Reason of Necessity, blessings are divided into prescribed and non-prescribed.

To the prescribed pertain:

a) Episcopal blessings of each kind (see under IV. B. C.), except the blessing of a cemetery - since the blessing of the place or sepulcher suffices - and the solemn blessing of crosses or images. - From sacerdotal garments and vestments:

1° The purificator, veil, and burse are not necessarily to be blessed.⁷ 2° Probably the cincture and pall are to be blessed.⁸ 3° But certainly the corporal, amice, alb, maniple, stole, chasuble, and cloths.⁹ 4° The pyx and lunula ought not to be consecrated, but nevertheless probably to be blessed. The monstrance is laudably blessed.¹⁰

b) Parochial blessings, except the blessings of a woman after childbirth, of fields, of fruits, and of houses.

c) Those which according to the Rubrics are prescribed on certain days of the year, for example on the day of Purification, or on Sundays before the principal Mass (concerning which see De Herdt¹¹ or our Ceremonial¹²).

Notes to n. 1247. (1) L. VI. 94. (2) Benger. Comp. der Past. Theol. p. 498. (3) Decr. 22 Sept. 1703. 3. (4) L. VI. 378. Dub. 4. De Herdt. T. III. n. 129. (5) Scav. T. IV. n. 350. Gury, Ed. in Germ. 4a, p. II. n. 233. (4). (6) De Herdt. T. III. n. 129. (7) S. R. C. 7 Sept. 1816. n. 26. L. VI. 389. (8) L. VI. 376. 388. (9) Ib. 384. 385. De Herdt. T. I. n. 173. 2°. (10) T. III. n. 184 sq. (11) T. III. n. 134 sq. (12) P. II. ch. VII. p. 122. Ed. 1875.

1248. With What Rite Blessings Are to Be Done. - Blessings which either from precept, or publicly in churches or public oratories before the people gathered for this, are done outside Mass, are to be given with surplice and stole according to the reason of the season,¹ standing and with head uncovered, hands joined, with a minister carrying the vessel of blessed water and the sprinkler, and with the formula prescribed in the Missal or Roman Ritual or approved by the S. C. Rit. - For blessing those things for which a special blessing is not had, the Blessing for all things can be used (see *Exc. ex R. R.*, Ed. 1872, p. 260; Ed. 1874, p. 252), or the Sign of the Cross is to be made over the thing to be blessed with the formula: In the name of the Father, etc.; then the thing itself is sprinkled with blessed water.²

If the cross has the image of the Crucified, the blessing for images is to be employed. Craisson, *Elem. Jur. Can.*³ If the blessing is done at the altar, all things are recited at the Epistle corner, and the priest uses a cope. The things to be blessed, if they are sacerdotal vestments, can be placed upon the altar; but otherwise, if they are candles and other things of this kind, which are to be placed upon a table before the altar, or at the Epistle corner.⁴ - The church is the more proper place of blessings, although not necessarily of all; for the blessings of certain things, as of water, sacerdotal vestments, and the like, can from a reasonable cause be done in a profane or honorable place.⁵

Notes to n. 1248. (1) i.e. with a stole of the color of the office of the day, unless otherwise in the proper places of the liturgical books something is noted as regards the color. De Herdt, Pr. Rit. Rom. C. 10. § 3. n. 2. (2) Scav. T. IV. n. 344. 356. (3) n. 703. (4) Ib. n. 705. (5) De Herdt, l. c. n. 1.

TREATISE ON BAPTISM

We must treat: 1° of the nature, properties, and necessity of Baptism; 2° of the matter and form; 3° of the Minister; 4° of the subject and accessory solemnities.

CHAPTER I: ON THE NATURE, PROPERTIES, AND NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

1249. - The word Baptism or Baptisma signifies the same as immersion and washing; hence Baptism is also called a washing, because it wipes away sins.

Baptism is defined: the Sacrament of regeneration through water in the word. Thus the Roman Catechism; or: It is the first Sacrament of the New Law, and the one most necessary, instituted by Christ for the spiritual regeneration of man.

From the Baptism of water, which is called *fluminis*, there is distinguished the Baptism *flaminis* and of blood, by which Baptism properly so called can be supplied, if this is impossible. The former is an ardent desire, at least implicit, of receiving Baptism of water with full conversion to God, namely with contrition or perfect charity. The latter is the shedding of blood, or death borne for the Faith, or for another Christian virtue, in adults probably with contrition or perfect charity. But only Baptism of water is properly called Baptism in reality. Baptism *flaminis* and of blood are called Baptisms in vow. Yet Baptism of blood is more excellent than Baptism *flaminis*, because 1° this latter does not always, as the former does, take away every debt of punishment, and because 2° the former produces its effect almost *ex opere operato*, i.e. although not so strictly as the Sacraments, nevertheless from a certain privilege by reason of the imitation of the Passion of Christ; for otherwise it would not have profited the Holy Innocents, whom nevertheless the Church honors as martyrs.¹ But only Baptism *fluminis* imprints character, and renders man capable of receiving the other Sacraments.

1250. - The principal effects of Baptism are numbered as three, namely: 1° remission of original sin and of actual sins, if there are any, through the infusion of sanctifying grace, to which is added the habit of all the virtues;² 2° total remission of eternal punishment and temporal punishment due for sins, but not liberation from the penalties of the present life, which nevertheless by virtue of Baptism will be taken away from the just in the Resurrection, when this mortal thing will put on immortality;³ 3° the impression of character, by which the baptized person is marked as a son of God and coheir of Christ, and is rendered incapable of receiving Baptism again. It is clear as regards the first from Trent, Session 5, in the Decree on original sin; as regards the second from Trent in the same place, and from the Council of Florence in the Decree for the Armenians; as regards the third, from the Council of Florence in the same place, and from Trent, Session 7, on Baptism.

Therefore Baptism is as the gate of the Church and of the kingdom of heaven. Hence if someone has not been validly baptized, he can validly receive no other Sacrament.

Baptism of water in reality or in vow, at least implicit, from divine institution is altogether necessary for salvation by necessity of means. It is clear from the words of Christ:⁴ Unless a man has been born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. - And from Trent.⁵

Notes to n. 1250. (1) L. VI. 95-100. (2) Catech. Conc. Trid. on Baptism, q. 42. Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. cap. 7. (3) St. Thomas, Part 3, q. 69, a. 3. (4) John 3. 5. (5) Session 7, canon 5, on Baptism.

CHAPTER II: ON THE MATTER AND FORM OF BAPTISM

ARTICLE I: ON BOTH THE REMOTE AND PROXIMATE MATTER OF BAPTISM

§ I. ON THE REMOTE MATTER OF BAPTISM

1251. Principles. - I. The valid matter of Baptism is natural water alone, or elementary water, apt for washing. It is of Faith. It is clear 1° from the words of Christ:¹ Unless a man has been born again of water, etc. - It is clear 2° from the Councils, especially from Florence in the Decree for the Armenians, and from Trent.² - "But what true and natural water is, although with the help of chemical analysis, confirmed by synthesis, it is sufficiently known to those skilled in natural science, nevertheless for theologians (on account especially of the difficulties which occur everywhere in defining the nature of mixtures) it seems that in place of a principle the admonition of the illustrious Author *De re Sacrament.* Tom. I. must rather be held, that concerning true and natural water judgment must be made from the common use of men, not from the disputes of philosophers."³ (W) p. 416.

II. The licit matter of Baptism, outside the case of necessity, is blessed or consecrated water alone, and mixed with chrism according to the rite of the Church, at least for solemn Baptism. This is clear from Canon Law (see below concerning the Ceremonies of Baptism). But he certainly sins gravely by the sin of sacrilege who without grave necessity uses impure, turbid, or foul water, although this is valid matter.⁴ (co) p. 401.

It is said: 1° *outside the case of necessity*, which case sometimes occurs in Missions. Concerning this the S. C. de P. F. wrote in 1806 to the Apostolic Vicar of Tonkin: "Where to preserve water blessed according to the prescribed rite would be of grave inconvenience or danger, in that case it will be lawful for Missionaries or anyone else who, according to the opportunity of things, is apt for conferring this Sacrament, to use common water, especially if it has been blessed,"⁵ for water of the baptismal font, which cannot be had except with grave inconvenience or danger.⁶

It is said: 2° *according to the rite of the Church.* - Concerning this, note that although water, as our Councils admonish,⁷ is to be blessed by the form in the Roman Ritual, if water thus blessed, because of the absence of a baptismal font in places where Baptisms are rare, is lacking, or has failed, or has been corrupted, it can also be blessed by that shorter formula which was approved for the use of our Missionaries by Pius VIII, and is found in the little book *Excerpta ex Rit.*,⁸ etc.

It is said: 3° *impure, turbid, or foul water.* - On this matter note the response of the S. C. Ing., Feria IV, 17 April 1839: "Baptisms conferred with" blessed "corrupted water were valid, although illicit outside the case of necessity; and in a case of necessity natural water is to be preferred; but provision must be made for the renewal of the water of the baptismal font, according to the Roman Ritual."⁹

III. In danger of death, if certainly valid matter cannot be had, doubtful matter ought to be used under this condition: If this matter is sufficient.... Then even a slight probability concerning the value of the matter suffices, because in necessity one must assist the neighbor in the best way in which it can be done. But if one baptized thus has survived, once there is availability of certainly valid matter,

he ought to be baptized again under this condition: If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee, etc. - Common.

Appendix annotation (Psi), to n. 1251. I. p. 23. col. 1. The common sense of the faithful in matters of Faith and morals, furnished with the required conditions, constitutes the passive infallibility, or the infallibility of the learning Church. - The common practice of the faithful, that is, legitimate custom, moderates the laws of the Church, n. 186. - The common use or estimation of men: 1° interprets ecclesiastical laws, as custom does, and this not rarely against the opinions of physiologists; as when, in interpreting the law of ecclesiastical fast, it holds beer, which for physiologists is food, as drink, or when, in interpreting the law of the natural fast to be observed before the reception of the Eucharist, it does not care about the drawing in of the fumes of foods in a kitchen; 2° sometimes also interprets the divine laws of the Sacraments, insofar as it shows in what signification the matter of some Sacrament is to be taken, for example water in Baptism, n. 1251. I, or wine in the Eucharist. For although some artificial wine perhaps may be true wine for physiologists, nevertheless wine from the vine, even granted that the Church had defined nothing about this matter, would be pronounced by the common estimation or use of men to be understood by the word wine. For Christ is to be judged to have used words in that sense in which the common use of men understands them. Let that text be an example, John 12. 24: "Unless the grain of wheat, falling into the earth, has died." Linz. Past. Bl. Appendix annotation (sigma), to n. 1251. II. p. 28. col. 1. Wherefore a physician and a midwife, in the case in which they are compelled to administer Baptism, are bound under grave obligation beforehand, insofar as it can be done, to cleanse the hands from blood and other filth, or to pour clean water from some vessel. Capellmann, Past.-Med., p. 138.

1252. Resolves. - 1° Valid matter is: 1) water of springs, wells, rivers, the sea, pools, marshes, lakes, cisterns; 2) water dissolved from ice, snow, or hail, because it preserves the same substance, although it has been accidentally changed as regards color, taste, or odor; 3) sulphurous or mineral water, water collected from vapor, dew, or flowing in stormy weather from a wall, leaves, etc.; 4) water simply distilled with roses or other flowers, yet not licit *per se*; 5) turbid water mixed with another substance, provided water is the truly and certainly predominant matter, so that according to the use or estimation of men it can still be called water.¹⁰

2° Invalid matter is: 1) milk, blood, tears, sweat, saliva, spittle, urine; 2) wine, oil, beer, thick broth from fat, etc.; 3) mud, ink. (2) p. 416.

3° Doubtful matter is: 1) very thin broth, lye, thin beer (water from dissolved salt?); 2) liquid flowing from a vine and other plants; 3) snow, ice, hoarfrost, and other similar things not yet dissolved,¹ coffee, tea.

Notes to n. 1252 - note sequence 1. (1) John 3. 5. (2) Session 7, canon 2. (3) Gury, Ed. Rom. 1873. P. II. n. 236. (4) L. VI. 102. (5) Ib. (6) Anal. I. P. Ser. 8. col. 1571. n. 95. (7) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 234. (8) p. 239. Ed. 1872; p. 231. Ed. 1874. (9) Anal. I. P. Ser. 8. col. 1571. n. 95. (10) L. VI. 103. 104. Notes to n. 1252 - note sequence 2. (1) 5. 26. Appendix annotation (Omega), to n. 1252. p. 24. col. 1; n. 1254. q. 4°. p. 24. col. 2. Scented waters in which the very substance of the water has been changed are not valid matter of Baptism. Nevertheless dying infants in the case in which, on account of the resistance of unbelieving parents, etc., they cannot be baptized in another way, can and must be baptized with water varied even as to color by some mixture, which nevertheless does not change the substance of the water, by way of washing, "douche," cleansing, remedy, etc., in such a way, however, that at least part of the water flows over the head, or, if this is absolutely impossible, over some principal member of the infant. But if the matter, whether remote or proximate, which was used in the case of necessity, was doubtful, the infant, if perhaps he has recovered, should again be baptized under condition and instructed in whatever better way can be done. S. C. S. Officii, Collect. p. 116 n. 181. - The same is to be resolved if someone baptized a dying infant by wiping his forehead with his hand dipped in natural water, or with a finger or cloth similarly wet, without the water flowing or running down. Ib. p. 117 n. 182.

§ II. ON THE PROXIMATE MATTER OF BAPTISM

1253. - The proximate matter of Baptism is ablution, which can be done in three ways, namely by immersion, sprinkling, and pouring, according to the practice of diverse Churches (which practice, namely of pouring among us, must be observed under grave obligation), so that by the moral judgment of men the baptized person is judged to have been washed. This is clear from the words of the form, and from the perpetual practice of the Church, and also from Paul, Eph.:¹ Cleansing by the laver of water in the word of life.

Notes to n. 1253. (1) L. VI. 103. 104.

1254. Questions. - Query 1° Can a child in the womb of the mother validly be baptized?

Resp. Affirmatively, sufficiently probably, if the child in the womb is reached by water by means of some instrument; because, since the infant already exists as a wayfaring man, he can validly be baptized. It stands in the way that the child is still enveloped in the afterbirth, whose exterior membrane is part of the mother. But more recently an instrument has been invented by which the afterbirth is cut open; and thus water, another instrument being employed, can come to touch immediately the body itself of the fetus. Yet he is to be baptized under condition, because it is not certainly established whether Baptism conferred in this way is valid. Therefore, if the child "has put forth the head" from the womb "and danger of death is imminent," or if he is born, he is to be baptized again under condition. - "But if he has put forth another member which indicates vital motion, let him be baptized in that member if danger threatens; and then, if he is born alive, he will have to be baptized under condition."¹ - But the Baptism of one not yet perfectly born, for the sake of decency, is to be conferred by a lay person, and, unless others are lacking, not by a priest.

Query 2° Is Baptism valid if the water only touches the garments or hairs of the one to be baptized?

Resp. 1° If the water touches only the garments, Baptism is certainly invalid; because thus no one would say that the man is washed. 2° But it is probably valid if the water touches the hairs. But in practice the safer part is to be followed.¹ - Hence if the one to be baptized is covered with hair, let the priest either divide his hair with the fingers of the left hand while with the right he pours water, or let him baptize him on the forehead.

Query 3° Is Baptism valid when conferred in another part than on the head?

Resp. Affirmatively, probably, especially if Baptism is conferred on some more principal part, for example on the breast, shoulders, etc. Nevertheless, if necessity has compelled this, afterward, if it can be done, Baptism would have to be repeated under condition.² Cf. the things said in this number, Query 1°.

Query 4° Does one or another drop of water suffice for baptizing?

Resp. Negatively, probably, especially if the water does not flow, because it cannot be called ablution, which is altogether required for Baptism. - Thus commonly. Nevertheless it is probably doubtful matter, which in a case of necessity would have to be employed. But they commonly say that the matter is then certain if the one baptizing with the motion of a moistened finger should wash a part of the body.³ - But there is no doubt that it is certainly valid if water sprinkled in sufficient quantity truly flows down; since Baptism is validly conferred by sprinkling. (Q) p. 416.

Query 5° Is a threefold ablution required for Baptism?

Resp. 1° Certainly it is not required for validity; for one suffices, that someone be judged truly washed.

Resp. 2° But it is required for liceity, and indeed under grave obligation, where this threefold pouring of water is prescribed, as in the Roman Ritual.⁴ Yet these things seem to be understood of solemn Baptism.

Notes to n. 1254 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 107. S. C. C. 12 July 1794. Collect. p. 147. n. 248. Rit. Rom. De baptiz. parvulis. Notes to n. 1254 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 107. q. 3. (2) Ib. q. 4. (3) Ib. q. 6. (4) Ib. q. 5.

ARTICLE II: ON THE FORM OF BAPTISM

1255. - The form of Baptism is: I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Council of Trent defined, according to that saying of Matthew:¹ Go therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. But among the Greeks it is said: Let the servant of Christ be baptized in the name of the Father, etc.; or: The servant of Christ is baptized, etc. This form is valid from the instruction of Eugene IV to the Armenians; but it is licit only in the Greek Church.

Several theologians, among whom is St. Alphonsus (who nevertheless in the little work *Instr. al popolo*, P. II. C. II. n. 6, does not mention that word), judge that the omission of the word Amen at the end of the form of Baptism is venial; yet that word is not found in the Roman Ritual. Therefore it is asked whether it is to be used or omitted? Resp. S. C. Rit.: Let the Roman Ritual be strictly observed in the case (9 June 1853, Cochinchina, n. 5188).

This form can be vitiated in many ways, either accidentally or substantially, as was said above, n. 1212.

The omission of the word *I* in the form uttered in Latin, Italian, Spanish, but not in English, German, or French (since it would have the sense of the imperative), does not vitiate the essence of the form, nor would it exceed venial sin.² - The same seems to be said, at least probably, concerning the omission of the conjunction *and*, especially if it is omitted only once, and is placed before the third person. - The same also probably concerning the word *in*, although several grave theologians contradict this. Nevertheless the S. C. C. declared valid the form: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son, Holy Spirit." Likewise it has often declared valid the form: "I baptize thee with the name, etc.," uttered in good faith and with right intention.³ But the other words are altogether required for validity. - But it would be valid even if, in the plural number, the English *you*, the German *Sie* or *Euch*, the French *vous*, the Italian *vi*, were used, since by usage they also have the force of the singular number.

1256. Questions. - **Query 1°** Is the form of Baptism valid if it is said: I baptize thee in the name of the Most Holy Trinity, or in the name of Christ?

Resp. to the first: Negatively, at least probably, because in such a form the individual persons of the Holy Trinity are not expressed sufficiently distinctly; since the word Trinity signifies the persons only confusedly and implicitly; but Christ willed that they be expressed distinctly, as is clear from Matthew, the last chapter.⁴ - Thus commonly.⁵

Resp. to the second: Negatively, at least *a fortiori*, because the Trinity is in no way expressed by the words *in the name of Christ*. - Thus all, at least now after St. Thomas,⁶ and it is clear from Canon Law.⁷ St. Alphonsus proves this from Acts 19. 2.⁸

Query 2° Is Baptism valid if to the customary form there is added: and in the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary?

Resp. A distinction must be made. It is not valid if someone doing this intends to confer Baptism in the name of the Blessed Virgin, namely by attributing to such names true efficacy for the value of Baptism. - But otherwise, if he does it from importunate devotion.⁹

Notes to n. 1256. (1) 28. 19. (2) L. VI. 112. (3) Anal. I. P. Ser. 8. col. 1608. n. 140, 141, 144, 145. (4) L. VI. 111. (5) Part 3, q. 66, a. 6. (6) c. 30. de Consecrat. Dist. 4. (7) L. VI. 112. (8) Ib. 111. (9) Ib. 111.

CHAPTER III: ON THE MINISTER OF BAPTISM

The Minister of Baptism is one thing when ordinary, another when extraordinary. Again the extraordinary Minister is twofold: namely the Minister of solemnity and of necessity.

1257. Principles. - **I.** Every priest, and only a priest, by force of his ordination, is the ordinary minister of Baptism. It is clear from various places of Canon Law and from the Council of Florence in the Decree of Union, and also from the universal practice of the Church.

II. A deacon is the extraordinary Minister and Minister of solemnity, i.e. able to baptize solemnly, but only from delegation and for a grave cause. It is clear from Canon Law and the Roman Pontifical, or from the instruction of the Bishop to Deacons in ordination, etc.

III. Any man whatsoever using reason, whether male or female, whether Catholic or heretic, whether believer or unbeliever, is an extraordinary Minister of Baptism, so that he can always baptize validly, and in necessity also licitly. It is drawn from the same sources and from what was said above in the first principle. - Hence "let priests take care that all the faithful, especially physicians, nurses, and midwives, rightly know the manner of conferring private Baptism."¹

IV. Although every priest, by force of ordination, has the power of baptizing, nevertheless he cannot licitly use it, even privately, outside the case of necessity, unless he has ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. It is clear from Canon Law and from the Roman Ritual on Baptism. (1) p. 416.

Notes to n. 1257. (1) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 228. Appendix annotation (1), to n. 1257. IV. p. 26. col. 1. A priest or deacon entangled in censure or irregularity, if he baptizes because of urgent necessity, is bound to do this, excepting the cases which theologians except, for example n. 1676. 1°. Excipe: b; n. 1688. 1°. Rule, in the manner of laymen.

1258. Resolves. - 1° Neither a Pastor nor a Bishop, without commission, licitly baptizes outside his own diocese or parish, or, within it, persons belonging to others. And therefore parents also sin who without permission of their own Prelate bring their offspring to another to be baptized, since they violate the right of the Pastor.¹

2° Travelers, i.e. vagi, can be baptized in whatever Church they have chosen. If a woman by chance gives birth in a village not her own, the offspring is to be baptized by the Pastor of that village, unless perhaps the proper village is a little distant from there.²

3° According to the more common and more probable sentence,³ all can receive Baptism and the other Sacraments from the Pastor of the place where they have already contracted quasi-domicile.⁴

4° But a stranger can be baptized with the permission, either express or reasonably presumed, of his own priest.⁵

5° Religious can baptize in a case of necessity, or with the permission of the same Pastor and of their own Superior, since this is prohibited by no law.⁶

6° Father and mother ought not to baptize their own offspring except in danger of death, when another who may baptize is not found. Rit. Rom. Cf. St. Alphonsus.⁷

Note. - The dispositions of law under 1°, among us, prescinding from diocesan statutes, are to be understood with the limitation which the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore⁸ indicates in these

words: "Worthy of gravest reproof are priests who rashly baptize infants offered to them from another parish or diocese, when they could easily have been baptized by their own pastor."

Notes to n. 1258. (1) L. VI. 114. (2) Ib. 115. (3) Ib. (4) Ib. (5) Ib. (6) Ib. (7) Ib. 117. (8) a. 227.

1259. Questions. - Query 1° What order is to be observed among Ministers of Baptism?

Resp. In the Roman Ritual it is thus held: "If a priest is present, let him be preferred to a deacon; a deacon to a subdeacon; a cleric to a layman; and a man to a woman, unless for the sake of modesty it is fitting that a woman rather than a man baptize an infant not yet entirely born, or unless the woman should know better the form and mode of baptizing." See St. Alphonsus.¹

Query 2° Does a layman sin mortally who, in necessity, with a priest present, baptizes?

Resp. Affirmatively, with the common sentence. The reason is, because then he truly usurps the right of the priest, to whom from the power of Order the office of baptizing has been committed. Therefore also the priest himself sins gravely if he yields the administration to a layman. Yet a layman is to be preferred to an excommunicated priest.²

Query 3° Does a layman sin gravely by baptizing before a deacon?

Resp. It is controverted. The first probable sentence affirms; because a deacon, by force of ordination, is deputed to baptizing, although from the actual practice of the Church he cannot solemnly baptize except for a grave cause and with the permission of the Pastor.

The second sentence, likewise probable, denies; because a deacon baptizing in a case of necessity without commission does not baptize from office, but in the same manner as an inferior cleric or layman. - St. Alphonsus³ says that each sentence is probable.

Query 4° Is it lawful for a layman, with the permission of a priest or Bishop, to baptize infants, on account of the common dangers of life, where there is no availability of a priest?

Resp. Kenrick: "We judge that it must be denied; for both the testimonies of the Fathers speak of one in danger and about to perish, and the decrees of the Church plainly treat of the same necessity. Thus Eugene IV says: with danger of death imminent, let them be baptized even by a layman.... If therefore a priest is not going to return except after some months, not on that account will it be lawful to baptize infants who meanwhile are born without any danger, but only those who are placed in danger. We judge the same must be said, even if afterward no hope of sacred ministry should shine forth; for we have learned from no document of the Church that a layman can be deputed to baptize outside danger of death. But the less hope there is that a priest will come, we think the less danger suffices for a layman to baptize; nor is the hour of death to be awaited; but if the illness brings danger of death, Baptism is to be ministered."⁴ - But when necessity urges, "if the weather is severe, and the journey long, or if the priest is infirm in health, or burdened with very many occupations of his sacred ministry" (I would add: which cannot be deferred), "he does not seem to sin by rejecting the burden of baptizing onto a layman who knows how to furnish it."⁵ (2) p. 416.

Query 5° At what age of infants is this Sacrament to be conferred?

Resp. As soon as it can be done, although danger of death does not urge. Cf. Rit. Rom. - the Bull *Cantate* of Eugene IV, etc. - More specially the C. S. O. on 30 July 1771 established: "Pastors are obliged to baptize infants without any delay, if danger of death is imminent; but if danger is not

present, the administration of Baptism is not to be deferred beyond the third day after birth."⁶ Moreover all agree that it is grave sin to wait for a long time. Yet St. Alphonsus⁷ more probably denies that a delay which does not exceed 10 or 11 days is grave. - Kenrick observes:⁸ "In most of the United States great neglect in this matter is found; for there are those who allow several months to pass before they fulfill this office. Theologians recognize grave sin in delay whenever there is availability of a priest and the infant can be brought without danger. Moreover the excessive cold of winter, length of the journey, contrary will of a non-Catholic father, and other excuses often occur; but the solicitude of priests is to be employed in this, that they be brought as soon as possible." Therefore the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore say:⁹ "We will that pastors of souls most sharply and more often rebuke the detestable sloth of Catholic parents, who do not take care that the age of little children, exposed to so many dangers, be fortified at once by the Sacrament of Baptism."

Notes to n. 1259. (1) L. VI. 117. (2) Ib. (3) Ib. (4) Kenr. Tr. XV. 16. (5) Ib. n. 19. (6) Anal. J. P. Ser. 2. col. 1807. (7) L. VI. 118. Note 2. (8) Tr. XV. 21. (9) a. 225. Appendix annotation (2), to n. 1259. q. 4^a. p. 27. col. 1. This seems to be opposed by the fact that S. C. de Prop. Fide, on 2 Feb. 1804, wrote back to the Vicar Apostolic of Cochin-China, namely: "The Sacred Congregation has most fully approved the custom of this Mission concerning Baptism, that, when the Priest is absent, it is immediately administered to infants by Catechists or other approved laymen, although they are enjoying good health, concerning which you doubted; for the life of men, especially of infants, is exposed to continual dangers." Collect. p. 121 n. 197. Perhaps, however, the peculiar circumstances of so widely extended a Vicariate had great weight in this response. Thus, for example, the Synod of Suchuen expressly mentions the danger imminent to infants in this Vicariate from the custom of parents placing those recently born in the same bed with themselves. Ib. p. 125 n. 207.

CHAPTER IV: ON THE SUBJECT OF BAPTISM

The subject of Baptism is every and only wayfaring man not yet baptized.

1260. Resolves. - 1° Infants are validly baptized, likewise the perpetually insane who have never used reason, and therefore are judged to be of the same condition as infants. But if they have ever used reason, Baptism more probably is not valid unless before the insanity they sought it. In practice, however, such persons should be baptized under condition, both because it is not plainly established that they did not seek Baptism, and also because according to several authors it is enough if someone had the will of receiving all things necessary for salvation. (Cf. nn. 1238, 1240.)

2° If there is doubt whether an infant lives, he is to be baptized under condition. But since today the opinion that the fetus is informed by a soul from the beginning of conception is common (n. 474), an abortive fetus, however small, if it has human form and gives a sign of life, is to be baptized absolutely. But if indications of humanity and life scarcely appear in it, it is to be baptized under the condition: *if thou art a man*. The same must be said concerning an unformed production - unless it already displays manifest signs of putrefaction, decomposition, or disorganization - and provided there appear the outlines proper to a human fetus, by which it is distinguished from a mole and other fruitless generations.¹ But if the fetus is still wrapped in the afterbirth, it is not to be baptized at least on the exterior membrane of this, since to experts today no doubt remains that it is part of the mother, not of the fetus.² Therefore in that case the afterbirth is to be cut open before Baptism is conferred.

3° Concerning monsters, note these things from the Roman Ritual: "In baptizing monsters ... great caution is to be employed: concerning this, if there is need, the Ordinary of the place, or other experts, are to be consulted, unless danger of death is imminent."

"A monster which does not bear before itself the human species ought not to be baptized; but if there is doubt concerning it, let it be baptized under this condition: *If thou art a man, I baptize thee*, etc." But it will have to be said to bear before itself the human species whenever it has a head, however deformed that may be. Thus experts today.³

"But that concerning which there is doubt whether there is one person or several persons is not to be baptized until this is discerned; but it can be discerned if it has one or several heads, one or several breasts; for then there will be as many distinct men, and ... each one separately is to be baptized." If there is danger in delay, let him wash each one with the form in the plural. "But when it is not certain that in the monster there are two persons, because it does not have two distinct heads and two distinct breasts, then one must first be baptized absolutely, and afterward the other under condition, in this way: *If thou art not baptized*," etc.

4° He is validly baptized whom the Minister thinks to be someone else; indeed even if it is a female whom he thinks to be male, because he intends to baptize the one present, and not another (n. 1218).

5° Several are validly baptized at the same time with this form: *I baptize you*, provided they are washed at the same time. But outside the case of necessity this is illicit.

6° Adults, although rude, who nevertheless are not altogether incapable, cannot be baptized unless according to their capacity they have been instructed at least in the things necessary by necessity of means, as are the principal mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation. This also holds for dying persons of this sort, who therefore will have to be baptized without condition if the one baptizing prudently judges that the sick person sufficiently knows the aforesaid mysteries according to his capacity, truly gives faith to them, and sincerely promises that he will satisfy the duties of a Christian man; otherwise they either ought not to be baptized, if the contrary is morally certainly established, or under condition, if these necessary dispositions are doubtful, Baptism cannot be deferred, and otherwise nothing stands in the way of the conferral of this Sacrament. - Nor is it lawful to leave an adult baptized or to be baptized in good faith as regards the precepts of positive law (not even as regards those things which perhaps he will obey with difficulty), but all the precepts of positive law ought to be intimated to him. - Thus from very many decisions of the Congregation of the Holy Office, especially to questions of Missionaries.⁴

Notes to n. 1260. (1) Scav. T. III. n. 74. Anal. J. P. Ser. 5. col. 1112 sq.; Ser. 6. col. 1280 sq. (2) Capellm. p. 139. (3) Capellm. p. 143. (4) Anal. J. P. Ser. 2. col. 1804. 1805. Benedict XIV, c. Postremo, 28 Feb. 1747. Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 230.

1261. Questions. - Query 1° Can the children of non-Catholics licitly be baptized against the will of their parents?

Resp. Distinguish. For they either certainly have the use of reason, or doubtfully have it, or certainly do not have it.

If the first, asking and sufficiently instructed, the danger of perversion having been guarded against, they both can be baptized, and, every fear of evil having been set aside, ought to be baptized. - They can; for one certainly having the use of reason (which each one is regularly judged to have when the seventh year has been completed)¹ "already, as regards those things which are of divine or natural right, begins to be of his own power."² - Every fear of evil having been set aside, they OUGHT. For they have a strict right to the aids of salvation, which the Ministers of the Church are held from divine mandate to furnish; wherefore "it is not lawful to reject them, if they earnestly ask, from fear of the offense of parents, or of public hatred, or of another inconvenience.... Prudence indeed is necessary," - and hence "the consent of the parents is to be sought by the children themselves," if they are still minors, but not by the priest, and, insofar as can be done, all things are to be done with their peace - but not that "prudence which places the advantages of this world before the salvation of souls."³

If the second, St. Alphonsus⁴ with Benedict XIV and Lugo holds that before the seventh year Baptism is to be deferred until it is established concerning the perfect use of reason. The Instruction of the S. C. de P. F. to the Prefect of the Missions of Tripoli is consonant.⁵

If the third, subdistinguish. - It will be lawful in the cases in which the danger of perversion ceases, namely, if either the parents are slaves of some Catholic; or the offspring has been placed outside the care of the parents (for example, if exposed and taken up by Catholics), without fear that it will return to them; or it is perpetually insane; or it is placed in the article, or morally certain danger, of death. Except, nevertheless, if, although it is placed in the article of death, scandal is to be feared, because, for example, some greater hatred against the Catholic Religion and savagery against Catholics would be stirred up.⁶ For the common good is to be preferred to a private good.

Outside these cases it will not be lawful, whether there is question of the children of unbelievers, or among us of heretical parents. For there stand in the way, even as regards the children of heretics among us, the danger of perversion and the reason of scandal, or of graver evils. - I said: *even as regards the children of heretics among us*. For although the right of baptizing infant children of heretics belongs to the Church, and of preventing them from being imbued with the errors of their parents, nevertheless this right of hers cannot be executed among us. Hence absolutely no deference is to be shown to nurses, if they bring infants to the church to be baptized, while the heretical parents suspect nothing.⁷

Notes to n. 1261. (1) S. C. O. 16 July 1639. (2) St. Thomas, Part 3, q. 68, a. 10. (3) Kenr. Tr. XV. 31. (4) L. VI. 128. (5) apud Gury, Ed. Rom. 1873. T. II. p. 646. n. II. 6. L. VI. 129. 130, and Instr. cit. S. C. de P. F. apud Gury, Ed. Rom. 1873. t. II. p. 646. n. VI. 7. L. VI. 126. 127. 132, and Instr. citata, n. IX.

1262. - Query 2° Whether and when can infants of consenting non-Catholics licitly be baptized?

Resp. Affirmatively, if there shines forth a probable hope of their Catholic education, care nevertheless having been taken that a sponsor, male or female, and these Catholic, be had.¹ The reason is, because then the danger both of perversion and of scandal is absent.

But practically that hope is to be said to shine forth:

- a) If the parents are persuaded that the Catholic Faith is true, and have the intention of embracing it, or at least seem somewhat disposed toward embracing it.
- b) If they permit to a Catholic godfather or godmother the instruction of the child in matters of Faith, and promise that they will place no obstacle to the children professing the Faith.
- c) The same seems to be said if one or the other parent is so disposed.
- d) "As often as one or the other parent professes the Faith, although the other pursues it with more than Vatinian hatred, the infant can be baptized, with the Catholic parent being admonished to put forth every effort in its Catholic instruction. But if he grows so sluggish that he cares nothing about this, or if he has already bound himself to the spouse to permit to him the education of the child in heresy, it will not be lawful to baptize the infant with that condition, with manifest and certain danger of apostasy. For the most part, indeed, it is to be hoped that the Catholic spouse will sometime be recalled to a sense of Religion, and will be solicitous concerning the right instruction of the children, unless he plainly fosters the contrary purpose."² These things are similar to those which were decreed concerning Christian women of Turks asking that their children be baptized.³ (3) p. 417.

"But if the parents, as sometimes happens, ask for priestly ministry from a cause of opportunity alone, or because they believe Baptism to be necessary, while they reject most of the other dogmas of the Faith, and wish to educate the children in heresy, or to keep them until mature age without any document of religion, so that they may judge more freely and more maturely concerning matters of Faith, and choose a sect at will, we do not think it lawful to baptize the infants, since the Sacrament is profaned by heretical instruction, or by infidelity, which is so likely to follow. The S. C. Ing. in the month of September 1827, having weighed those things which seemed to import a moderation of the decrees concerning this matter in the diocese of Bardstown, judged that there was no departure to be made from the decrees."⁴

Notes to n. 1262. (1) Kenr. Tr. XV. 28. Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 229. (2) Kenr. Tr. XV. 30. (3) Benedict XIV, Ep. to the Archbishop of Tarsus. (4) Kenr. Tr. XV. n. 29. Appendix annotation (3), to n. 1262. p. 29. col. 2. S. C. de Prop. Fide on 29 Nov. 1672 declared "that it is lawful for the Pastor to baptize a child, with one of the Catholic parents consenting, even if he certainly knows that the other afterward will take care that the infant be baptized by a heretical minister; but the Catholic spouse is bound to warn the heretical spouse that the child has already been legitimately baptized." Collect. p. 122 n. 209.

1263. - Query 3° Can or ought Baptism ever be repeated?

Resp. It can and ought to be repeated under condition, whenever concerning its value there is some doubt not to be despised; otherwise it cannot be repeated without grave sin, because an attempt of ministering a Sacrament to an incapable subject is sacrilege. (Cf. n. 1213). But a doubt is to be despised if either 1° one witness (although a woman, concerning whom nevertheless no suspicion occurs) testifies concerning his own fact especially;¹ or 2° there is question of adults who were born of Catholic parents and educated among the faithful, although testimony is not had of Baptism received, provided grave reasons on the contrary side do not occur.²

Query 4° Are exposed infants to be baptized?

Resp. Affirmatively, if they have been exposed without testimony of Baptism conferred, unless from elsewhere it is established that they have been duly baptized. But if they have been exposed with a little note attesting that they have been baptized, it is controverted. The more common and truer sentence, which a decision of the S. C. C.¹ confirms, teaches that all these are to be baptized under condition, unless such a little note is of such a kind that it begets certitude, for example, because it was signed by a known priest.²

Query 5° Are infants to be rebaptized who have been baptized either by midwives or by lay persons?

Resp. Negatively, unless there is present a probable suspicion of error in the Baptism conferred. - Thus the most common and true sentence, says St. Alphonsus,³ who recalls a decision of the S. Congregation.

Notes to n. 1263 - note sequence 1. (1) Benedict XIV, de Syn. L. VII. c. VI. n. 2 sq. Inst. 8 sub fine. (2) L. VI. 134. Note II.

Notes to n. 1263 - note sequence 2. (1) Benedict XIV, Inst. 8. § Evenit quoque. (2) L. VI. 135. (3) Ib. 136.

1264. - Query 6° What things are to be observed in the reception of Neo-converts?

Resp. Concerning these see the Roman Ritual, Ratisbon edition 1882, Supplement for the American Provinces of the United States, p. 1.

Nevertheless note the following:

It is said in the Instruction of the Holy Office, whose tenor is reported in the cited place:

I. Baptism, if it is repeated under condition, is to be repeated according to the order of the Baptism of adults. But the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore¹ petitioned that the faculty of using in the Baptism of adults the shorter formula established for little children, which until the year 1870 had been conceded for certain dioceses (not, however, prescribed), the Supreme Pontiff would deign to extend to all for ten or twenty years. Moreover the Sacred Congregation judged that Bishops ought to recur when the time of the last concession had been completed.² Therefore let each one see whether that shorter formula has been conceded in his diocese. But it is usually conceded, with the Bishop admonished that he take care to introduce gradually the formula prescribed for adults, and to guard lest the shorter one pass into custom. - But to the postulate of the Fathers that it be conceded

to them what was conceded to the English, namely to baptize under condition privately, with lustral water only, and without ceremonies, adults converted from heresy, the Sacred Congregation responded: for the present it is not expedient.³ (4) p. 417.

II. If a Neo-convert, whose Baptism has been judged valid, greatly desires that the rites formerly omitted in his Baptism be supplied, the priest is indeed free to comply with this pious wish of his. Yet in such a case he will have to employ the order of the Baptism of adults, and to change the things to be changed on account of Baptism already validly received. Thus the aforesaid Instruction.⁴

III. "In the conversion of heretics" (supposing that the fact of Baptism conferred is established) "one must first inquire concerning the validity of the Baptism received in heresy." Today indeed, universally, one can prudently doubt concerning it; for "heretics" for the most part, "since they think rather incorrectly concerning Baptism, and hold it in the place of a mere ceremony which helps nothing toward obtaining the salvation of the soul, are most often accustomed to neglect certain rites which are of the greatest moment, and without which the nature of the Sacrament by no means subsists."¹ I said: *universally*; for the reason given only founds a presumption; but presumption ought to yield to truth; therefore by force of the same it will not be lawful to act unless diligence for discovering the truth has been employed in vain. Therefore the S. C. of the Holy Office rightly declared that "one must first inquire" concerning "the validity of Baptism received in heresy," and indeed "with a diligent examination having been instituted." But of this examination:

A) **The objects** are: the very fact of Baptism conferred or not conferred; then, if the fact is established, the mode and time in which, the sect in which, and the place where someone was baptized.

I said: a) the very fact of Baptism conferred or not conferred; for 1) Socinians and Quakers are not baptized; 2) Baptists, not before adult age; 3) Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Universalists judge Baptism free; 4) many other non-Catholic parents do not take care concerning Baptism to be conferred on their offspring, or procure it for only one or another of their infants, whence it happens that, the parents being dead, there is often no one who can testify concerning the fact of Baptism conferred, especially among us.

I said: b) the mode and sect. Thus Baptism "sometimes becomes doubtful from a slight reason, because ministers of the sects, especially Presbyterians and Methodists, sprinkle those to be baptized, and very often several at the same time, with a sprinkler; but" probably "the skin ought to be touched by the water and to flow."²

"Since the custom of the Baptists leaves no room of doubting concerning the abundance of water, and they pronounce the due form, certain words being premised, which do not vitiate it: *that I may obey the Lord Jesus Christ* or *that I may obey thy command*, the sole reason of doubting concerning the value of Baptism conferred by them would be taken from the separation of the ablution from the form; for this is pronounced entire before the immersion; or from defect of intention, namely because they believe Baptism to be the same as that by which John washed Christ. Therefore for converts from that sect, who all received Baptism in adult age and therefore can give certain testimony concerning it received, it does not seem that Baptism is to be repeated, not even with a condition added. Moreover an entirely close conjunction" (or one which the delay of one *Pater* does not interrupt) "ought to exist between form and matter, on which account we leave the matter to the judgment of the wiser." Thus

Kenrick.³ Practically, Baptism will for the most part have to be repeated under condition, at least as it seems to me.

Among Anglicans (Episcopalians), the Baptism of Ritualists is presumed to have been duly conferred; most of the other Anglicans, and generally heretics, even today attribute no force to the rite.

Congregationalists, Unitarians, Universalists, as I said above, universally judge Baptism free.

Therefore the Baptism of all these is rightly presumed doubtful.

On the contrary, Baptism conferred by the Greek schismatics, by Eutychians, Nestorians, and other Eastern heretics, and also in the Gallican Sect which is called *La petite Eglise*, is to be held as certainly valid.

I said: c) *time*. Namely, at the beginning of this century, Rationalism not yet ruling among Protestants, Baptism was for the most part administered with greater care than today.

I said: d) *place*. Formerly especially, there were certain regions in Northern Europe which the same Rationalism had not yet invaded, while others already were plainly infected with it.

B) The manner of examination. Those are to be interrogated concerning the aforesaid things, and notably concerning the mode, both the one whose Baptism is doubted, who will be able to bear almost undoubted testimony if he was baptized in adult age, and others, if they can easily be had, who perhaps were present at his Baptism, or know in what way the rite was customarily performed in the region in which and at the time when he was baptized. "Nor is it generally to be demanded from converts that they receive Baptism again, if they themselves, well conscious of the morals of the sect to which they adhered, are persuaded that they were duly baptized." Thus Kenrick,⁴ whose sentence nevertheless is not altogether approved by others.

Once the examination has been completed in the way in which it can be done, today there will for the most part remain doubt about Baptism conferred by heretics. Wherefore it is universally repeated under condition, not only among us, but also in England, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and, Perrone testifying, even Rome.⁵

IV. "A threefold method of proceeding is distinguished in reconciling heretics:

"1) If Baptism is conferred absolutely, no Abjuration follows, nor Absolution, because the Sacrament of Regeneration washes away all things." - "Wherefore," says Kenrick,¹ "the custom of exacting it," i.e. Confession, "so that the soul may be disposed to the grace of Baptism, is altogether to be disapproved, as Cardinal Consalvi, Pro-Prefect of the S. Congregation de Propaganda Fide, responded to me when I consulted him, on 31 May in the year 1823, ... lest a graver burden be imposed on those wishing to approach Baptism, by which they may be frightened away; or the error creep in, that their sins must necessarily be declared; or they themselves, hindered by shame, conceal some things contrary to the dictate of conscience, and thus approach not rightly disposed. To those wishing to confess, it can be indulged, according to St. Thomas:² 'If, however, some to be baptized from their devotion should wish to confess their sins, their Confession would have to be heard, not for this, that satisfaction should be imposed on them, but for this, that spiritual information of life should be handed down to them against accustomed sins.'"

In which case they are to be instructed concerning this end of their Confession and concerning its non-obligation, lest they sin against conscience while they conceal certain things.

"2) If Baptism is to be repeated under condition, one must proceed in this order:

"A) Abjuration, or Profession of Faith.

"B) Conditionated Baptism.

"C) Sacramental Confession with conditionated Absolution.

"3) But when Baptism has been judged valid, only Abjuration, or Profession of Faith, is received, which Absolution from censures follows."

Concerning abjuration note: a) according to Kenrick,³ that it is done by the Piana Profession of Faith; but today that is to be used which the Roman Ritual exhibits, Ratisbon edition 1882, Suppl. p. 2. b) From Scavini, that it is to be done also by a material heretic. c) Perhaps by epikeia that formula can be omitted when there is question of persons of color, or other rude persons, to be received, who are able neither to recite nor to understand it. Also the priest can read it beforehand to women (or others) of more timid disposition, who will signify their assent at the end. Moreover the journal *Pastoral-Blatt fuer Nord-America* admonishes⁴ that two suitable witnesses are to be employed for the Profession of Faith, and this even then when for just causes it seems it must be received secretly, for example, in the sacristy.

Absolution from censures is to be given both to those for whom Baptism is repeated under condition, and to those for whom it is not repeated; but "in grave or light doubt whether the penitent incurred excommunication through heresy perhaps professed only materially, the priest here" (i.e. after the words "of excommunication, which") "should insert the word: perhaps."⁵

V. There is scarcely need to say that he is not to be admitted to Baptism who doubts concerning some doctrine of Faith, and that a man cannot be baptized who indeed acknowledges Baptism to be necessary, but rejects other dogmas. The same holds concerning him who in mind is not prepared to keep the mandates of God and the Church.⁶ Therefore it is altogether clear that the practice of some is to be disapproved, who formerly, lest they be compelled to obtain a dispensation in the impediment of disparity of cult, or I know not from what other cause, conferred Baptism upon an unbeliever about to enter Matrimony with a Catholic, not taking care concerning the Faith and concerning his will of living as a Christian. All these things are to be understood concerning ordinary cases; for:

VI. If there is question of a dying non-Catholic, who manifests a desire of embracing the Catholic Faith either by himself or, when he is no longer able to do this, through others, or formerly manifested it, the examination concerning the value of Baptism received in heresy ordinarily will not be able to be instituted on account of the circumstances, and the Sacrament under condition (or, if it is established that he was never baptized, absolutely), by a threefold or even one pouring of water, with all things to be done before Baptism omitted, is to be conferred by a priest vested in a white stole. Afterward, if time is available and he has Chrism with him, let him anoint him on the crown of the head, and impose the white linen cloth, and hand to him the lighted candle, as is handed down in the Order of baptizing.⁷ Baptism having been conferred under condition, the Confession of the dying person, in the manner in which it can be done, is received; but in every case absolution is given

(under condition) from censures and sins. Then, if time permits and there is question of a dying person master of himself and sufficiently instructed, Viaticum will be ministered.⁸ Finally Extreme Unction is conferred, since an interpretative intention suffices for receiving it.⁹ But if the dying person is still master of his mind, the priest will take care that he express before witnesses his will of embracing the Catholic Faith and of dying in it, lest otherwise a place be given to inconveniences.

Notes to n. 1264 - note sequence 1. (1) a. 243. (2) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. p. CXLIV. IV. 3. Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 244, note 5. 4. Excerpta ex Rituali Romano, Balt. 1872, p. 271. III. Ed. 1874, p. 263. III, or the Roman Ritual itself, Balt. 1873, p. 423. III. Notes to n. 1264 - note sequence 2. (1) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 240. (2) Kenr. Th. Dogm. de Bapt. 81. (3) Ib. 119. (4) Kenr. Tr. XV. 41. (5) Tr. de Bapt. c. V. n. 133, Note. Cf. Brownson's Review, 1873, p. 562 and 1874, pp. 245, 389. Notes to n. 1264 - note sequence 3. (1) Tr. XV. 33. (2) Part 3, q. 68, art. VI. Resp. 3. Tr. XV. 35. 4. (3) Jahrg. S. 40. 5. Excerpta ex Rit. p. 280. 6. Kenr. Tr. XV. 34. 7. Conc. Plen. Balt. II. a. 238. 8. Kenr. Tr. XVII. 41. 9. L. VI. 82.

CHAPTER V: ON THE ACCESSORY SOLEMNITIES OF BAPTISM, NAMELY ON PATRONS AND CEREMONIES

ARTICLE I: ON PATRONS

Patrons are, as it were, spiritual fathers, who lift the baptized person from the sacred font, and, in default of the parents, undertake care of him.

1265. Principles. - I. In solemn Baptism there must, under grave obligation, be employed at least one patron, whether he be a man or a woman; nor can more than two licitly be employed. Thus Trent established.¹ But if a Parish Priest were to admit more patrons than two, he would sin gravely, because he would violate the precept of the Church imposed under grave obligation, lest relationships be multiplied.²

II. In order that someone be truly a patron, the following conditions are required: 1° that he have the use of reason, and himself be baptized; 2° that he have been designated by the parents, or justly by the Parish Priest; 3° that he touch the one to be baptized, by himself or at least through another, and indeed physically (which more probably also holds as regards adults to be baptized³), and in the ablution itself, so that it does not suffice if it is done among the ceremonies;⁴ 4° that he have the true intention of carrying out the office of a patron.⁵

Notes to n. 1265. (1) Sess. 24, c. 2, Ref. Matrim. (2) L. VI. 154 in fine. (3) Ib. 148. (4) Anal. J. P. Ser. 8, col. 1736, n. 221, etc. (5) Gury, Ed. Rom. 1873, T. II, p. 452 ().

1266. Questions. - Query 1° What are the obligations of patrons?

Resp. They are held to fulfill the office of teacher in a case of necessity, or when the parents of the little child are lacking. Hence they are held to instruct the baptized person concerning Faith, morals, various obligations, etc. But they are released from every obligation when they can prudently presume that the baptized person is diligently instructed by the parents.⁶

Consequently the priest, after Baptism has been conferred, must warn the patrons concerning the obligations undertaken, and besides concerning the spiritual relationship contracted. - But concerning that relationship contracted through Baptism we shall speak where we treat of the impediments of Matrimony.

Query 2° In private Baptism must a patron necessarily be employed?

Resp. Negatively, because he does not seem to be required by the Church except for solemn Baptism. Nevertheless also in private Baptism he can be employed, and more laudably is employed. - Thus commonly with St. Alphonsus.⁷ But if he is employed and lifts the infant with the intention of a patron, he contracts relationship.⁸

Query 3° Can the patrons be two males, or two females?

Resp. Negatively, because Trent established that at most two patrons can be employed, namely a man and a woman. But it is probable that it is only venial, if it is done thus. Several, however, with Bonacina, think that it is mortal. - "This seems truer," says St. Alphonsus,¹ "if the patrons were of a

different sex from the infant, because thus the relationships would be multiplied, which Trent wished to prohibit; otherwise if they were of the same sex."

Query 4° Must the patron of a male, if he is the only one, be male, and of a female, female?

Resp. More probably, negatively; because Trent says: "Whether man, or woman"; therefore a man or a woman can be employed indiscriminately.²

Query 5° Who are prohibited from being patrons?

Resp. Validly indeed, but illicitly, the following are patrons: 1° an Abbot and Monk, or a Religious and Nun of any Order in which solemn vows are emitted (or of any religious Institute whatever, in whose Rule this is prohibited), and this whether by himself or by procurator; 2° spouses with respect to spouses, and parents with respect to children; 3° all who are of depraved morals and lost reputation, as heretics, unbelievers, those publicly excommunicated or interdicted, those who are not of sound mind, those who are ignorant of the rudiments of the faith. - Therefore those notoriously enrolled in condemned societies, public concubinarians, and other public criminals are to be kept away. - Besides, "it is most fitting that patrons be at least in the age of puberty, and marked with the Sacrament of Confirmation." - Concerning a heretical patron Kenrick warns:⁴ "To avoid grave offense, sometimes a heretic who presents himself as sponsor is not openly repelled: nevertheless he is never to be admitted as sponsor, but the parents are to be warned that only a Catholic can perform that office: wherefore the custom of some persons everywhere receiving heretics for that office is altogether to be disapproved, being satisfied if one or the other sponsor is Catholic."

Notes to n. 1266 - note sequence 1. (6) L. VI. 146. (7) Ib. 147. (8) S. C. C. 17 Apr. 1603 and 5 Mar. 1678. Notes to n. 1266 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 155. (2) Ib. Cf. Gury, Ed. Ratisb. 1874, P. II, n. 962 (3). (3) Ib. 156 and Rit. Rom. (4) Tr. XV. 47.

ARTICLE II: ON THE CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM

It is mortal, without grave cause, for example urgent necessity, to omit all the ceremonies of Baptism, or some notable one from them, because thus a grave precept of the Church is violated.¹

1267. Resolves. - 1° Necessity being excluded, it is mortal to baptize without the anointing of Chrism, because this has a special and grave signification.²

2° Outside a case of necessity, it is mortal to baptize solemnly with non-consecrated water, because an omission of this sort in the ceremonies of Baptism is very grave. Probably there will be no sin, if there is question of private Baptism.³

3° It is mortal without necessity to baptize outside the Church, unless there is imminent proximate danger of death, or some other great inconvenience is present.⁴ Wherefore the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore⁵ command "that priests never dare to confer this Sacrament outside the church" (not even in the sacristy without a reasonable cause to be approved by the Bishop. S. C. R. 16 Mar. 1861) "except in an imminent case of death, in cities having one or more churches. Those who live in the country, or in villages and little towns, where there is no church, should bring infants to the nearer church or station, in which the Holy Sacrifice is usually offered, to be baptized. But if because of intemperate weather, difficulty of the journey, poverty of the parents, or other grave causes this cannot be done, then they leave it to the prudence of the Missionary," and, as the S. C. de P. F. also commanded on 21 Jan. 1739, "that they baptize them at home" and "with all the ceremonies of

the Church." - Concerning the place in which the children of kings or great princes can be baptized, see, if you wish, St. Alphonsus.⁶ (7) p. 401.

4° It is mortal to omit the anointing of the Oil of Catechumens, or other similar things; because it is grave matter, at least from the end of the Church, just as the commingling of water with wine in the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist.⁷

Notes to n. 1267. (1) L. VI. 141. 144. (2) Ib. 141. (3) H. A. Tr. XIV. 8. (4) L. VI. 142. (5) a. 237. (6) L. VI. 118, Not. 3. Cf. Rit. Rom. and Clem., L. III, T. XV, c. unic.; De Herdt, Pr. Rit. p. 22. (7) L. VI. 141. H. A. Tr. XIV. 29. Appendix annotation (4), to n. 1267. p. 34. col. 1. The S. J. Missionaries in China had asked: "Whether all the Sacramentals are to be employed in the Baptism of adult women? The reason for doubting is the incredible modesty, zeal, and praiseworthy flight among Chinese women from all meeting with men, and not only meeting, but even sight; in which matter, unless great caution is employed by the Missionaries, enormous scandal is given to the Chinese, with the most evident danger of exposing the Christian Religion to persecution." Resp. "For a grave cause Sacramentals can be omitted in the Baptism of women. This response, however, is to be observed according to the things asked, the circumstances, and all the things expressed in them." S. C. S. O., 13 Nov. 1669, Collect. ib. n. 279 and n. 281. And thus it is easily reconciled with other Responses altogether contrary, since they were given for cases in which the circumstances set forth in the alleged doubt were not verified. Appendix annotation (tau), to n. 1267. 3°. p. 34. col. 1. "In necessity," says De Herdt, Prax. Rit. Rom., p. 36, "if a layman or a cleric inferior to a deacon baptizes, he must abstain from all the ceremonies. But if a priest or deacon baptizes, then, if the infant brought to the church is so gravely sick that danger threatens lest he die before Baptism is completed, he must only ask, if time is given, whether anything has been attempted concerning Baptism, and immediately, all other things omitted, baptize him absolutely or conditionally in baptismal water, and, if this has not been prepared, in common water, pouring water three times, or even once if necessity urges, upon the head in the form of a cross. Then, if the infant survives, he anoints him with chrism on the crown, imposes the white garment, and gives the lighted candle, as otherwise. When these things have been done, if he is still living, the ceremonies which precede Baptism are to be supplied; but the two omitted infusions are not to be repeated, if Baptism was conferred by one infusion. But the priest must beware of saying or doing anything when he has seen that the infant is entirely dead, because the ceremonies of Baptism were instituted for the living only, and not for the dead. "If a priest in necessity baptizes outside the church, he must omit all the ceremonies which precede Baptism, even if the infant seems about to live so long; but when Baptism has been conferred as above, he anoints the infant on the crown with chrism, if he has it, imposes the white garment, and gives the lighted candle. But when the infant has recovered, he is to be presented in the church; and there, and never outside the church, the omitted ceremonies which precede Baptism are to be supplied." S. R. C., 23 Sept. 1820, n. 4422. 4572; Baruffaldus, tit. 11. n. 59.

1268. Questions. - Query 1° Is it ever lawful to defer the ceremonies for a time?

Resp. Negatively, unless with the license of the Ordinary, where it can conveniently be had (De Herdt, Pr. R. R. c. 2. § 12. n. 1), and for a grave cause, lacking which Baptism is to be deferred until the ceremonies can be completed.²

Query 2° If Baptism solemnly conferred is found to be invalid, are the ceremonies also to be repeated?

Resp. It is controverted. There is a twofold probable sentence. Hence the ceremonies are not necessarily to be repeated: nevertheless it is to be advised that they be repeated, if it can be done without scandal or infamy.³

Query 3° Are omitted ceremonies afterward to be supplied?

Resp. Affirmatively, and that as soon as possible and under grave obligation, unless nevertheless as regards heretics validly baptized and returning to the Catholic Church, "for a reasonable cause it should seem otherwise to the Bishop." See nevertheless what has been said in n. 1264. II. - If there is question of a "Catholic adult validly baptized after birth, ... the ceremonies and prayers are to be observed ... for the Baptism of infants."⁴

Query 4° What does the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore specifically command concerning the names which are imposed upon those to be baptized?

Resp. "When various names, both of Saints and of family, are bestowed upon infants in Baptism, if the priest has judged it expedient, in the first interrogation let him express all the names; but in the following forms and prayers let him repeat only the names commonly called Christian. But in the book of Baptisms let all the names be recorded."⁵

Query 5° What likewise concerning the Baptismal font?

Resp. "Care is to be taken that baptismal fonts under key be erected as soon as possible in each church" (not in the sacristy. Gardell. in S. R. C. 16 Dec. 1826. III. ad V. 1), where the Sacrament of Baptism is ordinarily ministered; "near these let all things which pertain to the administration of this Sacrament be kept cleanly."⁵

Query 6° How is the prohibition of using old Chrism, or that of another year, to be understood?

Resp. 1° It is to be taken rigorously, when new Chrism is had. Therefore the priest would sin gravely who, the recent Chrism being available, used the old.

Resp. 2° If the new is not had in due time, this happens either fortuitously (because, for example, he who was to bring it came late), or regularly (for example, on account of the great distance of the parish from the episcopal city). - In the latter case the blessing of the Font is to be celebrated with the infusion of the Oils of the preceding year, and the new ones are to be employed in the blessing of the Font, which, the contrary custom having been eliminated since it is an abuse, ought to be done (S. R. C. 7 Dec. 1844 in Urbevet.) on the Vigil of Pentecost. - In the former case the Font is blessed on Holy Saturday, without the old Oils being infused (unless, nevertheless, it is foreseen that Baptism is to be solemnly ministered immediately after the blessing of the Font). But the new Oils, as soon as they have been received, are to be infused into the Font blessed without Oils, privately (i.e. without solemnity) and separately by a priest vested in surplice and stole, the rite of the Missal being observed. But if before they have been received an infant to be baptized is brought, his Baptism is not to be deferred until they are received, but, with the old Oils infused into the Font, it is to be conferred solemnly, and in this case the new ones are infused on the Vigil of Pentecost. - S. R. C. 12 Apr. 1755 in Lucan. ad 3.; 23 Sept. 1837 in Oriol. ad 1. 2. 3. 4.; 12 Aug. 1854 in Lucion. ad 79. 80.¹

Query 7° What does the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore warn concerning the blessing of a woman after childbirth?

Resp. "Let pastors commend that pious rite. The prelates desire, ... that the blessing ... not be conferred in future promiscuously, and with no account had of the disposition of the woman after childbirth, nor outside the church or the place where the Holy Sacrifice is offered."² (a), p. 393.

Notes to n. 1268 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 144. Kenr. Tr. XV. 61. (2) L. VI. 144. (3) Rit. Rom.; Gardell. ad Decr. S. R. C. 27 Aug. 1836, in Rhedon.; L. VI. 144; Benedict XIV, C. Inter omnigenas, 2 Feb. 1744. (4) a. 233. (5) a. 234. Cf. De Herdt, Pr. Rit. p. 23. Notes to n. 1268 - note sequence 2. (1) Linz. P Bl. 1881, p. 560. 762. (2) a. 245. 246. Appendix annotation (alpha), to n. 1268. q. 7°, p. 35, col. 1. "Only women who have given birth from legitimate Matrimony have a right to the blessing after childbirth," responded S. C. C. in Wratislavia, June 18, 1859. (1) "From this response of S. C.," add the Acta, (2) "by which any distinction is cut away, one would not rightly deduce that pastors are prohibited from blessing the women of whom there is question" (those, namely, who have given birth from illegitimate intercourse). "For it is inferred only that the aforesaid women cannot demand the said blessing by right, according to that which was posited in the question." Therefore, scandal arising by reason of a notoriously illegitimate birth being set aside, an exception can be made

as regards those women who secretly, and especially being deceived, yielded to human weakness. Nor do those have a right to that blessing who with public scandal entered Matrimony before a civil Magistrate or a little minister, unless by penance they have repaired the scandal. Resolve the same concerning those concerning whom it is notorious that they never approach the church and do not satisfy the Paschal precept."(3) To the question: "Women after childbirth are accustomed to present themselves before the priest for receiving the blessing, even if the offspring has sometimes died without Baptism. In that case, however, the words of the prayers of the Roman Ritual now in force in this Diocese cannot be verified, and on the other hand the blessing would not be omitted without some wonder of the people, and without aggravation of the grief of women of this kind. It is asked what is to be done, and whether it is lawful, after removing those things which are not verified after the woman has been introduced into the church, some prayer from those which are contained in the Missal being substituted, to impart the blessing as in the Ritual?" Resp. "The Roman Ritual must be entirely observed." To this Resp. the Past. Bl. für N. Amer.(1) observes that in the case concerning which the question is asked the blessing can be given, since its primary end is the postpartum woman herself, and the offspring is only secondary. It is clear per se that the blessing is not to be imparted unless the (living) offspring has previously been baptized. > Notes to appendix annotation - note sequence 1. > > 1 Acta, T. I. p. 347. | 2 Ib. p. 349. | 3 Past. Bl. für N. Amer. 10th year, p. 8. > Notes to appendix annotation - note sequence 2. > > 1 10th year, p. 8.

APPENDIX: ON THE CAESAREAN OPERATION IN ORDER TO BAPTIZING AN INFANT NOT YET BORN

The operation or Caesarean section consists in this, that the womb of the pregnant mother is opened, so that the fetus may be extracted. A twofold principal question occurs, namely whether, or when, it can be done, or ought to be done.

1269. Questions. - Query 1° Whether, or when, can it be done?

Resp. The following rules seem to have to be established:

Rule I. When the mother is dead, it is certain that the Caesarean operation can be done, and indeed immediately, as soon as her death is established. Nevertheless he whom it concerns by law is to be warned, lest perhaps the author of the operation be made liable to penalties. - But the reason why it can be done is evident: for if anything stood in the way, it would be danger to the mother; but from the hypothesis her death is certainly established; and from another side the spiritual, indeed perhaps also temporal, life of the infant can be saved. - See Cangiamila in the work whose title is: *Sacred Embryology*.

Rule II. While the mother is living, the Caesarean operation can never licitly be done, as often as there is present a proximate or probable danger of the mother's death to follow from it, although, if it is not done, the mother and the offspring are certainly going to perish. The reason is, because this would be just the same as directly to kill the mother, which is never lawful. - Thus St. Thomas, who says: "A man ought not to kill the mother, in order that he may baptize the child."¹ Hence the operation cannot be done when a very skilled surgeon is lacking, nor when the mother is so weakened by disease that the operation, otherwise not dangerous, would from the circumstances induce proximate danger of death, etc.

Rule III. While the mother is living, the Caesarean operation can licitly be done in these circumstances, namely 1° if by no other licit means the living offspring can be extracted, or the mother is going to die before she gives birth, with the greatest danger of the infant's death before he can be baptized; 2° if, by the judgment of a skilled surgeon, proximate danger of the mother's death is absent. But such danger can be absent if the mother is robust, as is established from innumerable examples, and from the more common opinion of physicians and surgeons, whose art, especially in our times, has become much more advanced and perfect. - See *Sacred Embryology*,² Elbel,³ etc. - The reason is plain; for there is no danger,

or at least it is very slight and remote, and thus, if perhaps death follows, it will seem to follow only accidentally.

Query 2° Whether, or when, ought it to be done?

Resp. 1° When the mother is dead it is certainly to be done *under grave obligation*, even against the will or resistance of parents or relatives, if it can be done; because by the law of charity, with every care and labor, the eternal salvation of the infant must be procured. - Thus St. Thomas.¹ Thus also the Roman Ritual, On Baptism, establishes.

Nevertheless there must be present hope of extracting the infant alive, which hope is scarcely present in the first months of pregnancy; but, unless some special grave reason suggests that he has already died before the mother or together with her, after the fourth month of gestation this hope seems to be present (Capellmann, *Med. Past.* p. 23. 24). In doubt concerning the life of the infant it is always to be done. See Marc,² and cf. n. 474, I.

Furthermore diligent care is to be employed that the region of the womb of the deceased woman be kept warm until the operation has been done; otherwise the infant would more easily depart from life before he could be baptized.

Resp. 2° The operation is to be done also while the mother is living, if by the judgment of experts the infant cannot otherwise be baptized. But the mother is held, *per se* and speaking speculatively, under grave obligation to suffer it, if it can be done without proximate danger of death. The reason is, because she is held to suffer any temporal inconvenience whatever for preserving the spiritual and eternal life of the infant. This follows from the general law of charity. - Thus commonly with Elbel,³ St. Alphonsus,⁴ *Sacred Embryology*.⁵

I said: *per se* and speaking speculatively; for in practice the confessor must beware lest he urge the mother under grave obligation, on account of too great danger, lest by denying consent she die in the state of mortal sin; and thus, while he wishes to save the spiritual life of the infant, the mother herself be damned. Therefore it will be enough to exhort her to consent to the incision.

Besides, since it is established that the fetus very often survives the deceased mother, great hope shines forth of baptizing him after she is dead, and therefore a lesser obligation of incision presses.

The mother is not held to undergo the operation if, the operation being omitted, she alone is judged to be going to perish; because no one is held to preserve life by extraordinary and such arduous means. - But if there were only a slight hope of saving the offspring, the mother could indeed, but would not be held to, undergo the operation, because charity does not urge to such a degree in so great uncertainty of the outcome. - Thus commonly with St. Alphonsus.¹

Query 3° Is a girl, dishonestly and secretly pregnant, and near to death, if on account of advanced pregnancy it is probable that Baptism can be conferred upon the fetus, to be obligated to disclose her state outside Confession, so that the operation may be done when she is dead?

Resp. Distinguish. Negatively, if she is living in good faith, nor is fruit hoped for from an admonition. Otherwise, affirmatively; for the eternal life of the fetus is to be preferred to the reputation of the mother.

Query 4° Is a priest held to perform the operation on a dead mother, if there is lacking someone who is willing or able to perform it?

Resp. It is controverted. See the arguments of those disputing at Marc.² It is certain that one must abstain from it if damage to Religion is to be feared from it, lest "while we seek a few, we lose many:"³ likewise, as is plain, if the relatives dissent. But the damage to be feared for Religion must be judged especially from the circumstances of various places. - Nevertheless then let him at least strive to obtain that Baptism be conferred within the mother's womb by someone through an instrument.

Query 5° In what manner is that operation to be performed?

Resp. 1° Let the section be made from the navel down to the pudendum or pubic bone; but lest the intestines be injured, let this caution be employed: after a small opening has been made, the one operating immediately inserts into it the index finger placed under the back of the scalpel or knife, and in the aforesaid way cuts first the skin, then the other coverings which cover the intestines. When this has been done, the womb, if the pregnancy is more advanced, will appear of itself; otherwise it will be found behind, after the bladder. If this is filled with urine, and impedes the finding of the womb, let it be compressed by the hand and emptied.

2° When the womb has been found, it is immediately cut, proceeding from the upper and anterior part to the lower; then also the membranes of the afterbirth, by which the fetus is enveloped, are cut or ruptured.

3° The infant or fetus is extracted, and if certain or doubtful signs of life appear, he is to be baptized without delay. But if it is thought or feared that danger of death is present, the fetus is to be baptized before he is extracted.

4° After Baptism has been conferred, if certainly or probably the infant still survives, the umbilical cord is cut at the distance of two or three inches from the belly, and is tightly tied with a thread at the distance of one inch from the same belly; when these things have been done, he is handed over to be nourished.

Notes to n. 1269 - note sequence 1. (1) P. III, q. 68, a. 11, ad 3. S. Alph. L. VI. 106. (2) P. III, c. IX. 3. n. 60. Capell., De occis. foet. c. 3. Notes to n. 1269 - note sequence 2. (1) P. III, q. 68, a. 11, ad 3. (2) p. 391, n. 283. (3) n. 60. (4) L. VI. 106. (5) L. III, c. IV. Notes to n. 1269 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VI. 106. Notes to n. 1269 - note sequence 4. (2) p. 392, n. 284. (3) Collect. p. 125, n. 208.