

THEOLOGIA MORALIS SANCTI ALPHONSI

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

THE EUCHARIST

The Treatise on the Sacraments in General and the Treatise on the Eucharist, 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 SACRAMENTS	5
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 ... Matter and Form.	8
CHAPTER III: ON THE MINISTER OF THE SACRAMENTS	10
ARTICLE I: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS, OR ON THE ATTENTION, INTENTION, FAITH, AND PROBITY OF THE MINISTER	10
§ 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 SACRAMENTS	24
ARTICLE II: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE LICIT RECEPTION OF THE SACRAMENTS	26
APPENDIX: ON SACRAMENTALS	29
TREATISE ON THE EUCHARIST	33
FIRST PART: ON THE EUCHARIST AS SACRAMENT	34
CHAPTER I: ON THE NATURE AND EFFICACY OF THE EUCHARIST	35
CHAPTER II: ON THE MATTER AND FORM OF THE EUCHARIST	37
ARTICLE I: ON THE MATTER OF THE EUCHARIST	37
I. On The Remote Matter.	37
II. On The Proximate Matter, Or On The Use Of The Matter Required In The Consecration.	39
ARTICLE II: ON THE FORM OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST	41
CHAPTER III: ON THE MINISTER OF THE EUCHARIST	44
ARTICLE I: ON THE POWER OF THE MINISTER OF THE EUCHARIST	44
ARTICLE II: ON THE OBLIGATION OF DISTRIBUTING THE EUCHARIST	45
ARTICLE III: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE LAWFUL DISTRIBUTION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST	46

ARTICLE IV: ON THE MANNER OF MINISTERING THE EUCHARIST TO THE SICK ...	50
ARTICLE V: ON THE MANNER OF RESERVING THE HOLY EUCHARIST	53
LITTLE APPENDIX: ON THE MANNER IN WHICH THE EUCHARIST IS TO BE ...	57
MINISTERED TO THE SICK IN THESE PROVINCES, AND ON THE METHOD OF RESERVING IT	
A. As regards the manner of ministering the Eucharist to the sick.	57
B. On the manner of reserving the Holy Eucharist.	58
CHAPTER IV: ON THE SUBJECT OF THE EUCHARIST	59
ARTICLE I: ON THE OBLIGATION OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST	59
ARTICLE II: ON THE DISPOSITIONS REQUIRED IN THE SUBJECT OF THE ...	63
EUCHARIST 1° AS REGARDS THE SOUL 2° AS REGARDS THE BODY	
§ I. On The Dispositions Of The Soul	63
§ II. On The Dispositions Of The Body	65
Point I. On The Fast Required For Communion.	65
Point II. On Decency Of The Body.	69
APPENDIX I: ON FREQUENT COMMUNION	70
APPENDIX II: ON SPIRITUAL COMMUNION	72
APPENDIX III: ON THE FIRST COMMUNION OF CHILDREN	73
PART SECOND: ON THE EUCHARIST AS SACRIFICE	74
CHAPTER I: ON THE NATURE AND VIRTUE OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	75
CHAPTER II: ON THE APPLICATION OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	79
CHAPTER III: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING	81
ARTICLE I: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING BY REASON OF THE ...	81
PRIESTHOOD	
ARTICLE II: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING BY REASON OF OFFICE	81
ARTICLE III: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING BY REASON OF STIPEND	82
CHAPTER IV: ON THE TIME AND PLACE OF CELEBRATION	90
ARTICLE I: ON THE TIME OF CELEBRATION	90
ARTICLE II: ON THE PLACE OF CELEBRATION	92
CHAPTER V: ON THE MANNER OF CELEBRATING	96
ARTICLE I: ON THE REQUISITES FOR MASS	96
ARTICLE II: ON THE RUBRICS	100
APPENDICULA.	103
ON THE DECREES OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES AND ON ...	103
CUSTOM AGAINST THE RUBRICS.	
DAYS, ...	106

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 confection 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 THE EUCHARIST

The Eucharist can be considered either as Sacrament, or as Sacrifice. Hence there is a twofold part of the present Treatise.

FIRST PART: ON THE EUCHARIST AS SACRAMENT

We must treat: 1° of the nature and efficacy; 2° of the matter and form; 3° of the Minister; 4° of the subject of the Eucharist.

CHAPTER I: ON THE NATURE AND EFFICACY OF THE EUCHARIST

The Eucharist is defined: The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, under the species of bread and wine, for the spiritual refreshment of souls. It is established from Trent.¹

1278. Questions. - Query 1° How long does Christ remain really present in the Eucharist?

Resp. He remains as long as the species remain entire; but he ceases to be present under them immediately when the species are so corrupted that, according to the estimation of men, they no longer seem to be bread and wine. - Then, by the law established by God in the institution of this Sacrament, there is substituted for the species the same matter which would succeed to the corrupted bread and wine.²

Query 2° How long are the sacred species thought to remain entire, i.e. not corrupted, after the taking of the Sacrament?

Resp. It is not established. The mechanical dissolution of the species is carefully to be distinguished from their corruption or chemical change. The former is not considered here, since it does not remove the real presence. The latter is a little slower or quicker according to the different digestive power of different men and the different circumstances of the same man, both internal (for example, the condition of the stomach) and external (for example, the temperature of the sky). Hence an absolutely universal answer can scarcely be handed down. Capellmann the physician¹ thinks that with those things which are vomited before a half-hour has elapsed after Communion, even of lay persons, the same thing should be done which the Church prescribes must be done with species not yet corrupted. But this certainly must be done when the species are still discerned, although several hours after Communion have elapsed.

Query 3° What are the effects of the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the soul?

Resp. The principal ones are the following, namely: 1° an increase of sanctifying grace, which constitutes the principal effect of the Eucharist. For, according to the words of Christ:² *My flesh is truly food*, this Sacrament was instituted as spiritual nourishment; and nourishment supposes life in him who receives it; hence it comes to pass that through this nourishment the very life of the soul, which consists chiefly in sanctifying grace, is strengthened and increased; 2° the obtaining of eternal glory; for Christ promises this: *If anyone shall eat of this bread, he shall live forever*;³ 3° a most abundant bestowal of actual graces, which flow from habitual grace and infused habits;

4° weakening of evil habits and amendment of vices, especially of lust; 5° remission of venial sins: this is established from Trent,¹ where the Eucharist is called an antidote, by which we are freed from daily faults, and are preserved from mortal sins; 6° remission of the temporal punishment due to sin; not indeed of all of it, but according to the mode of devotion and fervor, as St. Thomas says;² 7° special union with Christ and with his members, as is clear from John:³ *He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood, abides in me and I in him*; 8° preservation from future sins, both because, charity being increased through this food, the soul becomes stronger against corrupt nature, and because it is an efficacious memory of the Lord's Passion, through which the demons have been conquered.⁴

Query 4° Can the Eucharist ever blot out mortal sin?

Resp. More probably affirmatively. See n. 1208, Q. 2°.

Notes to n. 1278 - note sequence 1. (1) Sess. 13, c. 2. 3. (2) L. VI. 225. Lugo, D. 10, n. 36. Lacroix, n. 474. Rev. Theol. T. X, p. 394 deserves to be read. (1) p. 157. Notes to n. 1278 - note sequence 2. (2) John 6. 56. (3) John 6. 52 sq. (1) Sess. 13, c. 2. (2) P. III, q. 79, a. 5. 3. 6. 57. 4. L. VI. 269. H. A. Tr. XV. 5.

CHAPTER II: ON THE MATTER AND FORM OF THE EUCHARIST

We must treat: 1° of the matter; 2° of the form of the Eucharist.

ARTICLE I: ON THE MATTER OF THE EUCHARIST

I. ON THE REMOTE MATTER.

1279. Principles. - I. Bread and wine are the remote matter of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. It is established: 1° from the institution itself of this Sacrament; for Christ in the Last Supper took bread and wine, and consecrated them into his Body and Blood; 2° from the definition of the Church in the Lateran Council, chapter *Firmiter*;⁵ in the Council of Florence, in the Decree of union; and in Trent, Session 13, in almost all the chapters. - To all these is added the unanimous tradition of both Churches, Latin and Greek.

II. Only wheaten bread, and only wine from the vine, whether foreign or native, white or red,¹ are valid matter of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. It is established from the Council of Florence in the Decree cited above, where it is said: *The third is the Sacrament of the Eucharist, whose matter is WHEATEN BREAD AND WINE FROM THE VINE.* - The perpetual tradition and practice of each Church, Latin and Greek, also agree.

Bread must be made with water; hence bread kneaded with another liquid, for example with milk, butter, etc., is not apt matter, or at least is very doubtful.²

Must may be employed in general only when necessity makes it lawful; but juice from grapes altogether unripe is unfit matter.³

Generally, however, a slight admixture of unfit matter does not dissolve the species.⁴

III. A very small quantity of water must be mixed with the wine, and this not by necessity of the Sacrament, but by ecclesiastical precept.

The first proposition is drawn: 1° from the perpetual practice of the Church and the universal tradition of the Fathers; 2° from the Declaration of the Councils, and especially of Florence - which declares that the matter of the chalice is wine from the vine, with which a very small quantity of water must be mixed - and of Trent.⁵

The second proposition is drawn from this, that Christ, in the institution of this Sacrament, designated only wine, and the Councils, in making mention of this mixture, speak of precept alone, as Trent does in the cited place; there is added the doctrine of the Catechism of the same Council, which, after it taught that this mixture cannot be omitted without mortal sin, adds: Yet if this (water) is lacking, the Sacrament can stand.

1280. Questions. - **Query** 1° Is bread made from rye or secale valid matter?

Resp. It is controverted. Some affirm, because rye, they say, seems to be of the same species as wheat, although it is of different quality. - But others, much more commonly and more probably, deny; because rye bread is of a different species. Therefore in practice this matter is prohibited under grave obligation.⁶ (5) p. 417.

Query 2° Is bread made from far or spelt (in English: spelt) valid matter?

Resp. It is likewise controverted as concerning rye. Hence that matter also is to be held as doubtful, and therefore as gravely illicit.¹ - Nevertheless one must note that in various regions there are given different species of true wheat, which come under the name of spelt. Hence it seems that attention must be paid to the common estimation of men.

Query 3° Is bread, both unleavened and leavened, valid and lawful matter of the Eucharist?

Resp. 1° As regards validity, affirmatively. The reason is because each is true bread, and is also called simply bread in Scripture; and each is made from wheaten flour and natural water. It is also established from the definition of the Church. For thus the Council of Florence in the Decree of union: *We define that the Body of Christ is confected in unleavened or in leavened wheaten bread.*

Resp. 2° As regards lawfulness, Latins are held under grave obligation to consecrate in unleavened bread, and Greeks in leavened bread, each according to the rite of his own Church. It is established: 1° from the practice of each Church; 2° from the Council of Florence in the cited Decree, where it is added: *And priests must confect the very Body of the Lord in either one, each one namely according to the custom of his Church, whether Western or Eastern.* - But a Latin priest, passing through the regions of the Greeks, in which no church of his own rite is present, can consecrate in leavened bread; likewise conversely.²

Query 4° Does a priest consecrating in wine turning sour sin gravely?

Resp. Affirmatively, although that wine is still valid matter of the Sacrament. Indeed mortal sin is committed, not only if the wine is near to vinegar, but also if it certainly begins to turn sour and be corrupted, because even so grave irreverence seems to be brought upon the Sacrament. - It is established from the Rubric, tit. 4, n. 2, where it is said thus: *If the wine has begun to turn sour, or to be corrupted, or has become somewhat sharp, ... the Sacrament is confected, but the one confecting sins gravely.*

Nevertheless Gobat, Sporer, and Lacroix probably say that, if other wine is lacking, it is lawful without scruple, as upright men are accustomed, to employ wine turning a little sour, or not notably acid; and Sporer and Mazzotta add that, in urgent necessity, it is lawful to use wine even notably turning sour, provided that it is certainly wine. - Hence the Rubric does not seem to be accepted with such rigor that it comprehends even all the first degrees of sharpness, but only those which proximately begin to constitute wine turning sour.¹

Query 5° Is frozen wine valid matter?

Resp. It is controverted. More probably affirmatively, although it is illicit. The reason is: 1° because it remains substantially wine, since it retains the same color, taste, and odor; 2° because from the Rubric of the Missal the species of frozen wine after Consecration must be liquefied by applying heated cloths, and then taken, inasmuch as it is a true Sacrament (Rubr. de defect. § 10, n. 11). Therefore it supposes that the species of frozen wine retains the Blood of Christ; therefore the sacred species are not changed substantially through freezing after Consecration; therefore neither before it. - Thus St. Alphonsus,² where he says that it is the truer sentence because of the reason drawn from the cited Rubric.

Query 6° What quantity of water is to be mixed in the chalice?

Resp. A very small quantity of water suffices, as the Council of Florence says above, n. 1279. Probably water can be poured in up to an eighth part of the wine, indeed up to a fifth part according to Lugo.³ Busembaum adds that it suffices that the water not exceed a third part. But in practice this last sentence is not to be admitted, although a third part does not corrupt the wine, if it is generous. Generally one must counsel that the priest not exceed eight or ten little drops. But if by chance he has poured in too great a quantity of water, some quantity of wine can again be added.⁴

Notes to n. 1280 - note sequence 1. (5) L. I, Decr. T. I, c. 1. (1) L. VI. 207. Linz. P. Bl. 1881, p. 34. (2) Ib. 198. 199. (3) Ib. 206. 207. St. Thomas, P. III, q. 74, a. 5, ad 2 and 3. (4) St. Thomas, P. III, q. 74, a. 3, ad 3. (5) Sess. 22, c. 7. (6) L. VI. 200.

Notes to n. 1280 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 200. (2) Ib. 203, Dub. I. Notes to n. 1280 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 207, quer. I. Exam. ordin., n. 98. (2) L. VI. 207, quer. II. 3. D. 4, n. 38. 4. L. VI. 210.

II. ON THE PROXIMATE MATTER, OR ON THE USE OF THE MATTER REQUIRED IN THE CONSECRATION.

1281. Principles. - I. For valid Consecration, besides apt matter, it is required: 1° that the matter to be consecrated be physically present; because the demonstrative pronouns of the form, *this*, *here*, necessarily require this; otherwise the form would be false, because that which was not present would be demonstrated as present; 2° that it be determined in the individual by the intention of the Minister; because just as the Minister does not consecrate unless he intends to consecrate, so neither does he consecrate this matter unless he determinately intends to consecrate it. Nevertheless actual determination is not required, but virtual suffices.¹

II. For lawful Consecration it is required: 1° that the priest in no way depart from the use of the Church, especially that determined by the Rubrics of the Roman Missal: hence first of all it is necessary that the matter to be consecrated be decent and clean, on account of the reverence due to so great a Sacrament; likewise, from the prescription or use of the Latin Church, that the host be of round, thin, whole, and fresh form. Cf. St. Alphonsus;² 2° that it be placed on the altar and on the corporal, indeed also on the sacred stone; 3° that the ciborium or chalice to be consecrated be uncovered; 4° that it be done at the time prescribed by the Rubric of the Canon.³

Notes to nn. 1281-1283 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 211-214. (2) Ib. 205. (3) Ib. 218. 219. (4) Ib. 212. (5) Ib. 216. Notes to nn. 1281-1283 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 216. 217. (2) Ib. 215. (3) Ib. 217. IV. Exam. Ord. 99. (4) Ib. 196.

1282. Resolves. - 1° Hosts hidden under others, or otherwise covered, are validly consecrated. Likewise wine is validly consecrated in a chalice covered with a veil, pall, or in any way whatever; because it suffices for the true presence of the matter that it can be demonstrated by the pronouns *this* or *here*.⁴

2° The Consecration is valid if the priest thinks that only one or two hosts to be consecrated are present, although there are several placed either by him or by another; the reason is because the priest is always presumed to wish to consecrate whatever is decently consecrable. Hence if the celebrant notices after Consecration that two Hosts are joined together, let him take each as consecrated according to the Rubric of the Missal. But if before Consecration, after he has offered, he notices this, let him set one aside, and after Mass let him or another consume it as blessed bread. But if in some case unconsecrated hosts are mixed with consecrated ones, the whole mass is to be consecrated under condition, if they are not consecrated.⁵

3° The same must be said if someone has brought several hosts to the altar to be consecrated, or before the Sacrifice he has been warned concerning hosts to be consecrated already placed upon the altar, or he has noticed that they are brought by another that they may be consecrated, even if, while he consecrates, he does not so expressly remember them, or even has not uncovered them at the oblation, provided that they are present on the corporal; because the preceding intention virtually perseveres.¹

4° Hosts would not be consecrated, if the priest did not know of them, even placed on the corporal, but separated from the heap, because the wholly unaware priest did not have the intention of consecrating them.²

5° If small hosts for communicating the people are brought to the priest a little after the oblation has been made, he will be able lawfully to consecrate them, the oblation being supplied mentally. "And this, even if the Canon has been begun, ... when several would remain without Communion." ... But if only one remained, rather a part of the large Host is to be given to him, "or a smaller Host is to be divided. And it suffices for a cause if the one about to communicate would have to wait a long time," or if he is a grave or noble person, or, among us, a person of principal standing.³

6° It is never lawful to consecrate only one species. Nevertheless such a Consecration is more probably valid, even if the priest had a positive intention of not consecrating the other species.⁴

1283. Questions. - Query 1° Is a ciborium left outside the corporal or the stone through forgetfulness to be judged consecrated?

Resp. There is no difficulty if there is question of a ciborium placed indeed outside the stone, but nevertheless on the corporal, and with this extended over the stone; for in this case it is morally found on the stone. Otherwise it is controverted. The first sentence, probable, affirms, because the will of consecrating had at the beginning of Mass was not retracted.

The second sentence, common and more probable according to St. Alphonsus, denies. The reason is because that intention of consecrating outside the corporal would have been a grave sin, and was not necessary for the Sacrifice, and therefore the priest is not presumed to have had it.

But since it is illicit to administer Sacraments with doubtful matter, in practice that ciborium will have to be consecrated again under condition in another Mass, if the particles cannot easily be consumed. Otherwise they must be consumed after each Communion and ablution - because the remains of the Blood are certainly a Sacrament, but those hosts in the ciborium are only doubtful - and before purification. I said: *must*; because while they can be consumed, a sufficient cause is lacking for consecrating them under condition.¹

Query 2° Is a ciborium placed indeed on the corporal, but which through forgetfulness remained closed at the time of Consecration, judged consecrated?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is: 1° because certainly hosts can be validly consecrated in a closed ciborium, as was said above; 2° because the priest is always judged to have the absolute intention of consecrating whatever, with his knowledge, is above the corporal, is honestly consecrable, and is held by way of one continuous whole.

Query 3° Are drops of wine adhering to the chalice, whether exteriorly or interiorly, judged consecrated?

Resp. 1° Drops adhering exteriorly are never judged consecrated. The reason is because the intention of the priest is deservedly presumed to be to consecrate that one thing which is lawfully consecrable; but those little drops would be consecrated illicitly and irreverently, and without any utility. Therefore ... Thus all.

Resp. 2° More probably, neither are drops adhering interiorly judged consecrated, when they are altogether separated from the greater quantity, or are not next to the bottom. The reason is because it seems to be the intention of the Church, and therefore of the priest, not to consecrate except wine which is drinkable by way of one whole, and is found gathered together in the chalice.³

Query 4° What kind of sin is it to consecrate a broken or stained host?

Resp. Scandal being excluded, and without a reasonable cause, it is venial, unless the stain or fracture is enormous. But if some fracture or even notable stain is discovered in the host after the oblation, outside the case in which scandal of the people is feared, such a host will lawfully be consecrated, because through the oblation it has already been in some way dedicated and sanctified to God.⁴

Notes to n. 1283 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 217. Exam. Ord. n. 99. Cf. Vind. p. 379. Ed. 2a. I, p. 429. (2) L. VI. 215. (3) Ib. and Exam. Ord. n. 99. (4) L. VI. 204.

ARTICLE II: ON THE FORM OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST

Just as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is a twofold distinct matter, so also there is a twofold form of Consecration, one of bread and the other of wine.

1284. Principles. - I. The form for the Consecration of bread consists in these words: *For this is my Body*. But these words, or equivalent ones, are altogether essential to the form, if you except the word *for*.

It is established: 1° from the universal practice of the Church, and from her precept in the Roman Missal; 2° from the Council of Florence in the Decree of union, and from Trent;¹ 3° from the divine institution itself; for Christ transubstantiated bread into his Body by pronouncing the aforesaid words.

II. The form for the Consecration of wine is this: *For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal Testament, the mystery of Faith, which shall be poured out for you and for many unto the remission of sins*.

It is established likewise: 1° from the practice and prescription of the Church; 2° from the various Evangelists, who, although they do not report altogether the same words, nevertheless agree perfectly as regards this sense.

Appendix annotation (5), to n. 1284. q. 3°. p. 42. col. 2. The controversy seems to some to be a dispute about a name, which owes its origin to the double signification of the word *siligo*. For the most ancient signification of this word denotes wheat of the first note, and St. Thomas seems to have had this signification before his eyes, P. III. q. 74. a. 3 ad 2, where he pronounces the validity of this matter as undoubted. But *siligo*, which is sometimes also called *secale*, also signifies that which the English call rye, the French *seigle*, the Germans *Roggen* or *Korn*, the Italians *segala*; and *siligo* taken in this sense is invalid matter. - Linz. P. Bl.

1285. Resolves. - 1° Valid, but illicit, is the Consecration if the one consecrating says: *This food is my Body; this chalice is my Blood*. - Likewise if you pronounce: *Colpui* for *Corpus*; *meus* for *meum*; *es* for *est*; *calis* for *calix*; *Sanguis* for *Sanguinis*, etc.²

2° The Consecration will be invalid if you say: *Here* (adverbially) *is my Body*; *This Body is mine*; or *Here is my Blood*: because these words do not have a sense by which they signify that which they ought to effect.³

3° The Consecration is doubtful if you say: *This is my Flesh*: which, nevertheless, Laymann thinks to be valid.⁴

4° The words of the form must be pronounced in the person of Christ formally and assertively, or recitatively and at the same time significatively, but not merely historically: namely, the words of Christ are to be pronounced by applying their signification to the present matter, so that this may be transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ. Nevertheless no scruple is to be had whether the words are pronounced in the due sense; for any priest is presumed to have the intention of doing what Christ did and instituted, and thus he sufficiently intends to pronounce the consecratory words in each aforesaid sense. - Elbel,¹ St. Alphonsus.²

Notes to n. 1285. (1) Sess. 13, c. 1. (2) L. VI. 221. (3) Ib. (4) Ib.

1286. Questions. - Query 1° Is the omission of the word *for* in the form of Consecration grave?

Resp. It is controverted. The first sentence denies, because that word is not found in the words pronounced by Christ in the Consecration of the bread, and from another side, as regards the precept of the Church, it does not seem to constitute grave matter. - Thus Busembaum.³

The second sentence affirms, and St. Alphonsus⁴ says that this is not improbable. The reason is because in so grave a matter there does not seem to be light matter in any deliberate change whatever.

Query 2° In Consecration are required, as essential, those antecedent words: *Who the day before he suffered*, etc. ... *In like manner*, etc.?

Resp. Negatively, with the common sentence, which St. Alphonsus holds as most probable. The reason is because these words are pronounced only historically, and do not seem to have any sacramental efficacy. Nevertheless he does not dare to say that the opposite sentence is improbable, all the more because, if because of a doubtful Consecration the form must be repeated, according to the Rubrics one must begin from the words: *Who the day before*, and *In like manner*.⁵ (v) p. 401.

Query 3° In the Consecration of the chalice are these words alone: *THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD* ... of the essence of the form?

Resp. The affirmative sentence is more common than the negative, but each is speculatively probable on account of the reasons which are to be seen among the Dogmaticians or at St. Alphonsus.⁶ But in practice it is certain that it would be grave sin if all the words which are had in the Consecration of the chalice were not pronounced, and, if perhaps only the first words were said, the whole form must be repeated.

Query 4° Is the form valid if it is said: *HOC ENIM CORPUS MEUM*, by understanding *EST*, as in the Latin language this frequently is customarily done?

Resp. Negatively. For although in continuous speech the substantive verb *is* can easily be understood, nevertheless in the present case this cannot be done; both because continuous speech is not had, and

especially because in the matter of which we are treating, the form has not only an assertory sense, as in common speech, but also a force effecting transubstantiation.¹

Notes to n. 1286 - note sequence 1. (1) n. 34. (2) L. VI. 220. (3) Ib. (4) Ib. (5) Ib. 222. (6) Ib. 223. Notes to n. 1286 - note sequence 2. (1) Ib. 223. Appendix annotation (upsilon), to n. 1286. q. 2°. p. 47. col. 1. In the Brief to the Patriarch of Antioch of the Melchite Greeks, dated 8 May 1822, Pius VII forbids anyone, whether publicly or privately, to defend or maintain the opinion of the schismatics which teaches that the form of the Eucharist "does not consist in the words of Jesus Christ alone." Bullar. S. C. de Prop. Fide, T. IV. p. 388 sq.

CHAPTER III: ON THE MINISTER OF THE EUCHARIST

It must be treated 1° of the power of the Minister; 2° of his obligation; 3° of the requisites for ministering rightly; 4° of the manner of ministering the Holy Eucharist to the sick; 5° of the manner of reserving it.

ARTICLE I: ON THE POWER OF THE MINISTER OF THE EUCHARIST

The Minister of the Eucharist is twofold, namely one of Consecration, the other of distribution.

1287. Principles. - I. Every priest, and only a priest, is the Minister of confecting the Eucharist. It is established 1° from Scripture: for Christ, instituting the Sacrament, said to all and only the Apostles reclining with him, and therefore to all and only those who were to succeed them in the priesthood: *Do this in commemoration of me;*² therefore all and only priests received this power from Christ; 2° from Trent;³ 3° finally from the universal and perpetual tradition of the Church.

II. Priests alone, or presbyters, are the ordinary Ministers of the distribution of the Eucharist. It is established 1° from Trent,⁴ where it is said: "It has always been the custom in the Church of God, that laymen should receive Communion from priests, but priests celebrating should communicate themselves"; 2° from the universal practice of the Church.

III. Deacons, by force of their ordination, are extraordinary Ministers of the Eucharist, so that the distribution of this Sacrament can be committed to them from a sufficient cause; which commission, at least tacit, is certainly altogether necessary for the lawfulness of this act outside the case of extreme necessity, and indeed for public and solemn administration. It is established 1° from the practice of the first centuries, in which deacons everywhere, by commission of Bishops or presbyters, whether general or particular, ministered the Eucharist; 2° from various Councils, e.g. Nicaea I, general, Carthage IV, etc.¹

IV. By ordinary right the Pastor alone, or his Superior, can distribute the Eucharist. For jurisdiction is required for this, not indeed for the validity of the act, as in absolution, but for due order in ministering. It is established 1° from the Councils, especially Carthage I,² and Milevis,³ etc.; ... 2° from the universal practice of the Church. Hence he who without the license, at least presumed, of the Pastor ministers the Eucharist, violates his right in a grave matter, and therefore sins gravely. Nevertheless, when the Pastor grants to others license of celebrating in his Church, he is always judged to grant license also of ministering the Eucharist, unless he express the contrary; this also is confirmed by common practice.⁴

Nevertheless license is not so easily to be presumed, if there is question of receiving the Eucharist from obligation.⁵ Wherefore as regards Paschal Communion, custom will have to be observed; likewise to minister Viaticum outside the case of necessity without the license of the Pastor is illicit.

But the First Communion of children is not of parochial right. Nevertheless diocesan statutes will have to be observed, or also legitimate custom, if perhaps somewhere it has the force of law.⁶

The aforesaid dispositions of common law concerning parochial rights do not pertain to us, except insofar as the statute of the Bishop or prudence prescribes them. See n. 1138.

Notes to nn. 1287-1288 - note sequence 1. (2) Luke 22. 19. (3) Sess. 22. Can. 2. (4) Sess. 13. c. 8. Notes to nn. 1287-1288 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 237. (2) Can. 7. (3) Can. 18. (4) L. VI. 230. sq. (5) L. VI. 235. (6) Bouix, de jure Regul. T. II. P. V. Sect. 3. c. 2. q. 12. Notes to nn. 1287-1288 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VI. 237.

1288. Questions. - Query 1° In order that a deacon may minister, must the necessity be extreme?

Resp. Negatively, with the common sentence; but grave necessity suffices, namely when no priest is present who can conveniently minister the Eucharist. And in extreme necessity, when a priest is absent, he is held to minister Viaticum.¹

Query 2° Whether, or in what circumstances, Religious can minister the most holy Eucharist?

Resp. See n. 1200. E). F).

ARTICLE II: ON THE OBLIGATION OF DISTRIBUTING THE EUCHARIST

1289. Principles. - I. The Pastor, or any priest having care of souls, is held from justice to minister the Eucharist to his subjects not only at Easter and in death, but also as often as they reasonably ask, excluding, however, a legitimate cause of impediment. The reason is because it pertains to the Pastor, from a quasi-contract, to provide not only that the faithful fulfill the precepts, but also that they not lack the helps which very much profit spiritual advancement.²

II. Any priest, whether secular or regular, is held, if the Pastor is lacking, to minister the Eucharist to one about to die; otherwise in other cases. The reason of the first is because anyone from charity is held to succor his neighbor placed in so great an extremity by this salutary and most efficacious remedy. The reason of the second is clear.

III. To one dying, especially not yet confessed, Viaticum must be brought, even if therefore the people would have to lack Mass of precept, as is clear.

1290. Questions. - Query 1° Is the Pastor held also to investigate sick persons not asking for the Eucharist, that he may minister it to them?

Resp. Affirmatively, at least if they are in grave danger of death. The reason is because it is the office of a good Pastor to take care that to his sheep, placed in so great a danger, so salutary a remedy be supplied. It is gathered besides from Canon Law.³

Query 2° Is the Pastor held to minister the Eucharist to his subjects by himself?

Resp. Negatively. For it suffices if he provide that whoever opportunely asks or needs it not be defrauded of it. Therefore he can fulfill the obligation even through others. Nevertheless he must take care lest he seem idle and careless, if he habitually fulfills his offices through others.

Query 3° Does the Pastor sin gravely as often as he denies the Eucharist to one reasonably asking?

Resp. Negatively; for if he does this rarely, e.g. toward one or another, scandal or grave sadness of the asker being excluded, he will sin only venially. The reason is because neither grave injury nor grave damage is thus inflicted, and, if damage is present, it can easily be repaired. - Thus all. - Recall what was said n. 1227. 2°.

Query 4° Is the Pastor held to minister the Eucharist even with danger of life, e.g. in time of plague or contagious disease?

Resp. Negatively, very probably with St. Alphonsus.¹ - See what was said n. 1227. q. 2°. Resp. 2°.

Query 5° When is the Pastor judged to be excused from ministering the Eucharist to subjects asking?

Resp. He is legitimately excused, 1° when the subjects, on account of some circumstances, do not ask reasonably, e.g. if they ask before Mass when they can easily wait, etc.; 2° if the Pastor himself is impeded by infirmity or other necessary occupations, etc. - Nevertheless one must act cautiously, because in these matters the faithful can easily take scandal and be kept from receiving the Sacraments more often. - Thus all.

Notes to n. 1290. (2) H. A. Tr. XV. 8. (3) L. III. Decr. T. XLI. c. 1. (1) L. VI. 233.

ARTICLE III: ON THE REQUISITES FOR THE LAWFUL DISTRIBUTION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

1291. Principles. - I. Besides jurisdiction (cf. n. 1287. IV.), it is required that the Minister be free from every excommunication, interdict, and suspension from Sacred Orders; for otherwise he would sin gravely and contract irregularity.

II. It is required that the Minister be in the state of grace, because the most august and most holy Body of Christ ought not to be handled by impure hands. Hence the priest sins as often as, guilty of mortal sin and not contrite, he distributes Communion, although probably he does not commit as many sins as there are persons communicating in the same distribution of the Eucharist.¹ - Cf. n. 219.

III. It is required that the Minister distribute the Eucharist according to the rite customary in the Church. Hence, generally speaking, the administration of this Sacrament is to be omitted when it cannot be done in the manner prescribed by the Roman Ritual or by the custom of the place.²

Notes to nn. 1291-1297 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 30. sq. (2) Ib. 241. sq. (3) Ib. 241. 245. (4) Ib. 241. (5) Ib. (6) n. 168. (7) L. VI. 244. Notes to nn. 1291-1297 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 250. (2) Ib. (3) De Sacr. Missae. L. III. c. 20, n. 7. (4) L. VI. 252. (5) Ib. Notes to nn. 1291-1299 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 241. (2) Ib. (3) Ib. 242. (4) Ib. 244. Notes to nn. 1291-1297 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VI. 252. and S. R. C. 22 Mar. 1806 in Tiph. n. 4499. (2) Ben. XIV. c. Magno. § 24. 2 June 1751. 3. 7 Dec. 1844 in Januen. n. 4984. Notes to nn. 1291-1297 - note sequence 4. (1) De Herdt. T. I. n. 275. - Bengier. Comp. p. 365. 4. (2) C. 4. art. 2. (3) n. 212. Notes to nn. 1291-1297 - note sequence 5. (1) n. 498. (2) L. VI. 243. Notes to nn. 1291-1299 - note sequence 2. (1) S. C. R. 5 Mar. 1635; 23 Aug. 1695; 23 Jan. 1700. ad 1. n. 3368. 3544. (2) S. C. R. 23 May 1846. n. 5036. (3) De Herdt, T. I. n. 161, 2°. (4) H. A. Tr. XV. 12. 5. 23 Jan. 1740. in Laudensi n. 4100. 6. L. VI. 243. 7. Ib. 285. 8. L. VII. c. XII. n. 4. Notes to nn. 1291-1299 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VII. 5. (2) T. III. n. 118. (3) n. 235. (4) L. VI. 285. Dub. 1. (5) n. 235. (6) L. VI. 61.

1292. Resolves. - 1° The Eucharist is not to be ministered except with decent habit, that is, with stole, surplice, and light.

2° According to the common sentence, he sins gravely who, outside the case of necessity, distributes Communion without any sacred vestment; because this is very indecent and contrary to a grave precept of the Church.³ - If, however, only the stole is omitted, it seems to several and grave Theologians to be only venial, which seems sufficiently probable.⁴

3° It is reputed only venial to minister the Eucharist without light, or without the usual confession premised, the *Confiteor*, etc.⁵ - Similarly it is held only venial to transfer the Eucharist without sacred vestments from place to place, e.g. from one altar to another. - Reuter,⁶ Mazzotta.

1293. Questions. - Query 1° Can a priest laboring under an infirmity in the thumb and forefinger minister the Eucharist with other fingers?⁷

Resp. It seems one must deny, at least more probably, excluding the case of gravest necessity.⁷ - The reason is because, although the whole hand is consecrated, nevertheless the forefinger and thumb from the rite of the Church are specially destined for exercising this office.

Query 2° What must be done if the Host falls to the ground?

Resp. The place onto which the holy Host fell is immediately to be covered with some clean thing, and afterwards washed. If it falls onto the cloth, or small linen, with which the hands of the communicant are covered, the place is to be marked and afterwards washed in like manner. Thus the Rubric, which nevertheless, according to the common sentence, does not oblige under grave sin; nevertheless it would oblige gravely to wash the place onto which the sacred species of wine had fallen, since this is absorbed; yet there is no need to burn them, i.e. the object onto which they fell.¹

Query 3° What must be done if the Host falls onto the face, beard, or garments of the communicant?

Resp. In the aforesaid cases purification is to be omitted; because it is better to avoid wonder, disturbance, or offense of the people, than to observe the Rubric, which obliges only under light sin.²

Query 4° What must be done if the Host falls into the bosom or within the garments of a woman?

Resp. The woman herself must draw out the Host, and she herself must bring it to her mouth with her own hands. Thus Benedict XIV.³ But the fingers of the woman are to be washed, and the ablution is to be cast into the piscina. If the woman cannot easily draw out the Host there, let her withdraw apart, e.g. into some chapel, or into the sacristy, etc.

1294. Query 5° At what hour can Communion be distributed?

Resp. Regularly it ought to be ministered at the hours at which Mass, whether from custom or from a particular Indult, may be celebrated. But commonly with St. Alphonsus it is taught that it can be ministered at any hour of the day, except nevertheless the extreme part of the day, i.e. toward night. The reason is because there exists no prohibition concerning this matter.⁴ Nor does there stand in the way the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites given in Dec. 1816, permitting the administration of Communion from time to time at which Masses are celebrated in any church on a day of great concourse. For that Decree is not exclusive, since the Sacred Congregation gave the response according to the petition, in which there was question precisely of a day of great concourse for gaining a plenary Indulgence or Jubilee.

It must be added here that, from a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of the year 1641, Communion is not to be given (unless by force of privilege) in the Mass of the Nativity of the Lord, which is celebrated at midnight. At St. Alphonsus,⁵ and at Gardellini n. 1319.

Query 6° At what time and place can Communion not be given?

Resp. to the 1st. In the time of local interdict, and in the time from the reposition of the Most Holy Sacrament on Thursday of the Greater Week until the solemn Mass on Holy Saturday, within which, as today is certain, all the faithful are permitted to receive the Sacred Eucharist.¹

Resp. to the 2nd. Outside Churches or public oratories. But in private ones it can be given by license of the Bishop,² and, among us, wherever Mass is celebrated.

But at the altar on which the Most Holy Sacrament is exposed, it is not to be distributed (S. R. C. 12 Nov. 1831), unless because of the lack of another altar (S. R. C. 26 Sept. 1868).

1295. Query 7° Can Communion be given outside Mass?

Resp. It is to be given, generally speaking, insofar as it can be done, after the Communion of the Priest. Thus from the Roman Ritual. Yet by received usage Communion can easily be given before or after Mass, or even at any other time at which, as was said above (n. 1294. q. 5°), it can be ministered. Indeed, where there is a great influx of communicants, it is expedient to defer Communion until the Sacrifice has been completed, lest those who assist at Mass be detained in Church longer than is fitting and be affected with tedium. - Nay rather, it must be held as certain that, on account of the custom which has prevailed everywhere, and which cannot be abrogated by Pastors, there exists no precept by force of which Communion must be distributed only within Mass. - Thus the Sacred Congregation of Rites.³

Query 8° Can Communion be given with black vestments immediately before or after Masses of the dead?

Resp. 1° After Mass it can be given, if the priest has not yet withdrawn from the altar on which he celebrated; but then he does not give the blessing to those who have communicated. - Thus from the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites confirmed by Our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius IX, 23 July 1868.

Resp. 2° According to the same Decree, Communion can also be given before Mass, if a reasonable cause is present, the blessing nevertheless being omitted. But a reasonable cause is never lacking if some then ask Communion. For very often it happens that among those asking some are present who otherwise either would depart without Communion, or, by remaining longer, would necessarily undergo no light inconvenience, whether in domestic matters or in business to be transacted.

Query 9° Can Communion be given with black vestments *within* a Mass of Requiem?

Resp. Affirmatively, both if Communion is given with only Hosts consecrated in the same Mass, and if it is given from preconsecrated Hosts which are reserved in the tabernacle. Thus the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites cited above.

1296. Query 10° Can Communion be given with violet vestments, even before or after Masses of the dead?

Resp. On this question there could long be controversy, especially on account of a Response which was reported from the Sacred Congregation of Rites in the year 1670. But now there is no doubt, after the aforesaid decree of the Sacred Congregation, by which it is established that in Masses of the dead violet vestments cannot be used unless in some Church, on November 2. The Eucharistic Sacrament is publicly exposed for the solemn Prayer of Forty Hours.

Query 11° How is Communion to be ministered outside Mass?

Resp. 1° If Communion is to be ministered immediately before or after Mass, it must be done as in Mass itself; but the priest, standing at the altar, can say: *O sacred banquet*, etc. Vers. *Bread*, etc. (in

Paschal time is added: *Alleluia*); then he says: *Lord, hear*, etc., *The Lord be with you*, etc., with the Prayer: *O God, who*, etc. (in Paschal time: *Pour forth upon us*, etc.); finally, with his fingers washed and the Sacred Ciborium replaced in the tabernacle, he blesses those who communicated with the formula: *The blessing of almighty God, Father*, etc. - Roman Ritual and Sacred Congregation of Rites, 24 Sept. 1842.⁶ p. 417.

Resp. 2° If it is distributed at another time, two candles are to be lit according to the Roman Ritual. But if time urges and two candles cannot easily be lit, one will suffice; 2° the priest, with hands washed, vested in surplice and stole of the color suitable to the Office of that day, ministers, as above, and having returned to the altar he proceeds with the remainder as above; finally he gives the blessing with the hand raised, but not with the pyx, except over the sick.

But the versicles *Lord, hear*, etc., *The Lord be with you*, etc., with the proper Prayer, according to some, as connected with the antiphon *O Sacred*, etc., can be omitted; according to others they are of precept, as is the antiphon itself.¹ - But such prayers seem to be said with a voice at least moderately raised, since they must be answered by the minister. (z) p. 417.

Appendix annotation (6), to n. 1296. q. 11°. R. 1°. p. 51. col. 1. When the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist must be administered in Paschal time, before or after a Mass of Requiem, *Alleluia* is not to be added to the versicles. S. R. C. Jan. 29, 1712, in Senen. Acta, T. I. p. 4. Appendix annotation (7), to n. 1296. q. 11°. R. 2°. p. 51. col. 2. It is said in the Response that a stole of the color suited to the Office of that day is to be used. Wherefore, if the Mass does not agree with the Office, not the color of the former but of the latter is to be used in the administration of the Eucharist, which does not take place within, or before or after, Mass. The case can be given on Thursday in the Lord's Supper, and when, according to the Rubrics, the Office is celebrated of the Octave and the Mass of the Vigil or Feria. Where the custom prevails of administering the Most Holy Eucharist with white stoles to the faithful fulfilling the Paschal precept, it is to be tolerated. S. R. C. Venet., 11 Aug. 1877. Acta, T. XIII. p. 430.

1297. Query 12° What must be done if the minister is lacking for the priest: can a man about to communicate, or a woman, supply?

Resp. 1° Certainly any man about to communicate, if he is a man, can serve the priest; or even the priest himself can supply, by saying the *Confiteor* and answering *Amen*.

Resp. 2° A woman cannot supply, unless she is a Nun who, according to received custom, answers within the cloister; then the priest himself must by himself perform everything. Nor do you say that in necessity a woman can respond at Mass, provided she stands at a distance; for in Mass the priest alone can answer everything. - Thus commonly, Bouvier,² Gousset.³

Query 13° Can several particles be given to one communicant, or one larger one by cutting it, etc.?

Resp. Negatively. For this was expressly prohibited by a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, approved by Innocent XI on 12 February 1679. The words, as Benedict XIV³ reports, are these: "Bishops, Pastors, or confessors should warn that several forms of the Eucharist, or particles, are to be handed to no one, nor larger ones, but the customary ones."

Query 14° Can particles be broken if they are deficient; and what must be done if there is no tabernacle in which they can be replaced?

Resp. to the 1st. Affirmatively, from the common sentence and general practice, provided there is a just cause, e.g. if Masses or the faithful cannot wait. Indeed, when the question had been proposed to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, "Whether it is safe to follow the Rule of the Parisian Ritual, thus

expressed: If, when Communion is to be given, a sufficient number of Hosts has not been found, can some Host be divided into several particles, which are distributed to individuals?" the Sacred Congregation responded: "Let the custom of dividing consecrated ones be observed, if necessity is present." On 16 March 1833, n. 4707. Nevertheless the priest then must divide Hosts only into two or at most three parts, because otherwise Communion could scarcely be given with due reverence. - Lacroix.¹ Cf. what was said n. 1282. 5°.

Resp. to the 2nd. They are to be consumed by the celebrant before the ablutions, if this can easily be done. Otherwise they would have to be carried to the nearest tabernacle with the customary rite; and it must not be done that several Hosts be ministered to the faithful.

Query 15° For communicating the faithful, when smaller Hosts are lacking, can the priest detach a part of the larger one to be consumed by himself?

Resp. 1° Affirmatively in the case of carrying Viaticum to one dying, by reason of urgent necessity. - Thus all. - 2° Affirmatively also if one or another of the faithful were about to communicate, who otherwise would have to wait for Communion not without inconvenience.² Cf. what was said n. 1282. 5°.

ARTICLE IV: ON THE MANNER OF MINISTERING THE EUCHARIST TO THE SICK

1298. The Roman Ritual Establishes The Following. - **I.** Let the Pastor admonish that the sick person's room be cleansed, and in it a table be prepared covered with a clean cloth, on which the Most Holy Sacrament may decently be set down. Let two candles at least be prepared, two small vessels, one with wine, the other with water, so that either may serve the priest for washing the fingers, and the sick person for swallowing the Sacred Host after Communion (therefore it suffices to prepare either one); besides, a clean linen is to be placed before the breast of the communicant. Often a vessel of holy water is added, as often as it is not accustomed to be carried with the Most Holy Sacrament.

II. The Eucharist must be carried from the Church to the private homes of the sick with decent habit, a clean veil placed over it, manifestly and honorably, with all reverence, always with light and with a little bell being continually rung before it. But the priest, vested in surplice and stole, and first having placed from both shoulders a becoming oblong veil, should receive with both hands the vessel with the Most Holy Sacrament, to be carried before the breast, and then should go under the baldachin, or umbrella, if it can be had, and proceed with uncovered head. But in going he says the *Miserere* and other Psalms, and in returning *Praise the Lord from the heavens*, and other Psalms and Hymns, but these are only of counsel.

III. The priest, entering the room of the sick person, says: *Peace be to this house*, Resp.: *And to all dwelling in it*. Then he adores the Most Holy Sacrament placed upon the table; he sprinkles the sick person and the room with holy water, saying: *Thou shalt sprinkle me*, etc., and the other prayers placed in the Roman Ritual. Afterwards, the sick person having been questioned and exhorted, he gives the Most Holy Eucharist in the usual manner. But if there is question of Viaticum, he does not say: *The Body of the Lord*, etc.; but: *Receive, brother, the viaticum of the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, etc., as in the Ritual. (y) p. 401.

IV. When death is imminent, most of the prayers, or even all, are omitted. The priest, with fingers washed, and the prayers completed, if particles remain, blesses the sick person with the ciborium, saying nothing. From the Roman Ritual the ablutions must be given to the sick person, but if he is unwilling or unable to take them, they are cast into the fire in the sick person's own house, or, which is more fitting, into the Sacramentum. (x) p. 401. - The priest, having returned to the Church, with the ciborium placed upon the altar, recites the versicle and prayer concerning the Most Holy Sacrament, and with the Sacrament makes the Sign of the Cross over the people, saying nothing.

Appendix annotation (phi), to n. 1298. III. p. 52. col. 2. "If," says De Herdt, *Prax. Rit. Rom.*, p. 80, "the Most Holy Sacrament is to be administered at the same time to several sick persons in the same place, whether as Viaticum or from devotion, as can happen rather often in hospitals and in contagious diseases, then the antiphon *Asperges me* is said only once, and meanwhile the sick are sprinkled; likewise the verse *Adjutorium*, the prayer *Exaudi*, the *Confiteor*, *Misereatur*, *Indulgentiam*, and *Ecce Agnus Dei* are recited once, just as these also are said only once in church, however many there are to be communicated; then, under the respective form, Holy Communion is given to each sick person; and finally the prayer *Domine sancte* is recited once, and the blessing is given once." It is said: in the same place; for the things said do not hold if the sick are separated by intervals of places, even of the same house, in such a way that, precisely by reason of the interval, by no external sense can they - I do not say perceive - but be able to perceive the prayers and actions of the minister, and according to the common estimation of men the minister would not be judged to be acting with them. The case would be if different sick persons were lying in different stories of the same building, or even in the same story indeed, but in rooms so separated from one another that one could in no way be judged joined with the other. Thus *Past.-Bl. für Nord Amer.*, 12th year, p. 22. 23. > Notes to appendix annotation - note sequence 8. > > 1 In the plural: *vestri*, *vestrorum*, etc. | 2 *fratribus*, etc., in place of *fratri*. Appendix annotation (chi), to n. 1298. IV. p. 52. col. 2. To give the ablutions is not the office of the priest, but of the sick person or of another. - To avoid the difficulty joined with throwing the ablutions into the fire or into the sacramentum of the church, the following seems to be an easy method of washing the fingers: the purificator is placed beside the little vessel of water; the thumb and index finger of the right hand are held over the purificator beside the same little vessel; with the fingers of the left hand water is sprinkled upon the index finger and thumb of the right hand, as much as is sufficient to wash them, and then the index finger and thumb are immediately wiped with the purificator. If this method is observed, nothing is to be cared about the remaining water or wine left in the little vessel. See Baruffaldus, tit. 26. n. 186. De Herdt, *Pr. Rit.*, p. 75.

1299. Questions. - Query 1° Can the Eucharist be carried to the sick at night?

Resp. Negatively. For this is expressly prohibited, except in a case of necessity. For thus the Roman Ritual: "But at night this Sacrament must not be carried, unless necessity urges." But when necessity urges, it is to be carried at any hour of the night; but without noise and sound of the little bell. But the cited words of the Ritual do not regard Communities which reserve the Most Holy Eucharist in a domestic Chapel, because the danger of irreverence, on account of which the law was passed, is then absent.

Query 2° Can the Eucharist be carried to the sick secretly?

Resp. Negatively, generally speaking. It is established from the Roman Ritual, where it is said: "This Holy Sacrament must be carried manifestly and honorably." Nevertheless some circumstances are excepted, e.g. places of heretics, where it cannot be carried manifestly. Likewise sometimes even in Catholic places, if otherwise Holy Viaticum (but not Communion from devotion²) cannot be carried to the sick person without some inconvenience, for example because impious relatives absolutely do not wish any religious ceremony to be celebrated in their house, although they tolerate that the priest approach the sick person. Nevertheless this must not be done without license of the Bishop, where he can be consulted.

Query 3° Can a priest, when necessity urges, minister Viaticum without any sacred vestment?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is because it is not to be presumed that the Church, which is so benign a mother, wished those rites to be observed in the administration of Viaticum with detriment to the dying. For the Sacraments have been instituted primarily for the salvation of souls.²

Query 4° When necessity urges, in carrying Viaticum is it lawful to run?

Resp. Affirmatively, probably. The reason is because urgent necessity of carrying Viaticum to one dying can excuse from greater decency in walking.³

Query 5° Is it lawful in time of plague to offer the Eucharist by some instrument, for instance in a spoon, on a paten, or in another clean vessel?

Resp. Affirmatively, not improbably, because so great a necessity seems to excuse from the customary rite of the Church.⁴

Query 6° Is it lawful to carry the Eucharist with the head covered on the way?

Resp. Negatively, on account of the reverence due to the Sacrament, except nevertheless in the singular case of necessity - of a brief infirmity, not however a lasting one - and provided that another priest cannot be had. - Likewise if a legitimate custom on account of a most grave cause, e.g. on account of excessively cold air, prevails somewhere. Therefore in carrying the Most Holy Sacrament to the sick, whether this is done by day or by night, neither on the pretext of any infirmity nor on any other pretext can the biretta or even a small cap be used.¹

Wherefore a priest laboring under a cold or another infirmity must abstain from carrying the Most Holy Sacrament, or commit that office to another, or nevertheless proceed with uncovered head, unless the use of the little cap has been granted to him.² Yet the use of the little cap is not granted with so much difficulty on a journey; with more difficulty within a city or town. According to several, the Bishop can grant license of carrying a little cap on a journey; but the faculty of using a little cap through a city or town is of Apostolic right.³ The Holy See granted a dispensation from that law for the diocese of Cologne, especially in winter weather, on 3 Nov. 1862. - St. Alphonsus has this: "Pasqual probably says that the Bishop can dispense that Viaticum be carried with a little cap on the head, when one must proceed far and through villages."⁴

Query 7° Can a priest carry the Holy Eucharist riding on a horse?

Resp. Affirmatively, if it must be carried to a sick person far distant, or through a difficult road, or if there is danger in delay. But the horse must be gentle, so that danger of falling and irreverence is absent. But it is never lawful to give the pyx to be carried by a layman, however much the priest may be tired; but then he must carry it in a burse hung from the neck. It is established from the Roman Ritual on the Eucharist, and also from a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. And beforehand, "that Viaticum, on account of distance of places, difficulty of journeys, roughness of roads, can be carried by the Pastor while riding," the Sacred Congregation of Rites "grants," nevertheless with the consent of the Bishop.⁶

Query 8° Can the Eucharist be carried several times to the sick who are not fasting, or by way of Viaticum?

Resp. Affirmatively, and not only if a new danger of death recurs, but also if the same one perseveres. - Thus the common and true sentence, says St. Alphonsus.⁷ It is confirmed by the authority of

Benedict XIV, who, in the work *On the Synod*,⁸ testifies that no Theologian of any name denies this sentence; and he adds,¹ "The Bishop should suggest to Pastors that Viaticum can and ought to be administered again and a third time in the same infirmity, especially if the sick person requests it; and, if he wishes, he should decree a penalty against Pastors who decline to carry the Eucharist again and a third time to sick persons devoutly asking, under false pretexts." But Communion in this case, according to Scavini,² is to be given with the usual formula: *May the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ preserve*, etc. "Likewise in this case," says de Herdt,³ *Have mercy and Indulgence* are said in the plural: *your, your sins*."

Query 9° Can the Eucharist be carried frequently to the bedridden?

Resp. Affirmatively, of itself. Nevertheless this depends on the circumstances, namely on their particular disposition and necessity. Indeed, not improbably, "a sick person accustomed to communicate more often from devotion" will be able "already on another day immediately after Viaticum ... to receive Communion not fasting. And Pal. and Arm. and Dic. apud Croix admit this on individual days, and Tamb. thinks it probable."⁴ The Pastor must, as far as it is in him, exhort the sick to frequent Communion. - Gousset.⁵

Query 10° What must a priest do if, coming to a sick person with the Most Holy Sacrament, and hearing his Confession, he finds him indisposed?

Resp. First of all the confessor must labor, as best he can, to bring the penitent to better fruit. If the matter does not succeed, and e.g. the sick person does not promise either to break off the proximate occasion of sin, or to make a grave and certainly owed restitution, he surely cannot be absolved. But what of Communion? The penitent must be earnestly induced that, the Confession having been completed, he declare publicly that he does not yet wish to receive the Holy Eucharist. But if he gives this declaration, the difficulty now vanishes; for it is clear that the Eucharist is not to be ministered to him. But if he refuses to declare this, and wishes to communicate, the Eucharist must be ministered to him, although he is indisposed, or an agreement must be made with him that you say over him "The Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ," etc., without offering the Body.⁶

ARTICLE V: ON THE MANNER OF RESERVING THE HOLY EUCHARIST

1300. - I. "The most ancient custom," says the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore,¹ "of reserving the Sacred Eucharist in churches, as altogether salutary and necessary to be retained, the Council of Trent decreed.² It must be preserved in the Cathedral church and in any parish church, so that it can be carried to the sick when occasion is given. But in many other churches or chapels it can be preserved either by law," as in the churches of Regulars strictly so called, and of those who communicate with them in privileges, as also of Nuns who emit solemn vows and live in enclosure, "or by Pontifical indult," as in the chapels of the other religious communities of the Province of Baltimore and Philadelphia (25 July 1858), at the prayers of the Fathers of the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore (Second Plenary Council of Baltimore³), and in certain other dioceses.

II. "The Most Holy Sacrament is to be reserved in only one place of any church in which it can, is accustomed, or ought to be kept."⁴ But it is to be kept over a corporal in a tabernacle decently adorned, locked with a key,⁵ which key must always be kept by the priest who has care of the church or chapel.⁶ "The tabernacle covered decently with a conopaeum," the Ritual wills.⁷ (8) p. 417. The

custom of "placing upon it Sacred Relics (even of the Most Holy Cross, or Instruments of the Lord's Passion), and painted images, so that the tabernacle serves as a base," while the Most Holy is reserved in it, the Congregation of Rites disapproved,⁸ and decreed that neither can "vases of flowers, or anything similar, be retained before the little door."⁹ "The tabernacle regularly ought to be wooden, gilded outside, but covered decently within with some silken cloth."¹⁰ In it let the Sacred Eucharist be preserved in a pyx, or ciborium, "of solid and decent material; and with its own lid well closed, covered with a white veil."¹ "Vessels of the Holy Oils, Relics, or anything else,"² it is not lawful to place in it. But "the abuse which has crept in somewhere, of living or sleeping in that part of a religious house which is situated above the altar, is not to be tolerated further, but is altogether to be eliminated."³

III. "Before the Most Holy let a lamp always be kept burning, nourished with olive oil," which, where it "cannot be had," is remitted "to the prudence of the Bishops, that" it be nourished "from other oils, vegetable insofar as it can be done."⁴ Therefore petroleum the Bishop cannot permit outside necessity; nor without true necessity is one to use the privilege (p. LXXII. n. 24), "of retaining it without light," if any has been granted. (w) p. 402.

IV. "The Roman Ritual commands that particles of the Most Holy Eucharist be frequently renewed; and the Ceremonial of Bishops prescribes that this be done at least once a week."⁵ This rule, which the Sacred Congregation of Rites not only often confirmed,⁶ but declared to oblige 'strictly and rigorously,'⁷ we seriously inculcate to be faithfully observed by all priests. "Where the priest has consecrated new hosts, let him first distribute, or consume, the old ones,"⁸ but by no means preserve them in the tabernacle. Let him take care besides that the particles to be consecrated be fresh."

V. "The solemn Exposition and Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament," decree the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore,⁹ "the customary rite being strictly observed, in all churches of our jurisdiction and in the chapels of monasteries and religious communities, at least whenever it can be done with due solemnity, on each Lord's Day of the whole year, and on feasts of precept, or also on feasts of the first and second class not of precept, can be given once only in the day. But through the Octave of Corpus Christi it will be lawful that it be done solemnly both in solemn Mass and in Vespers, Benediction being given again. It will be lawful besides to give solemn Benediction twice in the week during the time of Lent, likewise on each day in the time of Sacred Missions, on the feast of the Most Holy Heart of Jesus, and wherever the devotion of Forty Hours is made; and on other days designated by the Ordinary. But if the Holy See has granted something further to some religious Order or Society, we will that that remain altogether inviolate. But outside such privilege, of which certain document should be shown to the Ordinary, we will that Benediction not be given or Exposition be made, except, as above, by express leave of the Ordinary, the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites also being preserved in all things in this matter."

Notes to nn. 1300-1301 - note sequence 1. (1) n. 265. sq. (2) Sess. 13. c. 6. (3) p. 326. XXIII. 4. S. C. Ep. 13 Oct. 1620. 5. Rit. Rom. de Euch. 6. See Pontifical Indults, passim. 7. De Sacr. Euch. 8. S. R. C. 31 Mar. 1821 and 12 Mar. 1836. 9. 22 Jan. 1701. n. 3575. 10. Or gilded, S. R. C. Urgel. 7 Aug. 1871 ad 7 and 8. Notes to nn. 1300-1301 - note sequence 2. (1) Rit. Rom. de Sacr. Euch. S. C. Episc. 26 July 1588 issued this decree: "The Most Holy Sacrament must not be kept in ivory little vessels, but in a silver pyx gilded within." (2) S. Cong. Episc. 3 May 1693. (3) S. R. C. 11 May 1641, 26 Apr. 1834, 12 Mar. 1836. n. 1325. 4770. (4) S. R. C. (Acta, T. I. p. 38. T. XI. p. 320). (5) Lib. I. Cap. 6, § 2. S. R. C. 7 Sept. 1850. 6. 5 Apr. 1573; 3 Sept. 1672; 16 Dec. 1826. 7. 7 Sept. 1850. 8. S. R. C. 3 Sept. 1672. n. 2602. Rit. Rom. 9. a. 379. Notes to nn. 1300-1301 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VI. 248. (2) Ib. (3) Tit. 7. n. 2. de def. (4) L. VI. 251. (5) L. III. c. XVII. n. 2. sq. (6) L. VI. 251. Notes to nn. 1300-1301 - note sequence 4. (1) L. VI. 251. (2) Tit. 7. n. 3. de def. (3) L. VI. 217. Notes to nn. 1300-1301 -

note sequence 5. (1) n. 167. (2) n. 232. (3) n. 77. (4) n. 491. (5) n. 492. (6) Ib. (7) n. 77. (8) c. 2. n. 35. 9. 16 Dec. 1826. Appendix annotation (8), to n. 1300. p. 54. col. 2. That canopy can be made from cloth, whether of cotton, wool, or hemp, and from whatever woven fabric; of a color either white or fitting to the character of the time and feast. But if it is not white, in obsequies or Masses of Requiem let it be of black or violet color. S. R. C. Appendix annotation (psi), to n. 1300. III. p. 55. col. 1. "This lamp is to be kept not above the doors of the church, nor in a side place, but before the tabernacle, or in the middle before it, so that those entering may notice where they must adore." De Herdt, Prax. Rit. Rom., p. 60. S. C. R., 22 Aug. 1699. n. 3376. 3825. "If several lamps are hung, it is fitting that they be of an odd number, as is prescribed in the Ceremonial of Bishops." Id. ib., p. 61.

1301. Questions. - Query 1° Does he sin gravely who neglects to preserve a light before the Most Holy Sacrament?

Resp. Affirmatively, of itself, if the time is notable. - Thus commonly with St. Alphonsus.¹ Indeed several say that the time is *notable* if this is done for a whole day or some whole nights. Thus Busembaum, whose words St. Alphonsus reports and implicitly approves.²

Query 2° What must be done concerning fragments of Hosts which are found?

Resp. 1° If the priest finds fragments of his present Sacrifice, he must consume them, even after the ablutions, whether they are small or large, because they pertain to the same Sacrifice. Thus from the Rubric of the Missal.³ But this is to be observed not only immediately after Mass, but also if the priest is in the sacristy, still nevertheless vested in the sacred vestments. - Thus commonly St. Alphonsus,⁴ after Benedict XIV, *On the Sacrifice of the Mass*.⁵

But if the priest has already been divested of the sacred vestments, he must replace the fragments in the tabernacle, if it is present, or reserve them for another priest about to celebrate on the same morning. If neither can be done, let him consume them himself.⁶

Resp. 2° But if the remains were consecrated in another Mass, they are not to be consumed after the ablutions, but must be placed in a decent place. The reason is because the Rubric permits a priest not fasting only to consume those remains which pertain to the same Sacrifice. If nevertheless this cannot be done, and grave danger of irreverence is present, then the priest should consume them. - Thus commonly.¹

Resp. 3° If a layman finds fragments, let him warn a priest as soon as possible, if one is nearby, or summon him, if he can be found. But the priest, reverently collecting the fragment, will replace it in the ciborium, or in a decent and safe place, if the tabernacle is lacking, so that it can be consumed in the next Mass. But if a priest cannot be had, let the fragment be collected reverently by the layman himself in paper or a clean little linen, by means of a little thorn, and be placed within the corporal, or in a decent vessel, until the priest arrives.

Query 3° What must be done if a Host certainly or doubtfully consecrated is found on the altar, or elsewhere?

Resp. 1° If the Host is believed certainly consecrated, and otherwise seems clean and recently consecrated, it is to be replaced with the others in the ciborium. It can also be consumed by the celebrant before the ablutions. But if it is not clean, or if it has been drawn from a place not clean, or is not recently consecrated, it is not to be mixed with the others, but the celebrant can consume it before the ablution; but if he experiences too great a repugnance, he will place the Host separately in

the tabernacle in a clean vessel, until it is corrupted, and, corrupted, it is cast into the sacrarium. Thus from the Rubric of the Missal.²

Resp. 2° If it is doubtfully consecrated, it is to be consumed by the priest in Mass after the ablution, but before the purification, because the remains of the Blood are certainly a Sacrament, but that host doubtfully;³ but if it provokes too great nausea for him, it is to be placed separately in the tabernacle, until it has been corrupted, as was just said.

Query 4° What must be done if a sick person has rejected the sacred species?

Resp. 1° If they appear, they must be carefully collected in a clean vessel, carried to the Church, and preserved in a safe and well-closed place until they are altogether corrupted, so that they can be cast into the sacrarium without irreverence.

Resp. 2° If they cannot be discerned, as being altogether mixed with impurities, the mouth indeed of the sick person is to be cleansed; but whatever has been rejected is to be collected with tow; then, the tow having been burned, the ashes are to be thrown into the sacrarium. Reuter,¹ Gousset.² Cf. nevertheless n. 1278. q. 2°.

Query 5° How is the ciborium to be renewed?

Resp. The renewal of the ciborium is to be made in the Sacrifice of the Mass itself. The celebrant, the most Precious Blood having been consumed, consumes the old Hosts, although they are many; but he can consume 20 or 30 Hosts thus, according to Elbel;³ 60 or even more (Lacroix⁴). But it will rarely happen that there are more, because not more should be consecrated than seems sufficient. But if at some time a much greater quantity of Hosts had to be consumed, the priest can consume them divided among several Masses, or even several priests celebrating successively can consume them.

But the smaller particles found in the ciborium the priest will cast into the chalice, and, wine having been poured over them, he will consume them, and will place the new Hosts in the entirely empty ciborium. He can also pour wine into the ciborium for collecting the smallest particles. Nevertheless the wine will not be drunk from the ciborium, but poured back into the chalice. - Lacroix.⁵

If the priest by inadvertence had first consumed the ablution, he could still purify the ciborium and consume the remains, because for the consumption it is morally reputed one. - Thus Lacroix,⁶ Elbel,⁷ Tamburini, on Communion.⁸ But St. Alphonsus otherwise here, n. q. 2°. Resp. 2°.

Particles to be consecrated ought to be fresh. Negligence of Pastors and others in this matter can constitute grave sin. - Gardellini. - The custom of consecrating Hosts made three months before in winter, or six months before in summer, is an enormous abuse altogether to be removed. But if the Pastor, his Vicars, or other priests seem to tolerate an abuse of this kind, they cannot use those Hosts. - Sacred Congregation of Rites.⁹

LITTLE APPENDIX: ON THE MANNER IN WHICH THE EUCHARIST IS TO BE MINISTERED TO THE SICK IN THESE PROVINCES, AND ON THE METHOD OF RESERVING IT

Among the faculties of Form I, which are customarily communicated to our priests by the Bishops, the 24th (p. LXXII.) reads: "Of carrying the Most Holy Sacrament secretly to the sick without light, and of retaining it without the same for the same sick, in a decent place nevertheless, if there is danger of sacrilege from heretics or infidels."

Lest in the use of this faculty abuses creep in or even persevere, the things which follow are to be well noted by priests.

A. AS REGARDS THE MANNER OF MINISTERING THE EUCHARIST TO THE SICK.

1302. - 1° The faculty is given for the case in which "there is danger of sacrilege from heretics or infidels." This danger must be said to be present scarcely not everywhere among us. Nevertheless in this region also there are certain wholly Catholic places in the country, in which, when the sick person is not far distant from the churches, that danger is in no way to be feared; in which case the Eucharist will have to be carried in the manner prescribed by the Church. The Encyclical Letter of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, given on 25 Feb. 1859 to our Bishops, not obscurely suggests this; in it, among other things, these things are read: "The Sacred Congregation further willed that the individual Prelates be urged, as by the tenor of the present letters they are urged, to keep the common discipline of the Church in this matter, as far as circumstances of time and places, and also the account of introduced customs, allow."²

2° "While they carry the Most Holy, let them avoid vain and useless conversations; rather let them give themselves to pious contemplation or prayers."³ In agreement with this admonition of the Plenary Council, pastors will repeatedly teach the people what is to be prepared in the house of the sick person, and that, while they are companions to the priest carrying the Eucharist to the sick person, they abstain from every useless conversation. "But on a journey," says Kenrick,⁴ "which requires several days" (which nevertheless today is more rarely necessary than formerly), "and where some persons met on the way occur, one cannot abstain from conversation; although speech is to be had sparingly and cautiously and with the utility of the hearers. For he sins gravely who, carrying so great a Sacrament, mingles idle conversations."

3° "The carrying of the Most Holy Sacrament is restricted to urgent causes only, and to the actual exercise of the priestly ministry."¹ But what is an urgent cause will have to be judged from the circumstances of place, time, and others.² Meanwhile it is certain that it is not lawful for a priest to carry the Most Holy Sacrament with himself from morning until evening for the sole cause that perhaps he could come upon some sick person.³

4° "A strict obligation is imposed on priests always in these cases of carrying the Holy Host upon the breast."⁴ "Never, unless in extreme necessity, should they touch either the Host itself or the sacred vessel in which it is preserved, unless they are vested at least in a stole. When they draw the Most Holy from the tabernacle in the church, let them always be vested in surplice and stole. Ministering

the Sacred Eucharist to the sick, let them most diligently observe the prescriptions of the Roman Ritual, insofar as the circumstances of things permit."⁵

5° What was said above n. 1299. q. 4° and 7° concerning a priest carrying the Eucharist while riding or running will be lawful for Missionaries carrying it privately and secretly from a lighter cause.⁶

Notes to nn. 1302-1303 - note sequence 1. (1) Cf. Past.-Blatt fuer Nord America. V. Jahrg. S. 39. (2) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. p. 297. (3) Ib. a. 264. (4) Tr. XVII. n. 26. Notes to nn. 1302-1303 - note sequence 2. (1) Ex Litt. Encycl. cit. Conc. Pl. Balt. II. p. 298. (2) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 264. (3) Ex iisd. Litt. ib. p. 297. (4) Ib. p. 298. (5) Conc. Pl. Balt. a. 264. (6) Kenr. Tr. XVII. n. 27. (7) Past.-Blatt fuer N. Amer. V. Jahrg. S. 49.

B. ON THE MANNER OF RESERVING THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

1303. - In rural churches, near which no priest resides, it is not lawful to reserve the Holy Eucharist, and it is to be consumed by the priest before he departs. Resolve the same concerning a single priest residing near a church, but departing beyond eight days (after which namely the sacred species are to be renewed), or not residing so near it that in case of fire he could remove the Most Holy Sacrament from it in time, or prevent other irreverences.⁷

CHAPTER IV: ON THE SUBJECT OF THE EUCHARIST

Only a baptized man can receive the Eucharist sacramentally; because only the baptized is capable of the Sacraments. Hence an unbeliever receiving the Eucharist would indeed receive it truly, but only materially, not however sacramentally. But a baptized man who is indisposed receives indeed sacramentally, but not spiritually, i.e. he receives, but without fruit. But a baptized man who is disposed receives both sacramentally and spiritually, or with fruit. - Trent.¹

It must be treated 1° of the obligation of receiving the Eucharist; 2° of the disposition required for receiving it worthily.

ARTICLE I: ON THE OBLIGATION OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST

1304. Principles. - I. The real reception of the Eucharist is necessary neither for children nor for adults by necessity of means unto salvation. It is established 1° from the universal practice of the Church, which gives Communion neither to little children, nor to adults impeded by infirmity, e.g. those prone to vomiting, the delirious, etc.; 2° from the definition of the Church at least as regards little children, Trent.²

II. The reception of the Eucharist is necessary by necessity of divine precept. It is drawn from the words of Christ: *Unless you shall eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, you shall not have life in you.*³ But whether, and by what necessity of means, it is necessary, see above n. 1207. **III. 1°.**

III. The reception of the Eucharist is necessary also from a precept of the Church. It is proved from the Fourth Lateran Council,⁴ where it is said: "Every faithful person of either sex, after he has reached the years of discretion, should confess at least once in the year, ... receiving reverently, at least at Easter, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, unless perhaps, by the counsel of his own priest, he should judge that he must abstain from such reception for some reasonable cause." It is established also from Trent.¹

IV. The reception of the Eucharist is not necessary under both species, except for priests alone in the act of the celebration of Mass. It is proved from Trent.² It is established also from the universal practice of the Church, although in earlier centuries it was different.

Notes to nn. 1304-1305 - note sequence 1. (1) Sess. 13. c. 8. (2) Sess. 21. Can. 4. (3) John 6. 54. L. VI. 295. (4) L. V. Decr. T. XXXVIII. c. 12. Notes to nn. 1304-1305 - note sequence 2. (1) Sess. 13. Can. 9. (2) Sess. 21. Can. 1. (3) L. VI. 295. (4) L. VI. 295. (5) Ib. Notes to nn. 1304-1305 - note sequence 3. (1) D. 16. n. 39. sq. (2) L. VI. 285. Dub. 2. (3) L. VI. 285. Dub. 3. Quest. Retr. 66. Notes to nn. 1304-1305 - note sequence 4. (1) L. VI. 292. (2) Ib. (3) L. VI. 301. Dub. 2. and Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 261. (4) Kenr. Tr. XVII. 41. (5) St. Thomas, P. III, q. 80. a. 9. Catechism of the Council of Trent. St. Alphonsus, L. VI. 302. Notes to nn. 1304-1305 - note sequence 5. (1) L. VI. 303. (2) Ib. 302. (3) n. 232. (4) L. VI. 303. (5) L. VI. 303. (6) Ib. (7) Ib. Notes to nn. 1304-1305 - note sequence 6. (1) De Syn. L. VII. c. XI. n. 8. (2) L. VI. 303. Notes to nn. 1304-1307 - note sequence 1. (1) 1 Cor. 11. 28. 29. (2) Sess. 13. c. 7. (3) L. VI. 256. sq. Notes to nn. 1304-1307 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 264. (2) Ib. (3) Ib. 257. Notes to nn. 1304-1307 - note sequence 3. (1) H. A. Tr. XV. 23. (2) Sess. 13. c. 7. (3) L. VI. 268. (4) Ib. 266. Notes to nn. 1304-1309 - note sequence 1. (1) De defect. disp. corp. n. 3. (2) L. VI. 279. (3) De defect. disp. corp. n. 3. (4) L. VI. 279. (5) Ib. 280. Dub. 1. (6) Ib. 280. Dub. 2. 1. L. VI. 280. Dub. 3. 2. Ib. 282. in fine, and L. I. 89. H. A. Tr. XV. 35. 3. Ib. 280. 4. Ib. Notes to nn. 1304-1313 - note sequence 1. (4) Sess. 22. c. 6. Notes to nn. 1304-1307 - note sequence 4. (1) L. VI. 267. coll. n. 257 and H. A. Tr. XV. 23. (2) L. VI. 266. (3) Ib. 270. (4) Sess. 13. Notes to nn. 1304-1307 - note sequence 5. (1) L. VI. 279. (2) Ib. 280. Dub. 1. (3) P. III. q. 80. a. 8. (4) L. VI. 281.

(5) Acta. T. VII. p. 399. (6) De defect. Tit. IX. n. 3. Notes to nn. 1304-1313 - note sequence 2. (1) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. p. 294. (2) Praxis conf. n. 149-155. (3) Ib. 149. (4) Ib. 150. 153. Notes to nn. 1304-1309 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 284, 286 sq. (2) H. A. Tr. XV. 46. (3) L. VI. 285. Dub. 3. (4) p. 90. Notes to nn. 1304-1313 - note sequence 3. (1) Praxis conf. n. 149. (2) Ib. 150. 152.

1305. Questions. - Query 1° At what time does the divine precept of communicating urge?

Resp. 1° It obliges of itself in the article or proximate danger of death, and indeed under grave sin. The reason is because the Eucharist was instituted as a viaticum strengthening against the enemies of salvation.³

Resp. 2° It obliges of itself also several times in life. It is established from the fact that the Eucharist was instituted by way of spiritual food, by which the soul is nourished and strengthened; but food must be taken several times. It is also drawn from Sacred Scripture cited above, and also from the Councils just mentioned. Nevertheless Christ did not determine how often this Sacrament is to be approached, but left this to be established by his Church. But the Church established annual Communion in Paschal time. Hence by Communion received once in the year at that time, both the divine and ecclesiastical precept are satisfied.⁴

Resp. 3° This precept obliges accidentally sometimes, and perhaps even several times in the year, if the Eucharist is necessary for overcoming some grave temptation. Nevertheless this, says Suarez, happens most rarely, since other means can suffice for this, prayers, penances, etc. But he who in that case neglected Communion would not sin against this precept, but against the virtue against which he is tempted.⁵

Query 2° Is someone held to receive sacred Viaticum, when danger of death is imminent, if a few days before he communicated from devotion?

Resp. Affirmatively, more probably. The reason is because this precept, by interpretation of the Church, urges in danger of death, that we may be fortified against spiritual enemies by this divine help. Therefore it is not fulfilled by Communion made before the illness; because, although someone has fulfilled the prescribed work, nevertheless he has not fulfilled it at the time at which he was held.

Nevertheless several deny with Lugo.¹ Their reason is because the precept of Communion has already been fulfilled in substance. - St. Alphonsus says that this sentence is sufficiently probable, at least if the danger of death occurs naturally, because through that brief preceding time it has already morally begun to be imminent, although it had been unknown.²

Query 3° Is he who communicated in the morning from devotion held, or can he, when danger of death urges, receive Viaticum?

Resp. There is a fourfold sentence.

The first affirms that he is held, because then Viaticum must be received in order to fulfill the divine precept, which, since it was not yet urging at the time at which Communion was received, therefore could not be fulfilled by that reception.

The second says that he is not held, but can communicate: 1° indeed he is not held, because the time at which he communicated is morally the same, since it is the same day; 2° he can, because although strictly he does not seem to be held, nevertheless he is not for that reason prohibited; since favors are to be enlarged.

The third contends that he is neither held, nor can communicate. The reason is because the precept obliges from the intention of the Church, and the practice of the Church is that no one communicate twice in a day; nor is there a reason why this case should be excepted.

The fourth, which to St. Alphonsus³ seems more probable, distinguishes between a natural illness, as sudden apoplexy is also reputed, and a violent one, for example from a wound, or if someone has fallen from a height. In the latter case he is held to communicate, because in truth he did not receive Viaticum as constituted in the article of death.³

Query 4° Can the Eucharist be given to a sick person who suffers from a cough?

Resp. Affirmatively, because the danger lest the sacred species be rejected together with phlegm is for the most part absent. And the reason is because the way through which spittle is expelled by coughing is not the esophagus, i.e. the way through which food and drink are conveyed into the stomach, but is the rough artery, through which respiration extends even to the lungs. If nevertheless the cough is so continual that it impedes the host from being conveyed into the stomach, then Communion must be abstained from. - Thus the Roman Ritual. (w) p. 402.

But when the sick person labors under continual vomiting, he cannot communicate, unless perhaps he has been free from vomiting for at least six hours. But in doubt whether the sick person will vomit back the sacred particle, it must not be given to him.² (A) p. 402.

Query 5° In danger of death, is Communion to be given to children who have not yet been admitted to the sacred Synaxis?

Resp. 1° Negatively, if they have not yet obtained the use of reason. The reason is because this is against the present discipline of the Church.

Resp. 2° Affirmatively as regards children who are possessed of reason. Indeed not only can Communion be given to them, but it also ought to be. The reason is because, on the one hand, children constituted in such danger are held from divine precept to communicate, even if the precept of Paschal Communion did not yet oblige them; and on the other hand the utility of the Eucharist then does not demand a greater disposition. Therefore Pastors gravely err who do not wish to administer Viaticum to children of this kind.³

Query 6° Is Viaticum to be given to those recently converted to the faith?

Resp. Affirmatively, "if they have the faith by which Baptism can be ministered to them, together with some knowledge" of the Eucharist; ... otherwise, if Baptism is ministered to them when they have not been sufficiently instructed, or are doubtfully disposed, so that, insofar as it can be done, provision may be made for them.⁴

Query 7° In danger of death, is Communion to be given to the insane, the half-witted, the delirious, and those destitute of the senses?

Resp. 1° As regards the insane: 1) If they have been perpetually insane, Communion is never to be given to them. Thus from the Roman Ritual on the Eucharist. - 2) If they sometimes have lucid intervals, and have manifested the desire of communicating, at least implicitly, Communion can be given to them; indeed it ought to be, danger of irreverence being excluded.⁵ (B) p. 402.

Resp. 2° As regards the half-witted: Communion is to be given to them when they have sufficient discretion to distinguish this heavenly food from others; but rarely, namely only in the article of death, and where the strict precept of communicating urges.¹ (I) p. 403.

Resp. 3° As regards the delirious: Communion can be given to them if they can communicate, danger of irreverence being excluded. But the best practice is that beforehand a non-consecrated particle be given to the sick person, and thus it appear whether he can communicate decently.² (A) p. 403.

Resp. 4° As regards those destitute of the senses: they certainly do not sin when they do not receive Communion, since they are capable of observing no law. But the Pastor is not for that reason dispensed from the obligation of ministering the Eucharist to them, if before the loss of reason they were disposed. For the Sacraments operate *ex opere operato* in those who desired to receive them before they lost the use of reason. Except, however, if danger of irreverence is present, or if it is feared that they cannot swallow the Host. - Thus commonly. - Gousset.³ (A) p. 403.

Query 8° Is Communion to be given to the deaf-mute, the possessed, and epileptics?

Resp. 1° As regards the deaf-mute: Affirmatively, if from signs it is established that they have discretion and are sufficiently instructed. But if they enjoy not merely some discretion, but sufficient discretion, they will be able to communicate more often.⁴

Resp. 2° As regards the possessed, one must distinguish: Communion is to be denied to them when they are not in control of themselves; otherwise it is to be granted. Indeed it is expedient that such persons communicate more often according to the prudence of the confessor, since the Eucharist is a special remedy for warding off demons.⁵

Resp. 3° As regards epileptics: Communion cannot be given to them when they are in an actual paroxysm, on account of the proximate danger of irreverence; but at other times it is not to be denied.⁶ (E) p. 403.

Note. - To those who are deaf-mute and at the same time blind from birth, Communion is to be denied.⁷

Query 9° Ought Communion to be given to those condemned to death?

Resp. Affirmatively. Benedict XIV indeed teaches that "that custom is to be followed which is known respectively to exist in each place";¹ but he calls the usage of ministering the Most Holy Eucharist to them "more conformable to Christian piety." But St. Alphonsus teaches absolutely that it is to be given to them, as they are constituted in the article of death; nevertheless Communion should precede the execution by one hour. And indeed it can be given to one not fasting;² for it is administered by way of Viaticum, as is clear from the Response of the particular Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide concerning Chinese matters, 5 July 1841.

Appendix annotation (omega), to n. 1305. q. 4°. p. 59. col. 2. If the cough were so vehement that it seemed about to excite vomiting, Communion, as is clear of itself, would have to be abstained from, or at least deferred until that more vehement cough has ceased. Capellmann, Past.-Med., p. 154. Appendix annotation (Alpha), to n. 1305. q. 4°. p. 59. col. 2. The distinguished Capellmann, Past.-Med., p. 154 sq., judges that case must be distinguished from case. In place of a rule he has these things: If the sick person has suffered much more frequent vomitings through shorter intervals of time, and then after a longer space of time, which according to the circumstances can be shorter even than six hours, has been free from vomiting, in doubt it can be presumed that the stomach, now somewhat settled, will not at once again be excited to vomiting from the slight irritation through the Sacred Species. Thus those who are laid low by cholera are very frequently

accustomed to vomit; but if these have been free from vomiting for 2, 4, or certainly for 6 hours, it will be a sign that the condition of the sick has been so changed that the danger of vomiting is much less to be feared. On the contrary, if vomiting has taken place through irregular intervals, now longer, now shorter, and the general condition of the sick person has not been changed, Holy Communion cannot be given to him, even if he has been free from vomiting for the space of six hours. Thus, for example, they would have to be free from vomiting at least for 12 hours who have strangulated hernia, or who labor under cerebral diseases, or who are laid low from a wound of the brain, or from a disease of the kidneys, or from peritonitis, that is, inflammation of the bowels. Say the same of pregnant women while they suffer the vomiting proper to them. In particular cases the physician, if he can be had, should be consulted; or, when Viaticum is in question, some solid or liquid food, or even water, should be given by way of experiment to the sick person who has taken absolutely nothing after the last vomiting. After Communion has been administered in these circumstances, let the sick person remain quiet and drink nothing, or, if he must drink something to swallow the Sacred Species, let him drink a little. Cold water will be best, or, if it can be had, water cooled with ice. Ice itself especially is an excellent remedy against vomiting, and one so harmless that, even without consulting a physician, it can be used for this end. But the most advisable thing in this case will be that the sick person swallow ice in little pieces which scarcely exceed the size of a hazelnut. Concerning the so-called morning vomiting, the same author, p. 156, remarks these things. It arises from chronic catarrh of the stomach or throat. Those who are affected by it, and drinkers are affected before others, in the morning, after they have risen from bed or have thrown something into the stomach, are tormented as though by no slight suffocation; and, when the stomach is empty or almost empty, they vomit a certain quantity of phlegm with some remains of food. To these, indeed, if outside the case of Viaticum they are to communicate, nothing remains except that they rise very early in the morning and not approach the church before they have freed themselves by their vomiting. Pregnant women also are accustomed to be tormented by morning vomiting, whether fasting or after the first food has been thrown into the stomach, and this in the first and second, or even the third or fourth, month of gestation. These, as is clear of itself, outside the case of Viaticum, must defer Communion until the danger of vomiting has ceased. Appendix annotation (Beta), to n. 1305. q. 7°. R. 1°. p. 59. col. 2. What if someone had fallen into madness while he was existing in mortal sin? A case could be if someone, having contracted delirium tremens from long-protracted drunkenness, entirely deprived of reason, without a lucid interval, had been reduced to extremities. St. Alphonsus answers, L. VI. 302, that Communion cannot be administered to this man if it is certainly presumed that he fell into madness utterly impenitent, that is, not even attrite. Appendix annotation (Gamma), to n. 1305. q. 7°. R. 2°. p. 60. col. 1. Yet it must be seen in what degree the semi-fatuous are; for there are some who can be equated with those deaf-mutes who, as St. Alphonsus says, L. VI. 303, with Holzmann, are not endowed with any discretion whatever, and whom you would with equal right call dull and semi-fatuous; these, like those deaf-mutes, will often be able to communicate. Appendix annotation (Delta), to n. 1305. q. 7°. R. 3°. R. 4°. p. 60. col. 1. It is also advisable to give to those delirious persons, and generally to those who are destitute of their senses, a little water or wine together with the Sacred Species or immediately after this has been put into the mouth, since these persons easily retain solids, and therefore also the Sacred Species, in the mouth. Thus Capellmann, Past.-Med., p. 152. 153. Appendix annotation (Epsilon), to n. 1305. q. 8°. R. 8°. p. 60. col. 1. Except if the paroxysms followed one another at intervals so brief that there was almost no moment at which danger of them was absent. Yet in this case the disturbance of reason progresses at so swift a pace that they are to be treated as mad or semi-fatuous. There are also some who have learned by experience that paroxysms befall them precisely in church very often, or even always. Communion can be administered to these at home. Capellmann, Past.-Med., p. 153.

ARTICLE II: ON THE DISPOSITIONS REQUIRED IN THE SUBJECT OF THE EUCHARIST 1° AS REGARDS THE SOUL 2° AS REGARDS THE BODY

§ I. ON THE DISPOSITIONS OF THE SOUL

1306. Principles. - I. For receiving the Sacrament of the Eucharist, besides immunity from excommunication (n. 1676) and interdict (n. 1696. q. 1°. q. 2°), there is required the state of grace, at least prudently judged to be present. Otherwise a most grave sacrilege is committed. The reason is clear from the nature of the thing, and also from the words of the Apostle:¹ *But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of the Chalice. For he who, etc.*

II. It does not suffice that the state of grace be acquired by perfect contrition, but it is required that Confession of mortal sins be premised and Sacramental absolution be received, except in a case of necessity, namely either when the supply of a confessor is lacking and Communion cannot be omitted without grave note or suspicion, or when it must be celebrated by a priest so that the people may assist at Mass on a feast day. - Trent.² See St. Alphonsus.³

1307. - Questions. Query 1° When is the supply of a confessor judged to be lacking?

Resp. It is judged to be lacking: 1° If no confessor is present, and, considering the circumstances of weakness, age, business, distance, weather, shortness of time, etc., an absent one cannot be approached without grave difficulty.

2° If no other confessor is present except one ignorant of the language, or lacking jurisdiction, or to whom you cannot confess without grave damage to yourself or another. Nevertheless in these cases perfect contrition is required. But the supply of a confessor is not judged to be lacking if the one to whom you are accustomed to confess is absent; rather any approved confessor must be lacking.¹

But a cause excusing from Confession occurs most rarely for laymen. It can indeed more easily be present as regards priests; but one must surely beware lest, deterred by a vain pretext or by shame and embarrassment, they imagine for themselves a chimerical impossibility.

Query 2° What distance is required, that the priest may be judged to be lacking?

Resp. It cannot be determined rigorously, but depends on circumstances. Some require a distance of two leagues; others one league with a half or a quarter; others one league only. But besides the reason of journey, other reasons often urge, e.g. infirmity or shortness of time. Thus a priest already about to celebrate can be excused from Confession, even if the confessor is distant only 50 paces.²

Query 3° Is he who remembers a mortal sin which from inculpable forgetfulness he did not declare in Confession held to confess it before Communion?

Resp. 1° Certainly not, if the penitent is already at the Sacred Table, or a grave cause of communicating is present, and he can confess again only with difficulty. The reason is because, even if the precept of Confession were present, it would not urge with so great an inconvenience. - Thus all.

Resp. 2° If the penitent can confess or omit Communion without inconvenience, it is controverted: very probably he is neither held to confess, nor to abstain from Communion; because the sin omitted involuntarily has certainly been remitted, although only indirectly; and therefore it in no way stands in the way of Communion to be received. Nor should you say that the precept of Trent of confessing before Communion urges; for the penitent, since he has already been rightly confessed and justified through the Sacrament of Penance, is sufficiently proved, even according to the mind of the Council of Trent. - St. Alphonsus³ and others, against others who more commonly and not improbably held the opposite. - St. Alphonsus inclines more to the former sentence, nevertheless he judges that the second is to be advised in practice, provided that some cause does not counsel otherwise.

Query 4° Is a priest who celebrated, or a layman who communicated conscious of mortal sin, without Confession, because of urgent necessity, held to confess *as soon as possible*?

Resp. 1° As regards the priest, affirmatively. For thus expressly Trent:² "But if, necessity urging, a priest has celebrated without previous Confession, let him confess as soon as possible."

Resp. 2° As regards the layman, negatively, more probably. The reason is because Trent speaks only of priests, as is clear from the text. - Thus most commonly, says St. Alphonsus.³

Query 5° How is that precept imposed on priests of confessing *as soon as possible* to be understood?

Resp. More probably it suffices if the priest confesses within three days; because, since this precept is only ecclesiastical, the word *as soon as possible* can be understood morally, as it is understood in other human laws, where that word, or another similar word, by common interpretation is extended to the space of three days.⁴ - Nevertheless the priest cannot celebrate again before he has confessed, because he was not excused from Confession except on account of present necessity. Hence, if the same necessity of celebrating on the following day urges, and he can confess, he cannot defer Confession to another day.

Query 6° Is a priest celebrating after Confession, in which he inculpably forgot some mortal sin, held to confess *as soon as possible*?

Resp. 1° Negatively, if he remembers the sin after celebration; because he did not celebrate conscious of that sin, as Trent speaks. - Thus commonly.

Resp. 2° Negatively, very probably, even if he remembers the sin before celebration; because since he has premised Confession, although he forgot some grave sin, nevertheless he cannot be said to have celebrated conscious of mortal sin without previous Confession. St. Alphonsus¹ calls this sentence very probable, after Lacroix and others against Suarez, Lugo, etc.

Query 7° Is a priest celebrating sacrilegiously, when necessity does not urge, or, if it does urge, when the supply of a confessor is not lacking, held to confess *as soon as possible*?

Resp. Negatively. The reason is because the precept of Trent is ordered only to striking fear into those who defer Confession under pretext of necessity, not however into those celebrating sacrilegiously, to whom a precept of this kind would very rarely be of profit; for those who, having contemned the divine precept, dare to celebrate sacrilegiously, would surely more easily condemn the precept of the Church. - Thus most commonly and more truly, St. Alphonsus.²

Query 8° Does affection to some venial sin impede the whole fruit of Communion?

Resp. Negatively. The reason is because the will can well experience pious movements toward God and the Sacrament, although it retains some lightly disordered affection toward a particular thing; therefore one communicating with such an affection is not deprived of every fruit of the Eucharist.³

§ II. ON THE DISPOSITIONS OF THE BODY

A twofold disposition is required on the part of the body, namely 1° fasting; 2° decency.

POINT I. ON THE FAST REQUIRED FOR COMMUNION.

1308. - Principles. I. From the precept of the Church, for Communion there is required natural fasting, or total abstinence after midnight from any thing whatever, however minimal, which by way of food, drink, or medicine is conveyed into the stomach, with certain cases nevertheless excepted. It

is established 1° from the universal custom of the Church and unanimous tradition; 2° from all Catechisms and Rituals approved by the Church;³ 3° from the Councils and especially from Constance.⁴

II. For breaking that fast, according to the common sentence three conditions are required, namely 1° That what is taken be taken from without and be conveyed into the stomach: for what does not come from without, even if it is voluntarily swallowed, or what is not conveyed into the stomach, but e.g. sticks in the throat, is not said to be eaten; for things which are eaten come from without and are destined for the stomach. Hence blood flowing from the mouth, tongue, gums, etc. does not break the fast.¹

2° That something be taken by way of eating or drinking. The reason is because according to common sense the natural fast is broken only in this way. Hence whatever is drawn by way of respiration or saliva in no way breaks the fast. Thus you remain fasting, although through respiration you swallow dust or a fly, by accident, namely, and not on purpose.²

3° That the thing taken have the character of food or drink, that is, that it be something alterable in the stomach and apt for nutrition. The reason is because otherwise, according to the common mode of understanding, there is not eating nor drinking. For no one is said to eat iron, glass, etc. - Thus commonly the Theologians with St. Thomas,³ St. Alphonsus.⁴

III. From the Response of the Sacred Penitentiary, dated 18 June 1873, it must be gathered that as regards the moment at which the obligation begins of the natural fast, the ecclesiastical fast, the divine office, etc., one must stand by public clocks, or those designated by the Magistrate for indicating noon; and this even if they do not mark true time, but only mean time, or the mean time not of one's own meridian, but of another, e.g. of the metropolis.⁵

Addendum and Corrigendum. - What is said in this place is to be understood according to the following response of the Sacred Penitentiary. "Whether, where clocks accommodated to mean time are used, one must stand by them both for fulfilling the burden of the Divine Office and for observing the natural fast; or whether one ought, or at least can, use true time? The Sacred Penitentiary responded: The faithful, in observing the natural fast and in reciting the Divine Office, can follow mean time, but are not bound to do so. - On 29 Nov. 1882."

1309. Questions. - Query 1° Does the swallowing of remnants of food which adhere between the teeth break the fast?

Resp. 1° Negatively if it is involuntary, because it does not have the character of food. It is established also from the Rubric of the Missal.⁶ - Thus all.

Resp. 2° If it is voluntary, it is controverted.

The first sentence, which to St. Alphonsus² does not seem improbable, denies; because such remnants are morally reputed parts of the eating of the preceding day, and not of a new one, and they are not taken by way of food, although on purpose, but by way of saliva. - See the Rubric.¹

The second sentence affirms; because such a swallowing, since it is done deliberately, seems to be a new eating. - Thus Roncaglia, etc. St. Alphonsus² says that this sentence is more common and more probable, and altogether to be counseled; nevertheless he warns that one must not act scrupulously in this, so that it suffices to spit out those remnants which are sensibly perceived on the tongue, and

there is no obligation to employ diligence to draw them out from the teeth, even if otherwise they are foreseen to be swallowed.

Query 2° Do little drops of water or broth tasted and mixed with saliva break the fast if they are swallowed?

Resp. 1° Negatively, if they are swallowed accidentally beyond intention, provided they are not in great quantity. The same must be said of the little drops which are involuntarily swallowed while washing the mouth. The reason is because they are not taken by way of nutrition. It is established also from the Rubric of the Missal.³

Resp. 2° Affirmatively, if they are swallowed on purpose. The reason is because then nothing is lacking so that they have the character of food or drink.⁴

Query 3° Does tobacco powder taken through the nostrils dissolve the fast?

Resp. Negatively, even if something is transmitted into the stomach. The reason is because, although such matter is nutritive, nevertheless it is not taken by way of eating, unless it is done on purpose.⁵

Query 4° Does tobacco smoke or similar smoke dissolve the fast?

Resp. Negatively, because in the common estimation of men tobacco smoke is neither food nor drink, nor is it taken by eating or drinking. On account of the same reason it must be said that those do not break the fast who draw in through both mouth and nostrils the smoke of foods in a kitchen. And this holds even if the smoke is voluntarily sent into the stomach.⁶ - The same seems to be said concerning the juice or odor of camphor, which is drawn in by way of tobacco smoke (in French: *cigarette de Raspail*).

Query 5° Does he dissolve the fast who takes a leaf of tobacco, or a spice, in order to bruise it with the teeth and spit out phlegm?

Resp. Negatively, probably, even if a little of the juice inseparably mixed with saliva is swallowed, nevertheless beyond intention; because, if this is swallowed accidentally, it is conveyed not by way of food, but by way of saliva. But all agree that chewing of this kind before Communion is indecent; hence it does not seem to be excused from venial fault, unless some reasonable cause intervenes.¹

Query 6° Can he communicate who doubts whether after midnight he has taken food or drink, or on the same day has swallowed something?

Resp. Affirmatively, as is clear from what was said n. 67. 1°. a). Except if presumptions to the contrary are so strong that the one acting believes more probably that twelve o'clock has already sounded.²

Query 7° Is it lawful to eat and drink immediately after Communion?

Resp. Formerly indeed after Communion the fast was prescribed until Sext. But this precept has long since been abrogated. Nevertheless from decency some delay must be observed between the reception of this Sacrament and other foods, at least as long as the consecrated species, not yet wholly corrupted, persevere in the stomach, unless nevertheless there is some reasonable cause of taking something immediately; otherwise such eating, on account of irreverence, is not excused from venial fault.³

Query 8° Is it illicit to spit after Communion?

Resp. Negatively, of itself, provided that no fragment of the Host has remained in the mouth. For there is no danger of irreverence toward the sacred species; since the way through which spittle flows together into the mouth is not the esophagus, or the way of food and drink, but is the way of respiration. Nevertheless all agree that it is fitting that those who have communicated abstain from spitting for some interval of time.⁴

Query 9° When is it lawful to communicate someone not fasting?

Resp. One not fasting communicates lawfully 1° in danger of death, from whatever cause it comes; 2° in danger lest the Eucharist perish or be badly handled, e.g. by heretics, impious persons; 3° in proximate danger of grave scandal from omission of the Sacrifice or Communion; 4° in necessity of completing the Sacrifice or Communion, e.g. if the priest has taken water for the species of wine, etc.¹ (9) p. 417.

Query 10° Is moral certainty of danger of death required, that Viaticum can be ministered to one not fasting?

Resp. Negatively, but a prudent doubt suffices, or probability of danger (for probability of the article of death is not required, if with some it is pleasing to distinguish danger from article), especially when it is to be feared lest the sick person be seized by sudden death. Indeed Pastors and parents or relatives of the sick are to be gravely reproved, who from carelessness or vain fear so prolong the administration of Sacred Viaticum that the sick are in danger of dying without the Eucharist.² But if the sick person could easily receive Viaticum fasting on the following day, he would be held to wait. Nevertheless in this matter one must not proceed scrupulously, since the Council of Constance simply excepts the dangerously sick from the law of fasting.³

Query 11° Is it ever lawful to give Communion to a sick person not fasting, and not dangerously bedridden, if the illness is long-lasting?

Resp. It must be denied, given the present practice of the Church, unless the illness is of such a kind that of itself it can induce danger of death. Nevertheless some Theologians permit this at times, if the illness is long-lasting, and the sick person can never communicate altogether fasting, provided it be done rarely, e.g. some times in the year. - Thus Elbel.⁴ But the most common sentence of Theologians with Suarez contradicts, who asserts that only the Pope can dispense in this law. In fact, the Supreme Pontiff is accustomed to dispense rarely and only from a grave cause, nevertheless even with private persons (as I myself know from a particular case), and not only, as formerly almost, with public persons or from a public cause, that they may communicate once, three times, or even several times in the year. But then there is a sufficient reason why sometimes the Eucharist can be administered to a sick person after midnight. The reason why this can be done only by dispensation of the Pope is that otherwise this law of the Church would be too much relaxed. See, if you please, Benedict XIV, the Brief *Quodam de more*, dated 24 March 1756, handing down the history of this law.

Appendix annotation (9), to n. 1309. q. 9°. p. 64. col. 1. Add from the response given by S. C. de Prop. Fide to the Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Tonkin, 13 Feb. 1806, the following case. "When salt has been tasted beforehand by Catechumens in the conferral of Baptism, although the fast seems to be broken, nevertheless there is still no doubt that, after Baptism has been received, they can be admitted to Sacred Communion; indeed, they ought to be admitted. Thus altogether the Church, in whose power it is to dispense in peculiar cases from the general law of the Eucharistic fast, introduced by itself for those

who desire to receive Sacred Communion outside danger of death, prescribes in the Roman Ritual, where it hands down the rite by which Baptism is to be conferred upon adults." Collect. p. 161 n. 282.

POINT II. ON DECENCY OF THE BODY.

1310. Principles. - **I.** By natural law that exterior habit and that composition of body are required which exhibit the internal reverence and devotion of the soul. The reason is clear: for not only internal, but also external veneration is due to this most august Sacrament, since Christ himself, by means of the species, exists and is handled in it in a certain sensible way.

II. No stain whatever of the body of itself impedes Communion, since the Eucharist is only food of the soul, nor is purity diminished by stains of the body, which contribute nothing to moral goodness or malice.¹ - Nevertheless the decency and reverence due to so great a Sacrament require that, if dirt appearing externally can be removed, it be diligently removed.

III. There is no obligation of abstaining from Communion on account of hidden stains of the body, or even those appearing externally, but indelible.² - If nevertheless external stains, here and now indelible, are very notable and ought to cease shortly, it will be becoming, where it can conveniently be done, to defer Communion. But when they last longer, there is no reason why someone should be deprived of heavenly nourishment. - Thus commonly.

1311. Resolves. - 1° Women ought to approach holy Communion in holy ornament, redolent of modesty; if some should present themselves to the Sacred Table very indecently (see n. 1233. 19), Communion would have to be denied to them, with due cautions nevertheless for preventing scandals as far as can be done.

2° Leprosy, flow of blood, and similar things, which happen without fault of the sufferer, of themselves do not prohibit from Communion, because those blemishes do not stand in the way of devotion, which is the disposition required for Communion.³ - After a voluntary pollution had shortly before, to approach holy Communion, although someone is contrite and confessed, they say is venial, unless scandal or another just cause demands Communion; the same holds after one venially evil, or even involuntary, if it leaves disturbance in the mind. They except if the one about to communicate endeavors to repel this as much as he can, or some just cause of necessity or devotion is present.¹ - Concerning Communion after conjugal intercourse it will be said n. 1646. 7°.

3° A priest infected with leprosy, or another infirmity exciting horror, can celebrate, but not in public; for thus it is established from Canon Law.²

4° It is fitting from decency and Christian humility that soldiers about to communicate approach the Sacred Table with arms laid aside. Nevertheless they are obliged to this by no law.³ - The same should be said of laymen wearing gloves. "But priests," says the Roman Ritual, "should communicate with stole."

Notes to n. 1311. (1) L. VI. 272. Rubric of the Missal, de defect. Tit. 9. n. 5. (2) L. VI. 275. (3) Ib. 1. L. VI. 272. 2. Ib. 3. Ib. 275.

APPENDIX I: ON FREQUENT COMMUNION

1312. By the name of frequent Communion, commonly with St. Alphonsus, are understood in the stricter sense those Communions which, besides Sundays or feast days, are made also on ferial days without previous Confession.

It is certain, 1) frequent Communion, even daily, has always been most desired in the Church. It is established 1° from the common agreement of the Fathers, who always earnestly commended it to the faithful. It is established 2° from Trent,⁴ where it says: "The holy Synod would indeed wish that at individual Masses the faithful standing by communicate, not only with spiritual affection, but also by sacramental reception of the Eucharist, by which the fruit of this Most Holy Sacrifice may come to them." It is established 3° from the Decree of Innocent XI of the year 1679, and also from the common agreement of Doctors. Therefore frequent Communion is greatly to be praised, and earnestly to be urged upon the faithful by Pastors and also by confessors. It is certain, 2) days for receiving the Sacred Eucharist cannot be established generally; nor are those to be kept away from it who desire to approach frequently, unless they seem unworthy. Therefore this whole matter must be left to the judgment of confessors, who, according to purity of conscience and the fruit perceived from the Sacred Table, ought to prescribe that which they judge will profit individuals more. 3) As regards Sacred Virgins, if they ask Sacred Communion daily, "they will be admonished that they communicate on the days established by the institute of their Order; but if some shine with purity of mind and have grown warm with fervor of spirit in such a way that they may seem worthy of more frequent or daily reception of the Most Holy Sacrament, let this be permitted to them by Superiors." - Thus from the same Decree of Innocent XI.¹ Cf. n. 1189. 5°.

1313. - According to the mind of St. Alphonsus,² and of others reported by him, the doctrine on frequent Communion can be constrained in a few general rules thus.

First Rule. - Monthly Communion is to be denied to no one sufficiently disposed; indeed it is to be advised most greatly to all, even if they live a life entangled in secular business; for otherwise it is very difficult to persevere long in divine grace, on account of innumerable occasions, and the quasi-forgetting of eternal things. - Thus commonly.

Second Rule. - Weekly Communion is to be permitted, indeed also advised, to those who by habit do not commit grave faults: nevertheless for those who labor under several light vices and are not at all solicitous concerning amendment, it will sometimes be useful to interdict Communion for some week, namely that they may be stirred up with some zeal to casting aside vices.³

Third Rule. - Frequent Communion, or several times in the week, can be permitted, or even advised, to those in whom these three things are found: 1) Flight from fully deliberate venial sin, and absence of voluntary affection to venial sin, i.e. to its matter. 2) Study of Christian perfection and desire of Communion. 3) Exercise of mental prayer and mortification.⁴ - Thus regularly speaking; for exceptionally it can also be granted "to some who" lack the aforesaid dispositions, but "would be in danger of falling into lethal sins, that they may receive strength for resisting."¹

Fourth Rule. - Daily Communion is to be granted to those who, besides the two former things aforesaid, devote themselves much to prayer and mortification and for the greater part have overcome

evil desires. "Except, ordinarily speaking, one day in any week ... and that time in which" directors wish "to deprive their penitents of Communion for proving their obedience, or humility, or on account of some just cause."² It can also be granted on account of some particular passing circumstance, e.g. on account of a novena.

APPENDIX II: ON SPIRITUAL COMMUNION

1314. - Spiritual Communion is called the pious desire of receiving the Sacrament of the Eucharist, when it cannot really be received. This Communion was very much in delight among the Saints, and is commended by Trent.³ It is very useful to pious faithful. For if God rewards the pious desire of any virtue whatever, how much more the desire of possessing himself! Therefore it is to be carefully suggested by confessors to the faithful, their penitents, and most vehemently commended. Spiritual Communion can be made at every time and in every place, both in the morning and in the evening. Nevertheless the more opportune time is the time of Mass itself, when namely the priest communicates; for then, since the most august Sacrament is shown to the eyes and represented more vividly to the mind, it will inflame hearts more ardently with divine love.

Notes to n. 1314. (3) Sess. 13. c. 8.

APPENDIX III: ON THE FIRST COMMUNION OF CHILDREN

1315. - "As regards children," says the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore,⁴ "who approach the Sacred Table for the first time, let it be permitted to apply to our matter the excellent words of the Fathers of Ravenna. It cannot be but that the manner in which one receives Holy Communion for the first time contributes much to the whole plan of Christian life, and indeed even to eternal salvation itself. Hence let all rulers of souls carefully see to disposing for it girls and boys whom by age and sufficient understanding of spiritual things they judge capable. Let them instruct them with special zeal, diligently inquire into their life, and admit to the Sacred Table those whom they understand to be already sufficiently instructed in the rudiments of Christian doctrine, and to be commended by probity of morals and piety, sending the rest away to another time, all human respect being set aside. But for three days before Communion, let them be prepared proximately for it both by pious exercises and especially by general Confession; but on the day itself, with the greatest solemnity, let them receive the Divine Bread, with the whole people looking on, and especially the parents, to whose care afterwards those souls, refreshed by the heavenly Banquet, will have to be commended by Pastors with the most fervent zeal of charity."¹

"But at what age children ought first to be refreshed with the Eucharistic Food has not been defined by the Church. St. Thomas, having used a general form of speaking, taught that this Sacrament can be conferred on them when they begin to have some use of reason, so that they can conceive devotion for this Sacrament."² Therefore it will belong to pastors to inquire diligently concerning this matter, lest anyone either through carelessness be admitted too soon, or through severity be kept away longer than is fitting. But this general rule, which nevertheless admits its exceptions, seems safely able to be established, namely that, ordinarily speaking, no one ought to be made a sharer of the Bread of Angels before the tenth year, nor after the fourteenth year ought it to be denied to anyone otherwise worthy."³

Notes to n. 1315. (4) a. 260. 261. (1) a. 1855. P. II. c. 4. Decr. 7. (2) P. III. q. 80. a. 9. (3) Syn. dioec. Sabinae a. 1844. P. III. c. 2. §§ 6. 7. Cf. Laymann, L. 5. Tr. 4. c. 4. n. 3.

PART SECOND: ON THE EUCHARIST AS SACRIFICE

The Eucharist has not only the character of a Sacrament, but also of a Sacrifice.

It must be treated 1° of the nature and virtue of the Sacrifice of the Mass; 2° of the application of the Sacrifice of the Mass; 3° of the obligation of celebrating Mass; 4° of the time and place of celebration; 5° of the manner of celebrating.

CHAPTER I: ON THE NATURE AND VIRTUE OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

Sacrifice taken generally is thus commonly defined: The external oblation of a sensible thing with its destruction or change, made to God alone through a legitimate Minister, in protestation of his supreme dominion.

1316. Principles. - I. The Mass is a true Sacrifice of the new law.

II. The Sacrifice of the Mass perfectly contains the characters of all the sacrifices of the old law, or it is latreutic, etc.

III. The unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass is certainly the same as the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, not only because the same victim is offered, but also because the formal character of Sacrifice is the same, namely through protestation of the supreme dominion which God has over life and death. Wherefore the Sacrifice of the Altar differs from the Sacrifice of the Cross not indeed essentially, but only accidentally, namely as regards the manner of offering.

These principles are proved and more broadly explained in Dogmatic Theology.

Notes to nn. 1316-1317 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 305. Notes to nn. 1316-1317 - note sequence 2. (1) De Euch. D. 19. n. 188. (2) L. V. Decr. T. XXXIX. c. 28. St. Alphonsus, L. VI. 308. Lacroix, n. 33. (3) L. VI. 309. (4) N. Rev. Th. T. 3. p. 298 sv. Notes to nn. 1316-1317 - note sequence 3. (1) Nouv. Rev. Th. T. 12. p. 558 sv. (2) L. VI. 309. (3) Apud Gury. Ed. Rom. 1873. T. II. n. 349 (). Notes to nn. 1316-1317 - note sequence 4. (1) L. VI. 312. Notes to nn. 1316-1317 - note sequence 5. (1) L. VI. 312 and the cited work, Sess. XXII. n. 22. (2) Sess. 22. c. 2 and Can. 3. 3. 26. 28. 4. Th. Dogm. vol. VIII. n. 282. 5. L. VI. 310. 6. Suppl. q. 71. a. 9 ad 5. 7. S. R. C. 29 Nov. 1856.

1317. Questions. - Query 1° In what does the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass consist?

Resp. It is controverted. Not a few hold that the essence of the Sacrifice consists in the Consecration and partially in the Consumption, because in the Consecration the victim is placed, and in the Consumption it is consumed. St. Alphonsus holds this opinion as the more probable.¹

Query 2° For whom can the Sacrifice of the Mass be offered?

It must be premised. In offering Sacrifice the priest acts in three ways, namely in the name of Christ, in the name of the Church, and in his own name. Those things which he does in the name of Christ comprise the essence of Sacrifice properly so called; but in the name of the Church he performs the ceremonies and pours forth the prayers which the Church prescribes for the celebration of this Sacrifice; but he acts in his own name insofar as the good and meritorious work which he places by sacrificing pertains to his person as such. - These things having been premised:

Resp. In general it can be offered for all for whom, at least as impetratory, it can be of profit. Hence:

1° Validly, at least in the name of Christ and in one's own name, it is offered for all, whether living or dead, except only the damned and infants dead without Baptism.

2° Validly and lawfully it is offered, and this in the threefold manner which we have described, for all living faithful, even for sinners not excommunicated, but for these only as regards the fruit of impetration.

3° As regards living excommunicated persons: a) Certainly it is lawful indirectly, even in the name of the Church, e.g. for their conversion, for the propagation of the Faith, etc., "insofar as their good results in the enlargement of the Church," as Lugo says. b) If there is question of the Sacrifice to be offered directly and in particular for some excommunicated person, distinguish between those to be avoided, or nominally excommunicated, and the tolerated. - For those to be avoided it is lawful in one's own name, but not in the name of Christ or of the Church.² - But for the tolerated, of itself, it is more probably lawful even in the name of the Church, because the faithful are permitted to communicate with them, even in divine things.³ I said: of itself; because, if there is question of heretics and schismatics, several Responses of the Holy See prove that in practice this is not lawful, by reason of scandal, etc.⁴

4° In the name of the Church, neither publicly (as is clear of itself and all admit) nor secretly (as almost all hold) is it lawful to offer for the dead to whom ecclesiastical burial is to be denied, for instance for notorious heretics and schismatics. For under the name of burial are understood whatever suffrages are customarily made by the Church for the dead; but among these, Masses celebrated in the name of the Church, even secretly, hold the first place.¹

Note. What has been said concerning tolerated excommunicated persons holds more probably also concerning unbelievers.² It is confirmed from the following Response of the Holy Office, which, to the proposed doubt: "Whether it is lawful for priests to celebrate Mass for the intention of Turks and other unbelievers, and to accept from them alms for the application of Mass?" on Wednesday, 12 July 1865, responded: "Affirmatively, provided that scandal is not present, and nothing is added specially in the Mass, and as regards the intention it is established that nothing of evil, or error, or superstition underlies the unbelievers offering the alms."³ (10) p. 418.

Query 3° Of how many kinds is the fruit of the Sacrifice of the Mass?

Resp. The fruit of the Mass is distinguished under a twofold head, namely on the part of the one offering and on the part of the victim.

I. On the part of the one offering. Since the one offering is twofold, namely Christ and the priest, hence there is a twofold kind of fruit of the Mass on the part of the one offering. The first comes from Christ offering, and is said to be *ex opere operato*, because it is received in view of the merits of Christ and his promise. The other comes from the priest offering, insofar as it is received in view of the merit and devotion of the priest celebrating, and is called fruit *ex opere operantis*. - Hence it happens that a Sacrifice offered by a holy priest, insofar as it is considered *ex opere operato*, is not of more profit than if it were offered by an unworthy Minister; because the Sacrifice, considered thus, is the work of Christ, and fruit flows only from the merits of Christ. Wherefore in this sense it can rightly be said that the Mass of a bad priest is worth as much as the Mass of a good priest. But otherwise it must be said if the merit *ex opere operantis* is considered; for the worthier the priest is and the greater the devotion with which he is endowed, by so much the greater does the fruit of the Mass become.

II. On the part of the victim. Under this head a threefold fruit of the Sacrifice is distinguished, namely general, special, most special.

1° The general fruit is that which corresponds to the Sacrifice insofar as it is a work placed by the priest, according as he operates in the name of the whole Church. And indeed all the Faithful, both living and dwelling in purgatory, perceive this fruit; but it is assigned to them only by way of

impetration (by force of which contrition and thus also remission of sins can be obtained), not however, as it seems, by way of satisfaction, because from the thousands of Sacrifices which are offered daily, any just man, even unknowingly, would obtain the remission of immense punishment, which appears incredible. - Those assisting at the Sacrifice, and *a fortiori* those cooperating in it, e.g. those serving the priest, etc., participate in this general fruit in a more abundant or more special manner. But this fruit, as being *ex opere operantis*, is the more abundant, the greater the devotion and holiness of those assisting and cooperating. Thus Gury; but St. Alphonsus calls the fruit accruing to those assisting and cooperating special (others call it middle or ministerial), nor does he distinguish between *opus operatum* and *operantis*. - But, as ministerial:

2° The special fruit is that which comes to him or to those to whom the priest specially applies the Sacrifice. These participate *ex opere operato* in the Sacrifice as it is impetratory and propitiatory; indeed also, provided nothing stands in the way, as it is satisfactory.

3° The most special fruit is that which comes to the priest offering, insofar as he is a private person offering. For if any cooperators perceive from the Sacrifice a fruit entirely special, much more ought the priest who sacrifices to perceive this. But whether the priest can apply this fruit to others is uncertain.¹

Query 4° Is the value of the Sacrifice of the Mass infinite?

Resp. 1° It is certainly infinite if it is considered in itself, or in the thing offered and in the excellence of the dignity of Christ offering. For Christ himself in this Sacrifice is at the same time the victim and the principal one offering. Wherefore the Mass is the oblation of a victim of infinite price, made by Christ as primary offerer, who has infinite merit.

Resp. 2° It cannot be infinite as regards the application made to individual men, or as regards the effect or fruit. The reason is because creatures are not capable of perceiving infinite fruit; but the application can be greater or lesser, according as the disposition or capacity of him to whom it is applied has been greater or lesser.

But it is controverted whether the application of the fruit of the Sacrifice is restricted to a certain degree, or is made indefinitely according to the capacity of those for whom it is offered.

The sentence today, says St. Alphonsus, most common, and which speculatively seems more probable, contends that the application is made indefinitely according to the capacity of the faithful for whom it is offered. - The reason is because the value of the Sacrifice is in itself infinite; hence of itself it can be applied to innumerable men, without being able to be exhausted. Otherwise the holy Doctor teaches in the work *contro gli eretici pretesi riform.*, where he teaches that the fruit, from the will of Christ, is restricted to a certain degree.¹

Query 5° Is the Mass of profit to the dead from an infallible promise of Christ?

Resp. Affirmatively. For Mass is usefully offered for the dead, as is established from Trent.² Moreover this cannot be done except from the promise of Christ, which is related in Matthew:³ *This is my Blood ... which shall be poured out for many unto the remission of sins*. It is established also from the words of the form in the conferral of Order: *Receive the power of offering Sacrifice to God, and of celebrating Masses both for the living and for the dead, in the name of the Lord. Amen.* - Nevertheless temporal punishment is not

remitted to the dead by a certain law, but it is of profit to them only by way of suffrage, according as it shall have pleased God to accept it. - See Perrone.⁴

Query 6° Is a Mass of Requiem of more profit to the dead than a Mass of the Saints?

Resp. Negatively as regards the substance, or on the part of the Sacrifice; but certainly as regards accidentals, or on the part of the prayers, whose defect devotion can supply. - St. Alphonsus,⁵ after St. Thomas.⁶

It must be noted here that a Mass of Requiem and in black can be applied for a living person, provided that he who gives the alms has not expressly declared the opposite.⁷

Appendix annotation (10), to n. 1317. q. 2°. Note. p. 68. col. 1. For deceased unbelievers, however, "if they truly die in unbelief, it is altogether not lawful" to offer Sacrifice, S. C. de Prop. Fide responded to the Dominican Missionaries in China, 12 Sept. 1645. Collect. p. 188 n. 369.

CHAPTER II: ON THE APPLICATION OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

The application of the Sacrifice of the Mass is the intention by which the priest wills that the fruit of the Sacrifice yield to the advantage of a certain person.

1318. Principles. - I. In order that a part of the general fruit be perceived, the application of the priest is not necessary; but it suffices that he wish to celebrate according to the mind of the Church: for such an application is always implicitly included in the general intention of the celebrant. Likewise, in order that the most special fruit come to the priest himself, it is not necessary that he wish to apply it specially to himself; for this is always of itself applied to him. Indeed there are those who think that this fruit is so proper to him that it cannot be applied to another.

II. Nevertheless the application of the priest is required, in order that the special or ministerial fruit come to someone. For the priest, and indeed he alone, bears the person of Christ; therefore, just as he alone in the person of Christ offers the Sacrifice for others, so also he alone applies its fruit.

III. The special fruit, applied to no one or to one incapable, remains in the general treasury of the Church.¹

1319. Questions. - Query 1° Must the application of the fruit of the Mass be actual?

Resp. Negatively; but it suffices that it be habitual, namely that once made it is not retracted. The reason is because this application is made by way of donation, which is valid until it is revoked. - Nevertheless it is expedient to make the application of the Mass before it is begun. But if the priest has not done this before the Consecration, afterwards he cannot specially apply the Sacrifice to anyone.²

Query 2° If a priest, forgetful of the prior intention, elicits a new one while celebrating, which one must be judged valid?

Resp. In general it cannot be defined. Let the priest see what sort of intention was predominant in his mind. For the rest, in practice it matters little; for since either one or the other is certainly valid, it will be enough another time to apply the Sacrifice to him to whom it was not applied.

Query 3° Must the intention of the celebrant be explicitly determined?

Resp. Negatively. For it suffices that it be determined implicitly. Thus the application is valid if you say: I offer this Sacrifice for him who gave the stipend, - for whom the Superior wishes the Sacrifice to be made, - for whom the foundation demands, - for the greatest sinner, - for the soul afflicted by graver temptation, - for the suffering soul needing greater help, or more pleasing to God, - for all the souls of Purgatory, - for him to whom I am held to apply, - for the person or intention determined by writing or by mind at the beginning of the week, etc. - On the contrary, this application is not valid: I offer, that God may apply this Sacrifice.¹

Query 4° If a priest has received stipends from ten persons, does he satisfy by celebrating with a confused and indeterminate intention?

Resp. In no way, negatively; because a determinate intention at least to a certain person is required; otherwise there is no reason why the Mass should be applied to one rather than to another, and thus it would be applied to no one. - Nevertheless, if he intended to apply any Mass whatever to those ten persons, by applying to each one a tenth part of any Mass whatever, he would satisfy the obligation; because the fruit of the Sacrifice is divisible, and to each one is assigned what is owed to him: for each one, perceiving in each of the ten Masses a tenth part of the fruit, when the tenth Sacrifice has been done, has already obtained the whole fruit owed to him.¹

Query 5° How is the application to be determined, when stipends are given by many unknown persons?

Resp. The intention is to be made for those who first gave the stipends. This easily succeeds when the same priest is going to satisfy all the obligations; nor does it stand in the way that he perhaps distributes part of the Masses to be celebrated to other priests: because he can distribute them in the same order in which he received them; and thus the application seems sufficiently determined. Greater difficulty seems to be present if a sacristan or another person has collected many stipends from diverse persons, and distributes the mixed money to several priests; which case is obvious and frequent. How then is the application of the Mass to be made? I respond: nothing else is to be done, nor can anything else morally be done, than that the application be made according to the order of time in which the stipends were given by the faithful, according to the axiom which is sometimes used in the matter of justice: *He who is prior in time is stronger in right*. Indeed it is not necessary that the priest explicitly attend to this; since he is judged to wish to act thus, since natural equity demands it. Hence, if from a common heap, or from a distributor of Masses, you have received stipends for 20 Masses, no other care ought to fall upon you, except that you make the Sacrifice twenty times according to the intention of the giver. The distributor himself is judged to have the same implicit intention, that he distribute the stipends successively according to antiquity of time. Nevertheless the priest can interrupt the aforesaid order by express intention from some just cause, e.g. if some other Mass urges, or he has received a greater stipend that the Sacrifice not be deferred, etc.

Notes to n. 1319. (1) L. VI. 336. (2) Ib. 335 and H. A. Tr. XV. 80. Exam. Ord. n. 110. (1) L. VI. 335.

CHAPTER III: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING

This obligation can be considered under a threefold respect: 1° by reason of the priesthood; 2° by reason of office; 3° by reason of stipend.

ARTICLE I: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING BY REASON OF THE PRIESTHOOD

1320. - I say: All priests, by reason of the Priesthood, are bound by divine law, under grave obligation, to celebrate at some time. This is proved from the words of Christ:¹ *Do this in commemoration of me.* By these words, according to the testimony of the Council of Trent, Christ commanded the Apostles and their successors to offer Sacrifice. Moreover, all priests in their ordination receive not only the power, but also the charge and office annexed to it, of sacrificing. Hence the Apostle:² *For every Pontiff taken from among men is appointed for men in those things which are toward God, that he may offer gifts and Sacrifices.* But in a grave matter anyone is gravely bound to execute an office undertaken. Therefore ... Thus St. Thomas.³ See St. Alphonsus.⁴

Notes to n. 1320. (1) Luke 22. 19. (2) Hebr. 5. 1. (3) P. III. q. 82. a. 10. (4) L. VI. 313. Notes to nn. 1320-1324 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 319. (2) Instit. 56. n. 10. (3) L. VI. 320. Dub. 1. (4) Inst. 56. n. 11. St. Alphonsus, L. VI. 320. Dub. 3. (5) a. 369. (6) L. VI. 317. q. II. (7) Ib. Notes to nn. 1320-1324 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 317. q. II. (2) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 371. (3) L. VI. 317. q. III.

1321. Questions. - Query 1° How often in life or in the year is a priest bound to celebrate?

Resp. It is not clearly established. It seems *more probable* that he is not bound to celebrate except three or four times in the year, or on the more solemn feasts. Indeed it appears not improbable that a priest has satisfied his office if, on whatever days at last, he offers Sacrifice three or four times in the year.

Query 2° Is he excused from every sin who celebrates only four times in the year?

Resp. No. For he does not seem to be excused from some venial sin. Thus commonly according to the mind of Trent,² where it is said: "Let the Bishop take care that they" (Presbyters) "celebrate Masses at least on Lord's days and solemn feasts." Indeed Holy Mother Church desires that a priest offer Sacrifice on individual days, and pious priests are accustomed very rarely to omit it.

Notes to n. 1321. (1) L. VI. 313. Dub. 2. (2) Sess. 23. c. 14. Ref.

ARTICLE II: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING BY REASON OF OFFICE

1322. - I say I. All Pastors of souls, by natural and divine law, are bound at some time to celebrate for their sheep. The reason is because they ought to feed them. This is also established from Trent,³ where it says thus: "Since by divine precept it has been commanded to all to whom the care of souls has been committed, to know their sheep, to offer Sacrifice for them," etc.

I say II. The same, by ecclesiastical law, are bound to celebrate for their sheep on all Sundays and on the days brought forward by Our Most Holy Lord Pius IX in the Encyclical *Amantissimi Redemptoris*, 3 May 1858 (see p. 87), from several Decrees of the Church, but especially from the Constitution of Benedict XIV, *Cum semper*.⁴ To this, however, not only secular Pastors are bound, but also Regulars;

likewise those who for a time or removably, e.g. on account of the absence or infirmity of the Pastor, are deputed to supply his office, as Vice-pastors.⁵ Indeed a Pastor set over two parishes (but not a Bishop set over two dioceses¹) is bound, outside the case of an indult, to apply 2 Masses, unless the union of the two parishes is plenary and extinctive, so that from two parochial Churches there has entirely come to be one, by the extinction of the title of the other.² That burden belongs *a fortiori* to Ordinaries after possession of the See has been obtained,³ but not to Vicars Capitular.⁴ Missionaries, however, and Vicars Apostolic (provided there is not question of places in which Episcopal Sees and Parishes have already been canonically erected, and Vicars Apostolic and Missionaries have been sent to them to perform the duties of legitimate Pastors), and titular Bishops, are by no means bound to apply Masses, although from charity it is becoming that they do so. V. T. I. (§), p. 471.

Query. Is a Pastor or Bishop who is ill, or prevented from celebration for another cause, bound on feast days to celebrate for the people through another?

Resp. It must be answered affirmatively, because that burden is not merely personal, but at the same time real, not otherwise than the burden of preaching, which consequently can and must be fulfilled through another.⁶

Notes to n. 1322. (3) Ib. c. 1. Ref. (4) 19 Aug. 1744. (5) Ib. and Craisson, Elem. n. 542. (1) Leo XIII, In suprema, 10 June 1882. (2) S. C. C. 11 March 1774; 27 Feb. 1875. (3) Leo XIII, ib. (4) S. R. C. 12 Nov. 1831. (5) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. p. CXLVIII. Decr. II. Leo XIII, ib. (6) L. VI. 326. S. C. C. 11 May 1720; Ben. XIV, c. Cum semper, n. 17. Craisson, Elem. n. 545.

ARTICLE III: ON THE OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING BY REASON OF STIPEND

1323. Principles. - I. A stipend or alms can lawfully be accepted for a Mass which one is not bound to read for another. For a stipend is not given as a price or compensation of the Mass, but as a means for the support of the Minister. This is also established from 1 Cor. 9. 13: *Do you not know that they who work in the sanctuary eat the things that are of the sanctuary; and they who serve the altar participate with the altar?*

II. Priests are bound from justice to celebrate Mass and to apply it determinately according to the intention of those who have given the stipend for this. For there intervenes with them an onerous agreement, which, by the title of justice, must be observed not otherwise than in any other contract. Hence a priest who, whether through himself or through another Minister, omits to apply according to the intention of him who gave the stipend, is bound to restitution by strict right.

III. A priest cannot satisfy a double stipend by one single Mass, but for each one he must offer a distinct Sacrifice. The reason is, 1° because it is not certainly established that a Sacrifice offered for several persons profits each one as much as it profits when applied for one alone, although this is more probable to many; 2° because this very thing is established from the 8th proposition condemned by Alexander VII, p. XIII.

1324. Questions. - Query 1° What is judged the just stipend of a priest celebrating?

Resp. The quantity of a just stipend cannot be universally determined. It is lawful to require the stipend established by the Bishop or by custom.¹ To this rule even Regulars are bound to conform themselves under grave obligation, from the Decree of the Sacred Congregation cited by Benedict XIV.² - St. Alphonsus.³ And indeed the Bishop, at least as regards manual alms, can prohibit a

stipend less than the established tax from being accepted (Benedict XIV⁴); that this not be done regularly is prohibited by the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore.⁵ - Nevertheless, just as through charity or friendship a lesser stipend can be admitted, so also from the liberality of the giver it is right to receive a greater one. Likewise, a priest can receive more for extraordinary labor, e.g. for a Sacrifice to be celebrated at such an hour or in such an inconvenient place, etc. - Nor is a priest to whom richer stipends are available obliged to accept those which correspond to the tax; for he would be obliged with his own loss.

Query 2° Does a priest sin gravely who, after receiving a stipend, delays celebrating Mass?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is because he violates a contract in a grave matter. This is also established from the Decrees of the S. C. C. in the year 1625. - St. Alphonsus.⁶

Query 3° What delay is judged grave?

Resp. It is controverted; certainly a delay which exceeds three months can seem grave. - Thus commonly with St. Alphonsus,⁷ against others who require an entire year. - But more probably a priest does not sin gravely who celebrates a promised Mass within two months. In Masses, however, which are to be celebrated for the dead, a delay of one month is reputed grave according to St. Alphonsus,¹ Salmanticenses, Lugo, etc. - Besides, the statutes of Bishops also must be attended to. Certainly, however, a priest sins gravely whenever "he omits to celebrate, within a time fitting to the circumstances, a Mass requested and promised for obtaining some urgent grace"; and therefore he who has accepted a stipend for a happy childbirth is bound to restore the accepted stipend if, even licitly, he has celebrated after the childbirth. - The will of the one giving the stipend must also be attended to; for when it is principally given for assisting the priest, and the burden of celebrating is not imposed so strictly, even a very long delay will be without fault.

"But that a more distinct account may be had of the obligation of accurately fulfilling the burdens of Masses, both manual and for an indefinite time, we decree that in each secular and regular church there be a catalogue or table of burdens, which have been imposed on them in perpetuity or for a certain and predefined time, and respectively accepted; and that in the same place in the sacristy books be kept, in one of which perpetual burdens of this sort or temporary burdens are to be inscribed, but in the other manual and adventitious Masses, together with a faithful and distinct notation of the subsequent fulfillment of both."²

Query 4° Does a priest sin gravely by omitting to celebrate a Mass, if the stipend accepted for it is not grave matter, e.g. \$0.50?

Resp. Affirmatively, more probably, unless perhaps the stipend is so slender that the Mass appears to have been promised gratis. The reason is because he who gave the stipend suffers a notable spiritual detriment.³

Query 5° Whether, or in what way, does one sin who omits a Mass promised gratis?

Resp. 1° He does not sin whenever there is not truly a contract of promise, but the one promising only shows a benevolent purpose.

Resp. 2° More probably he sins only venially when a true promise has intervened; because a simple promise does not oblige under grave obligation, unless, as Lugo says, the one promising expressly obliges himself under grave obligation and from justice.

Query 6° Is a priest guilty of simony who celebrates chiefly with a view to the stipend?

Resp. See n. 353, Query 3°. Resp. ad 1.

1325. Query 7° Can a priest commit a Mass to another to be celebrated, giving a smaller stipend than he himself has received?

Resp. No, not indeed generally of itself, but because, on account of the appearance of base gain, the S. C. C. prohibited this by a Decree approved by Urban VIII and confirmed by Innocent XII, where these things are had: "Wishing to remove every damnable gain from the Church, it prohibits a priest who has undertaken to celebrate a Mass with a certain alms from committing the same Mass to another to be celebrated while retaining for himself part of the same Mass." Cf. proposition 9 condemned by Alexander VII, p. XIII, and the Rescript of the S. C. C. 19 Jan. 1869.

Except: 1° If from the circumstances it is morally established that the excess of the stipend was handed over by a title extrinsic to the celebration, for instance friendship, gratitude, etc. 2° If another priest, entirely spontaneously and not having been asked, remits either part of the ordinary stipend or the excess. 3° If there is not question of manual Masses, concerning which alone the Decrees speak, but either 1) of perpetual Masses entrusted to some priest, or 2) of Masses to be celebrated by force of a rich legacy left to some priest for life, or 3) of those which are to be celebrated from a benefice or foundation, provided that the contrary has not been provided for in the foundation, a stipend is given according to the tax or custom of the place, and, if there is question of founded Masses, the one celebrating has been determined at least in some way, e.g. the Pastor for the time being. Thus St. Alphonsus,² to whom especially the S. C. C., in the Response of 29 Aug. 1860, refers for the solution of this question. See p. LXXXI. 7. The Response of the S. C. C. 18 July 1868 to the Archbishop of Cologne agrees as regards founded Masses. 4° If the remission is made, even when the one remitting has been asked, but with him consenting with complete liberty, especially in favor of a pious work, provided however: a) there is not question of a matter which by its amplitude and its annexed laws takes on the appearance of public business, which is illicit to clerics; and b) in the case of an extraordinary stipend, those who gave that stipend did not give it on that condition, that they should perceive more abundant fruit from the Mass, which indeed is to be presumed, unless the contrary is sufficiently established, as in the exception under 1°. - Besides, all the exceptions are to be understood with this addition: provided nothing is taken away from the will of the founders or givers concerning the place and time of the celebration of the Masses, any studied collection of them being excluded, and the one to whom it belongs by law being taught concerning the subsequent celebration of them.¹

It is pleasing here to append the following questions proposed to the Sacred Congregation of the Council by the Archbishop of Cologne.

I. "Many Masses to be sung have been founded in parochial churches, ... to which a richer dowry has been assigned by the founders, to be administered by the church-provisors, from which Pastors, to whom by diocesan law and custom the celebration of these Masses belongs, receive an alms greater than the diocesan one, although no priest has expressly been called by the founders to celebrate these Masses."

II. "In celebrating Marriages and obsequies of the dead, stole-fees are not paid to the Pastor in a lump, but a certain portion is assigned for individual acts required for duly performing these functions."

Hence a certain alms also, and one richer than for the other manual Masses, has been fixed by the Ordinary both for nuptial Masses and for funeral Masses; the celebration of which by law and custom belongs to the Pastors."

III. "Very many alms are offered through the year to Pastors by the faithful for Masses to be sung, either according to the tax constituted by the Ordinary, or even richer alms are spontaneously handed over."

"But since Pastors are sometimes hindered by illness, absence, and other sacred functions from celebrating these Masses themselves in the three cases set forth, other priests supply their places, whether attached to the same churches for their assistance, whose salary is paid by the church-provisors, or even outsiders. Hence the question arises whether Pastors in the same three cases must hand over the whole alms to the priests supplying their places; or whether rather it is lawful for them, retaining part for themselves, to give a smaller alms to the celebrant? But if in these cases part of the alms can licitly be retained by the Pastors, it is further asked whether the diocesan alms for low Masses must be paid by them to the priest celebrating, or rather that constituted by the Ordinary for sung Masses?"

To these questions the S. C., on 28 March 1874, rescribed: Let it be deferred; and the matter having again been maturely weighed and discussed in the meetings of the day 25 July 1874, judged that response should be made:

To I. That the whole alms must be paid by the Pastor for Masses whether low or sung.

To II. Since there is question of stole-fees, it is enough if the Pastor recompenses the celebrant with the ordinary alms. (11) p. 418.

To III. That the whole alms must be paid, unless it is established with moral certainty that the excess of the common alms was offered with regard to the person of the Pastor himself.¹

But these resolutions, since there is question of a matter of strict right, are valid also for our quasi-pastors. More easily, however, among us cases occur in which richer stipends are offered on account of a title distinct from the celebration of Masses, for instance for the support of a Missionary to whom certain or sufficient revenues are lacking.²

Query 8° Is he who retains part of the stipend bound to restitution?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is, 1° because this is deduced from the proposition condemned by Alexander VII related under this n. q. 7°. For the proposition said that a priest retaining part of the stipend can satisfy through another; therefore it follows that the contradictory is true, namely that he cannot satisfy; but satisfaction regards not only the honesty of the act, but also its justice; and he who does not satisfy an obligation of justice is bound to restitution; 2° because a priest dividing a stipend, if it is richer, acts against the will of the giver: for the will of the giver is not only that Mass be celebrated, but that it be celebrated for such a stipend. For he does not wish to bestow something gratuitously on him who does not celebrate. - Thus St. Alphonsus,³ saying that this opinion must be held. But to whom must restitution be made, namely to the one giving the alms, or to the celebrant? More commonly and more probably they teach that it must be made to the celebrant.¹

Query 9° Can a priest to whom a rich stipend is offered for today's Mass, having retained this, ask another priest to celebrate for him, promising to celebrate on the following day for the same person,

who is going to be celebrated for an ordinary alms?

Resp. It is controverted. The first opinion denies it, since this cannot be excused from the appearance of base gain. - Thus St. Alphonsus, who says that Concina thinks thus rightly, adding however that he deservedly does not dare to condemn this as grave, and leaves it to the judgment of prudent men whether the poverty of the priest can excuse from every fault.²

The second opinion affirms, with Lacroix,³ and others.

Query 10° How are Masses to be taxed, for the reading of which a testator has left some sum of money?

Resp. They are to be taxed according to the custom of the place or the law of the diocese prevailing for private Masses. But if the testator himself has taxed them, but below the custom of the place or the norm of the received tax, they are to be taxed by the Ordinary according to the custom of the place, account being taken of whether the inheritance is rich or slender. - Thus the S. C. determines in St. Alphonsus.⁴

Query 11° Can rich priests accept a stipend?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is because every worker, whether rich or poor, is worthy of his wage, as Christ himself says in Luke⁵ and according to the Apostle.⁶ Besides, if they could not accept a stipend, and otherwise are not bound to celebrate without a stipend, since there is no law which obliges them to celebrate thus, the faithful would often be unable to obtain Masses. This is established besides from the practice of the universal Church. - St. Alphonsus,⁷ and others commonly.

Query 12° What is to be said of booksellers and merchants who in various ways exchange Masses to be celebrated for books or merchandise?

Resp. The S. C. C., 9 Sept. 1874, to the following doubts:

1. Whether the manner of acting of those booksellers or merchants savors of base traffic, and therefore is to be disapproved and, if necessary, restrained also by ecclesiastical penalties by their Bishops, who, by employing public invitations and premiums or in any other way whatever, collect alms for Masses, and to priests, to whom they commit them to be celebrated, repay not money but books or other merchandise?
2. Whether this manner of acting can be made honorable either because, with no diminution having been made, as many Masses are committed to be celebrated by the aforesaid collectors as correspond to the alms collected, or because through it poor priests, lacking alms for Masses, are assisted?
3. Whether collections and distributions of alms of this kind, even then, are to be disapproved and restrained, as above, by Bishops, when the profit which is drawn from the exchange of merchandise with alms is expended not for the private advantage of the collectors, but for the use or increase of pious institutions and good works?
4. Whether they concur in base traffic, and therefore are to be disapproved and even restrained, as above, who hand over alms for Masses accepted from the faithful or from pious places to

booksellers, merchants, and other collectors of them, whether they receive or do not receive anything from the same under the name of a premium?

5. Whether they concur in base traffic, and therefore are to be disapproved and restrained, as above, who receive from the said booksellers and merchants, for Masses to be celebrated, books or other merchandise at the price of these, whether diminished or whole?
6. Whether they act illicitly who for Masses celebrated receive, in place of a stipend, books or other merchandise, with any commerce or appearance of base gain being excluded?

Responded: - To 1. Affirmatively.

To 2. Negatively.

To 3. Affirmatively.

To 4. Affirmatively.

To 5. Affirmatively.

To 6. Negatively.

Query 13° Can administrators of Churches retain something for themselves from the alms of Masses for the expenses of altars, lights, etc.?

Resp. No, unless the Churches have no other revenues; and then in no way must the value of the expenses which are necessary for the Sacrifice of the Mass itself be exceeded, and nevertheless also in that case care must be taken that from the monies which remain, the expenses as above having been deducted, absolutely as many Masses are celebrated as were prescribed by those offering the alms.¹ See the exception in Ben. XIV, Inst. 56. n. 13.

Query 14° Must he restore who, after receiving a stipend for a Mass to be celebrated on a privileged altar, celebrates the same on another altar?

Resp. It seems it must be denied; but he will be bound to gain a plenary indulgence applicable to the dead, such as are the indulgences of the Way of the Cross, etc. For thus a proportionate compensation is bestowed. If, however, he has accepted a stipend greater than ordinary for this, he is bound to restore the excess. - Thus St. Alphonsus,² Elbel,³ Sporer.⁴

But if someone accepts a stipend in order that he celebrate in a certain place, e.g. at a miraculous Statue, or in a Chapel so that the people may hear Mass, or at a certain time, e.g. on the Sabbath day in honor of the Blessed Virgin, so that the place and time are intended of themselves, he cannot retain the stipend unless he has read the Mass at the prescribed time and place. The reason is because otherwise the one giving the stipend is judged to be gravely unwilling. But it is otherwise if the time and place are not intended of themselves.

Query 15° Is one obliged by stipend to celebrate on a privileged altar for a deceased person bound to read a Mass of Requiem, when the RITE permits it?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is because this is required for gaining indulgences, as is clear from the declaration of the S. C. R. 11 April 1840.⁵

Query 16° Does one obliged by stipend to READ a Mass of Requiem, or a votive Mass, satisfy if he says another Mass?

Resp. Affirmatively as regards a Mass of Requiem, unless the testator or the one giving the stipend has expressly asked that it be said (S. R. C. 5 Aug. 1662 and 12 Sept. 1840). - Negatively as regards a votive Mass (S. R. C. 12 Sept. 1840), unless either 1° the one requesting consents; or 2° a votive Mass has been accepted which is not permitted to be celebrated, as in honor of a Mystery or of a Blessed; or 3° a votive Mass has been accepted for a day on which it is prohibited, and cannot conveniently be deferred to a free day.

But truly, neither in the case of a Mass of Requiem expressly requested, nor in the case of a votive Mass, do they sin gravely who read the Mass of the day, and not even lightly in the excepted cases, or when a legitimate cause is present, such as however one's own devotion is not.¹ The reason is because the essential value is the same; but the privation of accidental value does not bring so grave a prejudice. Besides, the virtue of fidelity in the case does not oblige so gravely.

Note, however, that here there is not question of the cases treated under q. 14° and q. 15°, nor of Masses of Requiem to be celebrated in chant, concerning which, as also concerning this whole question, see de Herdt.²

Query 17° Can a stipend be received for a Mass to be celebrated on the day of the Commemoration of all the faithful departed?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is because not all priests are bound on this day to apply Mass for all the dead, indeed they are not obliged to celebrate. Therefore they can apply Mass at will either for all the dead dwelling in Purgatory, or for some only. This is established from a Decree of the S. C.³ But this being posited, absolutely nothing stands in the way of a stipend being able to be accepted for Mass. - Thus commonly.⁴

Query 18° What does the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore counsel, and what does it prescribe, concerning Masses to be founded or founded Masses?

Resp. To the first. In the Appendix of the Council⁵ there is reported, and therefore by way of norm seems to be counseled, Decree LV of the Second Provincial Council of Cincinnati, which reads thus: "That a certain norm be established in this Province for foundations of Masses, ... the Fathers judged that foundations of this kind, especially when they are perpetual, because of the peculiar circumstances in which we are placed, ... are to be admitted with great caution; also on this condition, that for a private Mass there first exist a fund of at least fifty scutata, but for a sung Mass, of one hundred scutata." ... But the best precaution will be if the agreement to be entered into with the founder contains at least these conditions: 1) that there will be no future obligation of celebrating, if the capital destined for this end for any cause whatever has either perished, or remained idle or unfruitful; 2) that the number of Masses to be celebrated be diminished proportionately, if for any cause whatever the revenues do not reach the stipend established by the founder; and therefore that not only the capital, but also the stipend of the Masses be determined, or at least that the faculty of reduction be reserved to the Ordinary; 3) that, if for any cause whatever the Church in which the Masses are to be celebrated should lack a priest, or even be destroyed, they can be celebrated in another to be designated by the Ordinary.

Resp. to the second. "Let foundations not be accepted without the previous assent of the Bishop, if there is question of a secular institute, or of the regular Prelate, if the foundation is made in favor of an exempt community."¹

Query 19° What is the reduction of Masses?

Resp. It is the diminution of the number of Masses to be celebrated, granted by legitimate authority for a legitimate cause.

It is said: 1° *of Masses to be celebrated*; for reduction regards the future, or Masses to be omitted; and, if there is question of Masses omitted, there is a condonation, which is reserved privatively to the Supreme Pontiff. If it is granted, a small alms is imposed, which is called composition. B. 14. d. S. L. 13. c. ult. n. 15.

It is said: 2° *by legitimate authority*, namely through the Supreme Pontiff, as the S. C. C. declared, with Urban VIII and Innoc. XII approving, in the Bull *Nuper*. - Nevertheless the Bishop also will be able to reduce if either a) as is plain of itself, he has obtained an Indult for this, in the use of which Indult, lest Bishops wander from the path, rules are suitably handed down by Benedict XIV in the book *On the Diocesan Synod*, C. ult. n. 22-29; likewise nn. 32. 34. 35; or b) the founder has given the Bishop this faculty;² or c) the imposed and accepted burden was made *inter vivos* by force of a convention entered into with the Bishop; for that convention includes this tacit condition: the thing, or capital, remaining in that state in which the fruits yield at least the ordinary stipend of a manual Mass. Therefore in the case of diminution of revenues or loss of the fund, the Bishop by his ordinary power, or by assuming the parts of a judge, can either rescind the contract, or at least reduce it to the terms of right.³

It is said: 3° *for a legitimate cause*, e.g. diminution of revenues, increase by the Bishop of the alms, etc.

Notes to n. 1325 - note sequence 1. (1) Acta, Vol. IV. p. 537. (2) L. VI. 321. Notes to n. 1325 - note sequence 2. (1) Acta, T. VIII. p. 75 sq. (2) Cf. Vd. Burgt, de cel. Miss. n. 115. (3) L. VI. 322. Notes to n. 1325 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VI. 322. Dub. 1 in fine. (2) Ib. Dub. 4. Cf. Vind. p. 386. Ed. 2a T. I. p. 437. (3) n. 134. (4) L. VI. 320. Dub. 5. (5) 10. 7. (6) 1 Cor. 9. 14. (7) L. VI. 317. q. I. Notes to n. 1325 - note sequence 4. (1) L. VI. 322 in fine. (2) Ib. 329. Not. 2. See n. 1798. q. 4°, R. 7°. (3) 210. (4) n. 355 and Suppl. n. 137. (5) L. VI. 339. Notes to n. 1325 - note sequence 5. (1) L. VI. 327. (2) T. I. n. 66. (3) 4 Aug. 1663. (4) L. VI. 338. (5) p. 319. Notes to n. 1325 - note sequence 6. (1) a. 370. (2) Ben. XIV, de Syn. L. XIII. c. ult. n. 19. (3) Ib. n. 26. Appendix annotation (11), to n. 1325. q. 7°. p. 74. col. 1. to II. It is clear of itself that to one celebrating a sung Mass in this and similar cases the ordinary alms is to be given, which has been established for sung Masses. Thus also S. C. C., 25 July 1874. Past. Bl. für N. Am., 1881. p. 34.

CHAPTER IV: ON THE TIME AND PLACE OF CELEBRATION

ARTICLE I: ON THE TIME OF CELEBRATION

1326. Principles. - I. It is lawful to celebrate daily, indeed it is laudable, unless the unworthiness of the celebrant, or a special prohibition of the Church, stands in the way. - But the Church prohibits Mass from being celebrated on the day of Parasceve, or Friday of the greater Week; likewise, that several Sacrifices be made in the same Church on Thursday and Saturday of the same Week. Necessity, however, permits several Sacrifices only on Thursday in the Supper of the Lord, 1° on account of the communion of the sick, who cannot assist at the solemn Mass, and in whose favor it will be lawful to celebrate a private Mass, at the judgment, however, of the Bishop; 2° on account of a feast of precept occurring on the same Thursday in the Supper of the Lord (not on Holy Saturday), in which case not indeed all priests, but some, can and must celebrate a private Mass (not of the feast, but of the Supper of the Lord) before the solemn Mass, so that the faithful may not lack fulfillment of the precept. - But that single Mass, which is celebrated on Thursday in the Supper of the Lord and on Holy Saturday, cannot be celebrated in those Churches in which the Most Holy Sacrament is not reserved. This furthermore must be celebrated in chant (excepting parochial churches, if there is no cantor present, and then with the permission of the Bishop to be sought each year) and solemnly, unless ministers are lacking.¹

II. It is not lawful ordinarily, and with special privilege excluded, to celebrate before dawn, nor after noon, nor before the recitation of Matins and Lauds. For thus it is had in the Rubrics of the Missal: "A private Mass can be said at least after Matins and Lauds, at whatever hour from dawn until noon." - It is lawful, however, to begin Mass before dawn, provided that it is not finished before dawn. Likewise it is lawful to prolong the celebration beyond noon, provided that it be begun at least at noon; for the time of dawn and noon is to be taken not mathematically, but morally.¹ But dawn begins when the first brightness is diffused over the earth, or from the beginning of light, which is various for various places and times of year. Where there is no physical dawn, one should attend to when labor is accustomed to begin.² - By special privilege, which is conceded to our Bishops and through them can be communicated to priests and is customarily so communicated, it is permitted that Mass be celebrated for one hour before dawn and another after noon. See p. LXXI. n. 23.

III. In like manner, the privilege of celebrating one hour before dawn or after noon must be understood of one hour before or after the time assigned for others not privileged; otherwise the privilege would be of little profit.³

Notes to nn. 1326-1327 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 350. 424 sub 8, and De Herdt, T. II. n. 280. T. III. n. 34-36. Notes to nn. 1326-1327 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 351. (2) 25 Sept. 1858 in a case of Gaul. (3) 21 March 1863. Notes to nn. 1326-1327 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 341. (2) S. R. C. 18 Sept. 1634. (3) L. VI. 346. (4) L. VI. 346. (5) Ib. 343 sq. Notes to nn. 1326-1327 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 343. De Herdt, T. III. n. 3. (2) L. VI. 400. (3) Praxis Conf. n. 155.

1327. Questions. - **Query** 1° Does he sin gravely who celebrates before dawn or after noon?

Resp. Affirmatively, if he much anticipates or prolongs the time established by the Church; but otherwise, if the change is slight; indeed, if a just cause is present, it will be without any fault. But what change is judged notable is controverted. According to the more common and more probable

opinion, it is not held grave unless the celebration is begun a whole hour before or after the established time.⁴

Query 2° When is it lawful to celebrate before dawn or after noon?

Resp. 1° In necessity, e.g. that Viaticum may be administered to one about to die; in which case it would be lawful to celebrate even at midnight. 2° Where there is a reasonable custom, e.g. that workmen and servants may be able to hear Mass very early in the morning. 3° By force of a privilege granted by the Pope, or of a dispensation in a particular case from a reasonable cause by the Bishop, or for exempt religious by their Superior; 4° from the cause of a journey, for an hour after noon or before dawn; 5° likewise because of the funeral of some magnate, or of a sermon, or of a public supplication.⁵

Query 3° What sort of sin is it to celebrate Mass before the recitation of Matins and Lauds?

Resp. See n. 1100. q. 2°.

Query 4° Is it lawful to celebrate more than once in a day?

Resp. No, speaking generally according to the present practice of the Church, although formerly it was not prohibited. This is established from various places of Canon Law and from the Decree of Benedict XIV, 16 March 1746.

Except 1° the feast of the Nativity of the Lord, on which it is lawful to celebrate three Masses; 2° if a Pastor before the ablution is moved concerning communicating the sick, and has already consumed his Host, and no other fasting priest is found.¹

Query 5° When is it lawful to celebrate Mass twice in the day by permission of the Bishop?

Resp. With the Bishop permitting it, Mass can be celebrated twice (but never more than twice) by the same priest on Sundays and feasts of precept not suppressed, if necessity demands it, but not on account of custom alone, nor for the convenience of those who enjoy the privilege of a private oratory, nor on account of the poverty of the priest, nor where another priest is had through whom provision can be made for the necessity. Benedict XIV, Const. *Declarasti nobis*, and c. *consuluisti* (3) *de celebrat. Miss.* (L. III. Decr. T. XLI.). See p. LIV-LVI. n. 1-9.

Query 6° When is necessity judged to be present for celebrating twice in the day?

Resp. See p. LVI. n. 10. 11. See the broader faculty of our Bishops p. LXXI, LXXII. 23, and its declaration p. LVI. n. 11 sq.

Query 7° Can he who celebrates two Masses accept a duplicated stipend?

Resp. No; and Pius IX strictly prohibited this. - Thus S. C. C.² - Nevertheless, sometimes there is given, and to the Ordinaries of Missions there has been given, the faculty, for a just and grave cause, of permitting priests to receive a stipend also for the second Mass. Thus from the Letters of the S. C. de P. F. 15 Oct. 1863, which *Rev. Th.* T. IV. p. 101 exhibits. (12) p. 418.

Query 8° Would it be lawful in this case to accept a double stipend on this condition, that the other stipend be expended for a pious use?

Resp. No, without an Indult of the Supreme Pontiff, which indeed the Pontiff was unwilling to grant to the Archbishop of Cologne. - Thus S. C. C.³

Query 9° Is it lawful in the night of the Nativity of the Lord to celebrate all three Masses before dawn?

Resp. No, without an indult, or unless one of the causes alleged above in this n. q. 2° is present, some one of which, however, will very rarely be present on this day. It is clear from the Rubric of the Missal: "The first Mass is said in the night; the second at dawn; and the third in the day"; likewise from the decree of the S. C. R.:¹ "A priest who celebrates only one Mass should read the Mass which corresponds approximately to the hour according to the particular Rubrics of the same day." S. R. C. 19 June 1875.

Query 10° Through what space of time ought a low Mass to last?

Resp. The general rule is that Mass ought neither to be longer than half an hour, lest those present be affected by weariness, nor shorter than a third part of an hour, because otherwise it will not be able to be celebrated becomingly. But you will not excuse from mortal sin a priest who, in making the Sacrifice, does not reach a quarter of an hour. St. Alphonsus² gives the reason, because in so brief a space he must necessarily commit two grave defects, one of grave irreverence toward the Sacrament,³ the other of grave scandal toward the people. But it is to be desired, and earnestly commended to all priests, that in making the Sacrifice they complete half an hour.

Query 11° How much time, when the Sacrifice has been completed, ought to be spent in giving thanks to God?

Resp. No entirely certain rule is given. But the more benign require at least a quarter part of an hour. - St. Alphonsus³ earnestly persuades that at least a half-hour be spent on this pious exercise by a priest, who ought to offer an example to the faithful.

Appendix annotation (12), to n. 1327. q. 7°. p. 78. col. 1. A bination Mass can also be applied for a deceased priest-confrere by the members of a society who, by agreement, are bound to this. S. C. C., 14 Sept. 1878 in Nancien-Tullen. and Nemausen., apud Nouv. Rev. Théol., T. XI. p. 25, where also the reasons of this resolution are exhibited.

ARTICLE II: ON THE PLACE OF CELEBRATION

1328. Principles. - I. It is not commonly lawful to celebrate except in a Church, and one consecrated, or at least blessed, which is not polluted, execrated, or interdicted. This is established from Trent.⁴

As regards a polluted and execrated Church, see below n. 1329. 4° and 5°. But concerning an interdicted Church, n. 1695-1697.

II. The Bishop can no longer, as formerly, grant the faculty of celebrating in the houses of private persons, nor in a private Oratory.¹ This is established from the declaration of the S. C. C. 27 May 1617 and 23 Jan. 1847, in which it is said that it is not lawful for any Bishop to grant licenses of this sort, not even for a passing act, and that this faculty is reserved to the Roman Pontiff. An exception is made, however, if great and urgent causes are present, and then only by way of a passing act. Thus S. C. C. 20 Dec. 1856.

Notes to n. 1328. (4) Sess. 22. decr. de observ. et vitand. in celebr. Miss.

1329. Questions. - Query 1° In what Oratories can Bishops give permission to celebrate?

Resp. By common law, in public ones, and, outside private houses, in every religious or pious place. But a religious place is said to be that in which works of piety and mercy are exercised, and which has been erected by the authority of the Bishop or of another ecclesiastical Prelate. Such are monasteries, palaces of Bishops, Seminaries, and the rest. ... But a pious place is called that which is constituted and deputed for works of piety and mercy, even without the authority of the Bishop or of an ecclesiastical Prelate. Hence any Hospitals and Orphanages whatever must be held as pious places, in which therefore the Bishop can permit the erection of an Oratory, even if places of this kind have been erected and constituted by the civil power. Thus S. C. C.² Add also Oratories which are erected in prisons, although prisons are not customarily called pious places.

Query 2° Is it sometimes lawful to celebrate outside a Church, or outside the Oratories of which in the preceding question?

Resp. Affirmatively, when grave necessity urges, e.g. 1° if the Church were destroyed or could not contain an immense multitude, and otherwise the people would lack Mass on a day of precept; 2° if a priest were making a long pilgrimage through deserted places or among unbelievers, and otherwise would be without Mass for a long time; 3° if an army were in camps, and otherwise would lack Mass on a day of precept; 4° in a port because of the arrival of a ship, lest those sailing, who cannot leave the ship, be deprived of Mass on a day of precept. Thus from various places of Canon Law according to St. Alphonsus. Nevertheless in these and similar cases the permission of the Ordinary is always to be sought and can be sought;¹ 5° concerning the permission of the Bishop in a private house in the case declared in n. 1328. II. and n. 1144. IV. 2°.

Query 3° What are the special faculties of our Bishops concerning the place of celebration?

Resp. "Of celebrating under the open sky and under ground, but in a becoming place, ... if it cannot be celebrated otherwise." See p. LXXII. n. 23.

Nevertheless this faculty, which can be and is customarily communicated to priests, as the tenor of it, "if it cannot be celebrated otherwise," already demands, is restricted by the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore² in such a way that "no priest ... may celebrate Mass in private buildings, unless in stations, and in those buildings which the Ordinary has designated, or while he is actually giving attention to the exercises of a Mission" (understand: spiritual assistance furnished to some place "far from any church," through one or more days). Therefore it is not lawful to use that faculty in cities or towns in which churches have been erected.³

As regards the becoming place of which in this faculty, Kenrick⁴ observes that the following are not judged such: a) A room where a sick person lies, unless in the country far from every church it is necessary to celebrate for giving him Viaticum.⁵ b) Where a more suitable place can be had, the house where there is the corpse of a dead person; a room where some are accustomed to sleep; huts and the houses of laborers. c) The lower part of a house. d) A ship, unless by special Papal indult, which is customarily granted only to Apostolic Missionaries. Except the case of which in the preceding question 2° under 4°. e) A theater. f) Buildings of Freemasons. g) A room of an inn in which dances are customarily held. h) Churches of heretics or schismatics; for the so-called "Simultaneous" churches, in which Clement XI permitted the Missionaries of Rhaetia to celebrate, are consecrated churches of Catholics occupied by heretics, such as, so far as I know, we have none among us.

Query 4° In what way is a Church polluted, and in what way must it be reconciled?

Resp. to the first. A Church is polluted (likewise a crypt blessed together with it), when in it those indecent actions and injuries to a sacred place are done, on account of which it is reputed unbecoming that the immaculate Host be offered there, and that the divine Offices be celebrated, until it is reconciled. Hence it is polluted: 1° by voluntary homicide (therefore also by suicide), and one injurious, at least to the immunity of the Church, such as also is that which otherwise would be just by sentence of a judge; unless, however, a disturber of the republic could not otherwise be seized; 2° by a gravely culpable and copious shedding of blood from a blow or from a wound gravely injurious to the church; but it is required that he against whom the savagery of which under 1° and 2° is exercised, suffer it in the church itself, although perhaps the one wounding is outside the church, or although the shedding of blood or death follows outside it; 3° by a voluntary shedding of human seed, and one illicit either of itself or by reason of the sacred place. Therefore it would not be polluted by marital intercourse, when a just cause of having it was present, namely to avoid incontinence; 4° by the burial of an unbaptized person, or of an unbeliever. Except the infant of whom in n. 1699. q. 1°. R. 1°, and catechumens (ib.);¹ but not an infant already born (even of Christians) dead without Baptism (S. C. Immun. apud Craisson, Man. n. 4800); 5° by the burial of a baptized excommunicated person to be avoided; but not if he is indeed excommunicated, but not to be avoided. Concerning these things there is evidence from Canon Law. - See St. Alphonsus.² But that a Church be judged polluted, these crimes must be notorious either by fact or by law, either immediately from the beginning, or afterwards. They must also be committed in the Church itself, i.e. in some part of it from the upper vault to the pavement and from the interior door to the last wall; therefore not in the sacristy, etc.³

Resp. to the second. 1° If the Church was only blessed, it can be reconciled by a priest (according to the Roman Ritual to be delegated by the Bishop, which however is not of precept), with the customary prayers, and with water blessed for reconciling the Church by the priest himself delegated (or not delegated).⁴

2° But if that Church was consecrated, it must be reconciled by the Bishop himself, or by a priest delegated by the Pope [n. 1247. IV. b)], or among us by the Bishop (p. LXXI. 13), according to the rite of the Roman Pontifical. Nevertheless, if the divine Offices cannot be omitted without grave inconvenience, with the permission of the Bishop, if it can be had (otherwise without it), it can be celebrated.

Domestic Oratories in private houses, although blessed (which nevertheless cannot be blessed except with the blessing of a place or of a new house¹) and deputed to worship, are not judged to be polluted.

Query 5° In what way is a Church execrated, or an execrated Church rendered fit for worship?

Resp. 1° A Church is execrated when it loses its blessing or consecration. But it is judged to be execrated when it totally or for the greatest part collapses, or is destroyed, so that it must be built anew, at least for the greater part, or if the whole plastering of the walls, or at least the greater part, is removed at the same time.²

Resp. 2° An execrated Church is again to be blessed or consecrated, according to the rite and form prescribed for the blessing or consecration of Churches.

But a fixed altar loses its consecration when the table or upper stone is removed from its base, or through an enormous fracture of the table. - Thus S. C. R. 15 May 1819, 3 March 1821. Altars, whether portable or fixed, lose it when the sepulcher is opened or broken (or when the cover of this is broken or removed, but not precisely the seal),³ in which the Sacred Relics are placed, or through the loss of the same. - S. C. R. 23 Sept. 1848. Nor is it sufficient to bury other authentic Relics in them; but the altars are to be consecrated anew. - Thus S. C. R. 7 Dec. 1844. - Note, however, the faculty conceded to our Bishops and which through them can be and is customarily communicated to priests,⁴ of celebrating, ... even if the altar is broken or without Relics of Saints; ... if it cannot be celebrated otherwise. See p. LXXII. n. 23.

Finally, sacred vessels and other consecrated things are execrated when they lose their form, and can no longer serve for their use. - Hence also paraments lose their blessing if they become so torn or worn by use that by the estimation of moral men they can no longer be employed for their end, or if they lose their essential form even for the briefest time, so that, while this separation stands, they cannot serve for their use: hence also, if by one act a part is added which is greater than the blessed part; but not if they are repaired gradually by smaller parts. De Herdt.¹

Moreover, from what has been said it is clear what the distinction is between the pollution of a Church and its execration. When part of the Church is polluted, the whole Church is judged polluted, even together with the adjacent cemetery and fixed altars (but not portable ones). On the contrary, when a Church is execrated, the cemetery is not for that reason execrated, nor are the altars. L. VI. 368-371. (Z) p. 403.

Notes to n. 1329 - note sequence 1. (1) Sess. 22, decr. de observ. et vitand. in celebr. Miss. Cf. however n. 1144. IV. 2°. (2) 27 March 1847 and 14 Nov. 1648. Notes to n. 1329 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 356. 359. (2) a. 362. (3) Kenr. Tr. XVII. 87. (4) Ib. n. 87. 88. (5) S. C. de P. F. 14 Dec. 1668. Notes to n. 1329 - note sequence 3. (1) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 390. (2) L. VI. 362-366. (3) Ib. 364. Cf. L. IV. 460. (4) Ib. 363. De Herdt, T. II. n. 164. Notes to n. 1329 - note sequence 4. (1) L. VI. 361. (2) De Herdt, T. III. n. 289. I. (3) L. VI. 368. (4) Rev. th. T. 12. p. 595. n. 63 sq. Notes to n. 1329 - note sequence 5. (1) T. I. n. 169. 174. Appendix annotation (Zeta), to n. 1329. p. 81. col. 1. "By the misfortune of the times," writes the distinguished Van de Burgt, De celebr. Miss., n. 218, "and by the malice of men, it happens not infrequently that a sacrilegious injury is inflicted upon Catholic churches through crimes other than those which have been set forth thus far. And we must touch upon these briefly. Suppose that temples have been used as the place of quarrels and tumultuous fighting, for the exercise of the worship of heretics or schismatics, as a lodging for soldiers, as taverns, as workshops, as stables, and that neither report nor fame has spread of any one of the crimes previously mentioned being perpetrated there. Such a church has by no means need of the reconciliation which the sacred laws mention. Nevertheless, it seems very congruous to the sense of piety and religion that the temple, before the Most Holy Sacrifice is immolated in it, first be expiated from the stain of profanation by the designated rite of reconciliation." See St. Alphonsus, L. VI. 367. That this is accommodated to the mind of the Holy See is shown by the Responses of S. R. C. in Carpet., 3 March 1821, apud Van de Burgt, ib., and 27 Feb. 1847 in Tolent.

CHAPTER V: ON THE MANNER OF CELEBRATING

Namely, 1° concerning the requisites for Mass; 2° concerning the Rubrics.

ARTICLE I: ON THE REQUISITES FOR MASS

1330. - These things are required: 1° A stone altar, fixed or portable, consecrated by the Bishop, or among us, if there is question of a portable altar, while the See is vacant and in a case of necessity, by the Administrator of the diocese, or, while the See is full, by a priest deputed by the Bishop in places subject to him, with oils nevertheless blessed by the Bishop (see p. LXXII. n. 28 and p. LXXIII. n. 6). 2° A triple cloth made from linen or hemp; wherefore "the custom," says Kenrick,² "of certain persons using cloths which are found in the house in which they celebrate in the country is to be corrected, one shorter corporal cloth being placed beneath, or those which are not made from linen or at least from hemp. There is at least venial fault in not using three cloths; mortal fault in omitting all, unless grave necessity excuses." 3° Sacred vestments, or vestments blessed by the Ordinary, or among us by a priest delegated by the Ordinary by force of the faculty which is referred to on p. LXXI. n. 13. 4° A chalice and paten, consecrated by the Bishop, or among us by those deputed by him, as above 1°. 5° A linen corporal, or one made of hemp, blessed by the Ordinary, or among us by a priest delegated as above 3°. 6° A pall likewise linen or made of hemp. 7° A linen purificator. 8° A missal with a cushion. 9° A crucifix. 10° A double lighted candle made of wax. 11° A burse, silk veil, towel, cruet. 12° A male minister.¹ Cf. n. 1247. V. a).

But as regards candles, in strictly private Masses it is not lawful to light more than two wax candles, unless the Bishop celebrates, or unless there is question of low conventual or parochial Masses or similar ones on more solemn days, or of those which are celebrated in place of a solemn and sung Mass on account of celebrity and solemnity, or unless exposition of the Most Holy Sacrament requires a greater number. - De Herdt.²

1331. Questions. - **Query 1°** Must the altar cloths necessarily be blessed?

Resp. Affirmatively. The reason is because this is prescribed in the Rubric, and whatever some may say, there does not appear a sufficient reason for acting against the Rubric, by which it is thus determined: "Let the altar be covered with three cloths ... blessed by the Bishop or by another having power." Nevertheless, to celebrate over a cloth not blessed does not exceed venial fault, and therefore, when a reasonable cause urges, it is without any fault, according to St. Alphonsus.³

Query 2° Is it mortal to celebrate without any sacred vestment, or without stole, or alb, chasuble, maniple, or cincture?

Resp. 1° It is mortal to celebrate without any sacred vestment, in every case, from whatever cause. 2° Likewise to celebrate without chasuble, or alb, or stole and maniple together. 3° Likewise to celebrate with an ornament notably unclean and torn. 4° More truly also to celebrate without maniple, or stole, or (outside grave necessity) with these not blessed. 5° Probably it is not mortal to celebrate without amice, at least for those who do not use it to cover the head, but only the shoulders. The same is also to be said of celebration without cincture; hence a reasonable cause easily excuses from all these things.⁴

Query 3° Is the color of the vestments of precept?

Resp. Affirmatively, because all Rubrics which regard ceremonies accompanying Mass are held as preceptive. Nevertheless this Rubric does not seem to oblige under grave obligation, unless scandal is present, e.g. if on Easter day or on another solemn day Mass were celebrated with black vestments. Hence a reasonable cause, which will often be present to our Missionary priests, can excuse from this precept.¹ (13) p. 418.

Query 4° What colors are required in the paraments?

Resp. Paraments of white, red, green, violet, and black color are required. - Paraments made of glassy silk fabrics are altogether reprobated. Thus S. C. R.² - Likewise paraments of various color (*of the various colors*) are reprobated, which, on account of flowers of each color mixed in, not a few wish could be used on every feast. These the S. C. R. prohibited on 23 Sept. 1837; and therefore they can represent only that color which is primary and predominant.

Paraments of yellow and blue color are altogether prohibited.⁴ Paraments made of gold cloth are tolerated, which, according to the use of the City, are used for white and red color, and, where custom is present, also for green; indeed they can be used for every color, if the silk threads intermingled with the gold threads are of the prescribed color.⁵

Query 5° Must the chalice and paten be consecrated under grave obligation or only under light obligation; and from what material are they to be fashioned?

Resp. to the first. They must be consecrated under mortal obligation; for the precept concerns a grave matter.⁶

Resp. to the second. From present discipline, at least the cup of the chalice must be gold, or silver gilt within.⁷ But in a case of necessity a chalice with a cup of tin could be used. The paten must be of gold, or of gilt silver.

Query 6° Do the chalice and paten lose consecration if the gilding perishes?

Resp. No, more probably, but after new gilding they need a new consecration, because gold newly added and not consecrated intervenes, immediately touching the Blood.¹ The Declaration of the S. C. R. agrees.²

But it is to be held as an abuse that a priest should wish to execrate the aforesaid sacred vessels before he hands them over to an artisan to be repaired or refashioned. Therefore they must be handed over to him, if there is need, without the priest trying to execrate them either by his own hand directly, or by means of some instrument. - Thus S. C. R.³

Query 7° Must the alb, cincture, amice, small altar cloths, corporal, purificator, and pall necessarily be made from linen or hemp?

Resp. Affirmatively as regards all. Thus from the practice and precept of the Church. - Nevertheless, from the general Decree of the S. C. R.,⁴ amices, albs, and small altar cloths, if any were made from cotton, could meanwhile be used until they were consumed, yet not to be renewed unless from linen or hemp. But it was prescribed that Corporals, palls, and purificators, after the lapse of one month from the publication of the Decree, could be used only if made of linen or hemp. - The cincture can also be made from wool or silk. S. C. R. 23 Dec. 1862. n. 5326.

Query 8° Must the pyx necessarily be consecrated?

Resp. See n. 1247. V. a). 4°.

Query 9° What sort of sin is it to celebrate with a corporal not blessed?

Resp. This cannot be excused from mortal sin, unless grave necessity of celebrating urges. But in a case of necessity one could even celebrate without a corporal. - Thus commonly.⁵ Likewise, unless the precept of hearing Mass urges, it is mortal to use a very unclean corporal; light, if it is not very unclean; but none, in this case, if another cannot be had.⁶

Query 10° Is it mortal to celebrate without a pall, or with a pall not blessed?

Resp. It is controverted. The first opinion, probable, affirms. The reason is because formerly the pall was the corporal itself with which the chalice was covered; hence, although now it is separated from the corporal, it is equally necessary as it.

The second opinion, itself also probable, denies. The reason is because today the same reason of reverence does not apply to the pall as to the corporal, which immediately touches the Sacred Species. In necessity, when the pall is lacking, a purificator or burse can be used to cover the chalice.

Query 11° Is it lawful to use a pall covered with silk cloth and woven with gold?

Resp. Affirmatively. For although this is prohibited, nevertheless, at the request of several Bishops of Gaul, it was granted that it can be used. Hence to the question: *Whether, notwithstanding the Decrees issued by the S. C. R., it is lawful to use a pall covered on the upper part with silk cloth and woven with gold?* The S. C. responded: It can be permitted, provided that a linen pall joined underneath covers the chalice, and that the upper cloth is not of black color, nor displays any signs of death.²

Query 12° Must the purificator be blessed?

Resp. No. See n. 1247. V. a). Indeed, if a purificator cannot easily be had, it is probably lawful to celebrate without it, and in its place a clean small towel can be used, which afterwards is not to be used for profane use.³

Query 13° What sort of sin is it to celebrate without a minister?

Resp. It is mortal according to all. Nevertheless, Doctors commonly say that it is lawful to celebrate without a minister when the necessity of administering Viaticum urges. Others concede the same, that the people may hear Mass of precept.⁴ - Yet to our Bishops and to priests to whom it is communicated by them, there is the faculty "of celebrating ... without a minister, ... if it cannot be celebrated otherwise." See p. LXXII. n. 23. (14) p. 418.

Query 14° Can a priest ever celebrate with a woman responding?

Resp. Affirmatively, if necessity urges, especially among nuns, provided the woman responds from afar, and does not immediately minister at the altar by presenting the cruets, etc.; for this could not be excused from mortal sin, because the Church altogether forbids women to minister to one celebrating.⁵ - This is confirmed by a Decree of the S. C. R.⁶

Query 15° Is it mortal to celebrate without a cross; and what sort of cross ought it to be?

Resp. to the first. No; for this does not appear grave, wherefore a reasonable cause excuses even from venial sin. - Thus commonly the Theologians.

Resp. to the second. The Cross which is required in the celebration of Mass ought not to be small, but to stand out among the candlesticks, so that the priest and the people can easily and conveniently look upon it. Thus Benedict XIV, c. *Accepimus*, 16 July 1746. "In Missions, however," says Kenrick,¹ "necessity brings it about that a Cross not very large is used; but care must be taken that, as far as can be done, it be conspicuous to the people." He adds that, in a case of necessity, which however is to be guarded against, a small cross attached to a Rosary can be used. If on the altar on which Mass is celebrated there is a large statue, or a painted or carved image, in which the Crucified One obtains the first place, this suffices. - S. C. R.² - If Mass is celebrated on an altar where the Most Holy Sacrament is publicly exposed, the cross can be exposed or not exposed according to the custom of places. - Thus Benedict XIV, Const. cited. - A crucifix is not required with such great rigor as a Cross.³

Query 16° What sort of sin is it to celebrate without light, and is it ever lawful?

Resp. to the first. It is mortal to celebrate without any light at all.⁴

Resp. to the second. In one case it is lawful to complete the Sacrifice without any light, namely when, after the Consecration has been completed, the light is extinguished and no other can be had; for then the reason of completing the Sacrifice urges.

Query 17° Is it lawful to celebrate with candles made from another material than wax, or with one wax light?

Resp. to the first. No, except in the case of an Apostolic indult, or of necessity, e.g. lest one dying lack Viaticum, or the people lack Mass of precept; and St. Alphonsus⁵ reproves this as a mortal sin. With the former part of the response agrees the declaration given to the Bishop of Charleston. S. C. R. 10 Dec. 1857.⁶

Resp. to the second. No, likewise with the more common and more probable opinion; but if it is done, it does not exceed venial sin, and any reasonable cause excuses from every fault; wherefore, when the other wax candle is lacking, a priest could celebrate even from mere devotion.⁷

Note. Kenrick¹ observes that in Missions the cushion to be placed under the Missal cannot easily be had; the cloth or antependium almost nowhere among us; for cruets, any vessels whatever can be used in Missions.

Notes to n. 1331 - note sequence 1. (1) T. I. n. 169. 174. (2) Tr. XVII. 99. (3) L. VI. 373 sq. (4) T. I. n. 184. (5) L. VI. 375.

(6) L. VI. 377. Notes to n. 1331 - note sequence 2. (1) Kenr. Tr. XVII. 111. (2) L. VI. 378. Dub. 5. (3) 11 Sept. 1847. (4) S. C. R. 16 March 1833. (5) De Herdt, T. I. n. 147 and S. C. R. 28 Apr. 1866. (6) L. VI. 379. (7) S. R. C. 16 March 1876.

Notes to n. 1331 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VI. 370. Dub. 2 in fine. (2) n. 5011. (3) 20 Apr. 1822. n. 4588. (4) n. 4563. (5) L. VI. 387. (6) L. VI. 376.

Notes to n. 1331 - note sequence 4. (1) L. VI. 388. (2) 10 Jan. 1852. (3) L. VI. 389. (4) Ib. 391. (5) Ib. 392. (6) 27 Aug. 1836.

Notes to n. 1331 - note sequence 5. (1) Tr. XVII. 101. (2) 16 June 1663. n. 2231. (3) L. VI. 393.

(4) Ib. 394 and L. III. Decr. T. XLI. c. ult. (5) Ib. 394. Dub. 1 and S. R. C. 7 Sept. 1850. (6) Acta T. III. p. 602. Cf. Past.-Bl.

fur N. Amer. Jahrg. III. 23. (7) L. VI. 394. Dub. 2. Appendix annotation (13), to n. 1331. q. 8°. p. 82. col. 1. Among reasonable causes De Herdt, Pr. Lit., P. I. n. 155, recounts: "necessity of the church; a gathering of priests for whom vestments of the due color are not sufficient; great solemnity, which brings it about that in less wealthy churches it is useful to use more precious vestments, if even only the cross of the chasuble is of a color conforming to the office. Besides, as several note, it is better on any day to perform the Sacred Rite in whatever color than to omit it." Appendix annotation

(14), to n. 1331. q. 18°. p. 83. col. 1. Question. - If a priest celebrates without a minister, ought he to say the Confiteor twice before the introit? S. R. C. in Erien., 4 Sept. 1878, responded: Negatively. Gardellini, Appendix IV. n. 5627.

ARTICLE II: ON THE RUBRICS

1332. - Priests ought to observe with the greatest care and solicitude the laws of the Church which pertain to the manner of celebrating Mass, since among all sacred things this is the most sacred of all, and therefore worthy of the greatest reverence.

1333. Questions. - Query 1° Are all the Rubrics of the Mass preceptive?

Resp. 1° According to the common opinion, all Rubrics which are observed within the Mass are preceptive, since they regard so sacred a thing. But they oblige under grave or under light obligation according to the gravity or lightness of the matter, as will be said below.²

Resp. 2° But some Rubrics which are observed outside the Mass, that is, before or after the Sacrifice, are merely directive, as e.g. the washing of hands after Mass and the prayers for preparation or thanksgiving.³

It is controverted as regards the prayers which by the Rubric are to be recited while the vestments are put on; but with the common opinion it must be held, says St. Alphonsus,⁴ that their omission is venially culpable.

Query 2° Can an infirm priest celebrate, although he cannot observe all the Rubrics?

Resp. Affirmatively, if he omits only a few and lighter ones, especially if he celebrates privately. Indeed several authors of grave note permit an infirm celebrant even to use a staff, if he needs it, etc.⁵

Query 3° Is it ever lawful to interrupt Mass?

Resp. 1° It is never lawful to interrupt Mass essentially, so that the Sacrifice begun remains truncated, unless a very grave or extreme necessity urges, as in the case of an imminent fire, or of an enemy rushing in to kill; for then the priest, omitting the Consecration of the chalice, could consume the Host already consecrated, or carry it away with him by fleeing. But if he has completed both Consecrations, he should immediately consume both Species, if he can; or if he cannot, he should carry them away with him to a nearby place to be consumed most quickly.¹

Resp. 2° It is lawful to interrupt accidentally, namely by interposing something for a just cause before the Canon: 1° on account of a sermon after the Gospel, on account of prayers to be recited for the dead (which nevertheless, just as also those which are prescribed by the Ordinary, must among us be recited before or after Mass²), on account of proclamations of Banns to be made, or on account of a procession to be received, etc. 2° In favor of a Prince arriving, or of a crowd of pilgrims on a feast day, if otherwise they cannot hear Mass. Then, if the oblation has not been made, the priest can begin anew so that they may hear the whole Sacrifice. 3° If the priest remembers some impediment, e.g. that he is not fasting, or that he is not in the state of grace, or that he is irregular, provided that the Mass can be broken off without scandal or note.³

Resp. 3° Nevertheless, it is not lawful to interrupt, even accidentally, once the Canon has been begun, and *a fortiori* once the Consecration has been completed, except from a very grave cause. Hence Mass can always be interrupted, indeed must be, if a necessary Sacrament is to be administered, i.e. Baptism and Penance; likewise Extreme Unction or Viaticum, when these are to be administered for

this reason, because absolution could be given only doubtfully (n. 1226. q. 2°. R. 1°). Otherwise, between the Consecration and Communion, it is not becoming, unless there is question of Viaticum, and provided that in that case the celebrant ought not to take off the sacred vestments, nor lose sight of the altar.⁴ - Without a just cause, a notable interruption is mortal.⁵

Query 4° What is to be done if a priest, overtaken by illness or death, cannot complete the Sacrifice?

Resp. 1° If the priest fails before the Consecration, nothing is to be done by another priest, because the Sacrifice was not properly begun.

Resp. 2° But if he fails after the Consecration, even of only one Species, then another fasting priest, if he is present, must supply; if no fasting priest is present, another, even not fasting, should supply and complete the Sacrifice; because the precept of procuring the integrity of the Sacrifice urges more gravely. Indeed even an irregular or excommunicated priest would be obliged to supply. Nevertheless, if another priest could not be found immediately, after one hour has intervened, more probably he should no longer be sought, because moral union would be lacking, and therefore it would not be judged the same Sacrifice. But if a priest overtaken by illness while celebrating can complete the Sacrifice after some interruption, he himself will complete it better than another, even if he is not fasting.

Notes to n. 1333 - note sequence 1. (1) Tr. XVII. n. 102-104. (2) L. VI. 399 and S. C. R. 10 June 1690 in Mediolan. sub fine. (3) L. VI. 409. 410. Exam. Ord. n. 112. (4) Ib. 410. (5) Ib. 402. Notes to n. 1333 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 352. (2) Conc. Pl. Balt. II. a. 364. (3) L. VI. 352. 353. (4) Ib. 354. (5) De Herdt. T. II. n. 177.

1334. - Resolves. 1° It is illicit to celebrate with the head covered. This is established from c. *Nullus* de Cons. dist. 1. And indeed according to the common opinion it is mortal to celebrate the whole Mass with the head covered; but to celebrate with a skullcap (*calotte*) up to the Canon, contempt and scandal being excluded, is only venial; indeed probably it is without even venial fault, although it be done without dispensation up to the Canon only from a reasonable cause and in a private place, or even in a public place, if the reason is manifest to those present, and the priest cannot celebrate without notable inconvenience. Nevertheless it is illicit to celebrate the entire Mass with the head thus covered without Apostolic license. Thus expressly St. Alphonsus,² after others. - Craisson, *Man. Jur. Can.*³

2° It is illicit by common law to celebrate with a false head of hair (*wig*), because by it also the head of the celebrant is covered. Thus from the Decree of Innocent XI, in which moreover Bishops and Apostolic Nuncios are prohibited from granting this license.⁴ - But this prohibition has passed into desuetude in many places.⁵

3° A priest is not excused from venial sin who omits blessings, inclinations, genuflections, etc. ... Say the same of him who advertently does not genuflect to the ground, or contrary to the prescriptions of the Rubric changes the order of blessings, or performs these too hastily.

4° It is a grave sin, unless the lightness of the matter excuses, to omit the parts of the Mass which are called ordinary, or which are always recited or done. Hence Doctors commonly say that it is mortal to omit the Confession with the other things at the beginning of Mass, the Epistle, the Gospel, the principal Collects, the Offertory, the Preface, the breaking of the Host, and its mixing with the Blood.

5° It is mortal to omit in the Canon any prayer, or 10 or 8 names of the Saints (words?), or to change its words so that the sense is changed, or to omit some word by which, when removed, the remaining

words do not make sense. - The same is to be said if the *Pater noster* or *Agnus Dei* is omitted; likewise concerning *Libera nos*; *Domine, non sum dignus*; and *Quid retribuam*; likewise concerning the purification of the paten and chalice after the consumption.¹

6° It is venial to omit one of the three principal Collects. If the first prayer has been omitted, it seems it is to be recited together with the Secret, not afterwards. It will not be mortal to omit other prayers which are added in the Mass besides the proper Collect.²

7° He sins venially who, contrary to the express prescription of the Rubric of the Missal, a) pronounces those things which are to be said secretly so softly that he does not hear himself (indeed gravely, if he pronounced the words of Consecration thus); b) those things which are to be said in a loud voice, softly, or so loudly that he disturbs other celebrants; c) those things which are to be said softly, loudly. Nevertheless there would be no sin in reciting those things which are to be recited in a subdued voice so that only the ministers hear them.³

8° To mutilate words or to interpose a syncopation, with the sense preserved and scandal excluded, is no more than venial.⁴

9° To omit extraordinary parts, namely those which are not said in every Mass, is only venial. - Thus commonly, unless so many parts are omitted that, taken together, they constitute notable matter. - Hence it will be only venial to omit the *Gloria*, *Credo*, Collects besides the proper one of the Mass, the Tract, or special things about the Preface or the *Communicantes*. - Thus commonly. - Likewise to celebrate a votive Mass or Mass of Requiem when this is not lawful according to the Rubrics is venial, unless it becomes mortal by reason of contempt or scandal. Thus, for example, you will with difficulty be excused from grave scandal if you read a Mass, at least a public one, of Requiem on the solemn feasts of Easter or of the Nativity of the Lord.¹

10° The washing of hands before Mass must be done at least under venial obligation, and under grave obligation if the hands are very unclean, on account of reverence for the Sacrifice. - But to omit the washing after Mass will be no sin.²

11° Although there is no sin in omitting the prayers before and after Mass, nevertheless a priest who approached to sacrifice without any other preparation would not be without some fault.³

12° A priest would sin if in the purification of the Chalice he used water alone, but only venially according to the common opinion.⁴ - Several also excuse a priest from venial sin if he is an abstainer from wine. Thus Tamburinus. - See more concerning the Rubrics and Ceremonies in the authors.

13° Whether it is mortal to celebrate with notable voluntary distraction, e.g. in those things which are recited in the Canon, and especially under the Consecration and Communion, is disputed. St. Alphonsus rather adheres to the affirmative opinion, because, as he says, the Sacrifice, besides the character of prayer, by force of which it would not be certainly mortal (cf. n. 402), has moreover the character of a most excellent worship of Religion, "to which he seems to bring grave irreverence, who, while he professes to worship God by a religious act, voluntarily" and notably "distracts himself."⁵

14° The following things are rightly admonished by the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore:⁶

"In celebrating the divine Sacrifice let pains be taken diligently, that all ornaments of altars and sacred vessels be clean; not foul corporals or purificators; not torn or unbecoming vestments; but let the

garments of private attire lie hidden under the amice and alb so that they do not appear in an unbecoming or worldly manner; nor let anything be unworthy of the tremendous altar or the administration of the Sacraments."

"That all things be done according to order, and that the solemn rites of the Church be preserved whole, we admonish Rectors of churches that they diligently watch to eliminate abuses which have invaded ecclesiastical chant in these regions. Therefore let them take care that music serve the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the other divine offices, but not that the divine offices serve music. Let them know that, according to the rite of the Church, songs in the vernacular tongue may not be sung during the solemnities of Masses or solemn Vespers." (H) p. 403 and (15) p. 418.

Notes to n. 1334 - note sequence 1. (1) L. VI. 355. (2) Ib. 397. (3) n. 3688 sq. (4) L. VI. 398. (5) Craisson. Man. Jur. Can. n. 3692. Notes to n. 1334 - note sequence 2. (1) L. VI. 404. (2) Ex. Ord. 125. (3) L. VI. 405. (4) L. VI. 406. (5) Ib. 413-416. (6) Ib. 407. Notes to n. 1334 - note sequence 3. (1) L. VI. 420. (2) Ib. 409. (3) Ib. 410. Dub. 2. (4) Ib. 408. (5) Ib. 410. Dub. 5. (6) a. 360. 361. Appendix annotation (15), to n. 1334. 14°. p. 86. col. 2. S. R. C. seems to have receded from the former severity as regards the singing of songs in the vernacular language. For it responded, on 27 Sept. 1864, n. 5336, and 11 March 1871, n. 5472, that this custom of singing before the Most Holy Sacrament, or in its processions, and likewise while, the Sacrament not being exposed, the divine offices are celebrated, can be tolerated and observed. Cf. Nouv. Rev. Th., T. XII. p. 241. n. 27.

APPENDICULA.

ON THE DECREES OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES AND ON CUSTOM AGAINST THE RUBRICS.

1335. - Besides the Rubrics of the Missal, Breviary, Ritual, and other liturgical books, there are also decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, which likewise must be judged as the proximate rule of the same rites.¹ This is clear from what was said in n. 172. 4° and 173. q. 3°.

I. The Decrees of the S. R. C. can be distinguished as twofold, general and particular. See what was said in n. 173. q. 4°.

II. They are preceptive if either they are bare declarations or interpretations of Rubrics and concern a preceptive Rubric, or if they are in the rigorous form of a decree, i.e. they have some clause of command, as, e.g., *he commanded it to be observed*.² Otherwise they are only directive, nevertheless to be observed by all with due respect and to be preferred to any contrary opinion of authors.

III. That they oblige, they must be a) authentic (n. 173. q. 3. R. 1°), such as are all those which are had in the Gardellinian Collection (ib. q. 6°); nor is it enough that they were given by the Prefect or Secretary of the S. R. C. or by others outside the Congregation;³ b) if they are extensive, promulgated in the manner which we stated in n. 173. q. 5°.

IV. If any decrees are truly contrary to one another, one must stand by the later one. - But if some apparent discrepancy is had between the general Rubrics of the Missal and those which are noted in the Order of Mass, each Rubric is to be followed with equal form, reconciling, as far as possible, their dispositions; for the discrepancy ordinarily comes from the fact that what is expressly prescribed in one is passed over in silence or expressed more obscurely in the other. The same is to be said concerning a discrepancy which sometimes occurs between the Missal and the Ceremonial of Bishops; concerning which, however, it can also be said that the Ceremonial can be left to cathedral churches and others, for whose use it is prescribed.¹

I have said further that abuse alone is forbidden. Wherefore musical chant must be grave, decorous, sweet and pious, distinct, intelligible. Cer. Ep. L. I. c. 28. n. 12; Circular Letters of the Eminent Cardinal Vicar of His Holiness, 18 and 20 Nov. 1856, apud *Anal. J. P.*, month of May 1857. Hence in it these abuses are to be reprov'd and guarded against: 1° lest whether in organ or song anything lascivious or impure be mixed in, such as music is to be kept away from churches; lest profane melodies be introduced, or those which breathe levity, or by excessive noise dissipate rather than foster and excite affections of piety; lest theatrical, military, or worldly songs or modulations be transferred to sacred concerts; so that from sacred music there be removed whatever is alien from its scope, and serves only the curiosity or pleasure of the hearers, or even the fame of the authors. 2° Lest the text be notably altered by mutilating, putting before, putting after, and altering the words and the sense of them, and by adapting them to the modulation in such a way that the music does not seem to serve the words and sense, but these to serve the music; which S. R. C. judged to need reform, 21 Feb. 1643. 1. n. 1285. 1432. For this reason Benedict XIV prescribes in the cited Constitution, § 9, that care is to be taken that the words which are sung be perfectly and plainly understood. 3° Lest those things which are sung under the introit, offertory, elevation, and communion be so prolonged that the celebrant, by waiting, is compelled to interrupt the Sacrifice and to linger distracted longer at the altar, so that music does not serve the Mass, but the Mass serves music. S. R. C., 21 Feb. 1643. 2. n. 1285. 1432; Benedict XIV, Const. cited, § 13.

The Ceremonial of Bishops, L. I. c. 28. n. 1, says that it is fitting that the organ be played while in Mass the Most Holy Sacrament is elevated, but with a graver and sweeter sound. De Herdt, *ib.* n. 113, 114.

Concerning the use of instruments, Benedict XIV notes these things in the cited Constitution: "If instruments sound continuously, and only sometimes ... rest for some moments, so that they may offer free space for hearing harmonic modulations and rippled ejaculations of voices ... but otherwise overwhelm and bury the voice of the singers and the sound of the words, the use of instruments of this kind is vain and useless, indeed forbidden and interdicted." Which instruments are forbidden, see apud the same Benedict XIV, Const. cited, § 11.

Notes to n. 1335. (1) L. VI. 401. (2) *Ib.* (3) De Herdt. T. I. n. 8. Appendix annotation (Eta), to n. 1335. p. 86. col. 2. Sacred song can be of very great help to sacred worship, since it is able both to express the very text of the Sacred Liturgy with the greatest perfection possible, and to excite the minds of the hearers to devotion, and to impress the signification of the liturgical words more deeply upon the hearts of the faithful. But when song of this kind is such that it serves for expressing and exciting human passions rather than pious affections, and keeps the minds of the faithful intent upon the music rather than upon the words of the Sacred Liturgy, it will hinder true devotion more than it will help it. This was the reason why Holy Mother Church, while on the one hand she has never not taken upon herself both the care and patronage of song, on the other hand has always attempted, insofar as it could be done, to turn away abuses and dangers from it. Wherefore she has never omitted to prescribe by whom, what, and in what manner singing is to be done in churches. a. By whom it is to be sung. - Besides the priest, the choir ought to sing. Mention is also made sometimes in the Sacred Liturgy of the people singing together, for example at the Kyrie eleison and at the Litanies, while in the consecration of a church a procession is made around the church with the Relics. In sung Masses the choir holds the place of the people, as the minister does in private Masses. The singers, and musicians, as completing a liturgical action, have a distinct place in the church; they must attend processions clothed in a surplice and not in secular dress; they are forbidden to converse, make noise, or turn their back to the altar; they are commanded to perform their office with a recollected and devout mind, and to believe with the heart and profess by deed what they believe; or at least not to lead a notoriously depraved life, nor to be non-Catholics. Conc. Prov. Col. II. 20; Conc. Prov. Prag. III. 1; Conc. Prov. Vien. IV. 6. It is resolved. - Universally women are to be excluded from the choir, and a fortiori those who sing on stages. Thus demands the ancient custom of the Church,

the liturgical law commanding women to be far from the service of the altar, the dignity of ecclesiastical song, and the edification of the faithful. Conc. Prov. Col. I. c.; Westmon. I. Decr. XVIII. n. 20. Except if there is question of churches of Nuns; a case of necessity; a long-standing custom. b. What is to be sung. - 1) Nothing is to be sung except those things which the Church prescribes, or at least, says De Herdt, P. I. n. 112, "a long-standing, reasonable, and praiseworthy custom, with the consent of the Ordinaries of places, tacit or express, has approved." 2) The rubrics of the Missal, Tit. XVI. 3, indicate those things which are to be sung or intoned by the celebrant. 3) "By the choir are sung the introit, Kyrie eleison, Gloria, gradual, Alleluia, tract, sequence, Credo, offertory, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, communion, and whatever things are to be answered to the celebrant." De Herdt, P. I. n. 111. For the sake of brevity nothing is to be omitted, and the Mass is to be sung as it stands in the Missal. Thus answered S. R. C., 5 July 1631. 5. n. 776. 923, concerning Masses of the dead. Hence, according to the decrees of S. R. C., either Masses of the dead are not to be celebrated, or all things are to be sung which regard the prayer of suffrage, such as also are the sequence Dies irae and the offertory; yet in the sequence the singers can omit some strophes. In a conventual Mass in which the choir is bound to sing the Symbol, it is to be sung entire and in an intelligible voice; the verses cannot be supplied alternately by the organ, nor meanwhile can the celebrant proceed with the Mass. The Kyrie, Gloria, gradual, sequence, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei can be supplied alternately by the organ; but wherever the organ is used, the beginning and end, and those things which require an inclination and genuflection, are always to be sung. - The singers can and must begin the introit only when the celebrant reaches the altar. The Sanctus is sung after the preface, but Benedictus qui venit according to the Ceremonial of Bishops is reserved until after the elevation of the Most Holy Sacrament; this disposition of the Ceremonial is to be observed in Pontifical Masses, and is laudably observed in others. But if the Benedictus in other Masses is sung before the Consecration, under the elevation, or rather afterward, the Tantum ergo or some antiphon proper to the Most Holy Sacrament can be sung. The communion is to be sung after the celebrant has consumed the Most Holy Blood, during the distribution of Holy Communion; but if this does not take place, during the purification. > Notes to appendix annotation - note sequence 9. > > 1 There is no need to say that this does not apply where, from the obligation of singing the sequence, as in parish churches, they are to be taught to sing it insofar as circumstances permit. c. In what manner it is to be sung. - Plain and firm song, which is called Gregorian, if it is performed rightly and decently, is heard more gladly by pious men and is deservedly preferred to the other, which is called harmonic or musical. Benedict XIV, c. unus, 19 Feb. 1749, § 2. Students of Seminaries are to be taught the discipline of this song from the salutary prescription of the Council of Trent, Sess. 23. c. 18. de Ref.; and the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, n. 380, judge it greatly to be desired that its rudiments be explained and practiced in parish schools. - As to the matter of the tone in which Gospels, Epistles, Chapters, etc., are to be sung, the Ceremonial of Bishops, L. I. c. 27, sends one to other books, the Pontifical, Sacerdotal, Directory of the Choir, and similar books, and describes only the tone of the prayers; having described it, it adds: "It is regular that in both," namely solemn and simple, "the prayers be recited in a grave and fitting voice, with some pause interposed at the end of each clause, and especially in the final clause, and with decorum and gravity." - It is clear of itself that Graduals, Antiphonaries, etc., endowed with the approval of the Holy See are to be preferred. Although Gregorian chant is preferred, nevertheless musical chant and also the use of musical instruments has been permitted and received by use, and abuse alone is reprov'd. Benedict XIV, const. cited, §§ 3. 6. 7; Ferraris, V. Musica, n. 1. 2. I have said that musical chant is permitted. Yet it is by no means consonant with the mind of the Church that it be used regularly; for by the very fact that she prefers Gregorian, she shows sufficiently that musical chant is to be used only exceptionally. Moreover, musical chant was forbidden to Nuns by several Pontiffs, and expressly by Clement VIII, 12 July 1592, apud Craisson, Man., n. 5180. Finally, the Ceremonial of Bishops, L. I. c. 28. n. 13, also has these things: "In Masses and offices of the dead we use neither organ nor music, which they call figured, but firm chant, which also during the time of Advent and Lent" - feasts and the third Sunday of Advent and the fourth of Lent are not comprehended in this rule, according to the same Ceremonial - "it is fitting to use." (52) p. 430. Appendix annotation (52), to p. 405. col. 1. The words utimur and convenit indicate sufficiently that here there is no question of a strict precept. It is clear as regards Masses of Requiem from the following declaration of S. C. R., 31 March 1629, apud Mühlbauer, Decr. auth., II. p. 588: "The organ can be permitted in Masses of Requiem, but with a certain sad and mournful sound, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Ordinary," that is, unless the Ordinary prohibits the use of the organ.

1336. - On custom against the Rubrics.

Query. What conditions are required that it be legitimate?

Resp. 1° That it be immemorial.² This is clear from various decrees of the S. C. R. and from c. *Apostolici ministerii* of Innocent XIII, 23 May 1723, according to De Herdt.³ - 2° That it not openly conflict with the Rubrics of the Missal, Breviary, Ceremonial of Bishops, or Roman Ritual, or also

with the general decrees appended in the Missal and Breviary. - I said: that it not OPENLY conflict, etc.; for the S. R. C., according to De Herdt,⁴ permits and approves those customs which, although they plainly do not agree with the rules contained in the Missal, Breviary, Ceremonial, and Ritual, nevertheless do not openly conflict with the same, but rather concern a certain manner. 3° That it be laudable, i.e. not "contain a positive indecency which cannot becomingly be tolerated."⁵

"From these things it is clear," says De Herdt,⁶ "that very many customs are illegitimate, and therefore to be removed and corrected; which must be done the more if they regard clerics alone, so that, with the people scarcely attending or not caring much, they can be corrected; but if it is foreseen that wonder and scandal will arise in the people from the change to be made, one must proceed very prudently, and sometimes it is better to tolerate something, than to move disturbances, which sometimes are stirred up, even from a good cause, not without great harm to Religion. But truly legitimate and laudable customs ought not to be changed, and if the change would yield to someone's burden, or to wonder and scandal of the people, they cannot be changed at all."

Notes to n. 1336 - note sequence 1. (1) De Herdt. T. I. n. 9. (2) L. VI. 401. (3) Ib. (4) T. I. n. 11. R. 1°. (5) T. I. n. 11. R. 2°. (6) L. VI. 401. De Herdt. T. I. n. 11. R. 3°. Cf. Litt. Rundschau, 1860. col. 741. (7) Ib. Notes to n. 1336 - note sequence 2. "This one thing we except, namely, when together with the solemnity the Divine Office shall have been transferred to a Lord's day, only one Mass for the people is to be applied by Pastors." - Thus Pius IX in the cited Constitution.

DAYS,

on which, outside the case of an indult of remission, to be obtained by the Bishops from the S. C. C. or respectively from Propaganda Fide, Pastors and Ordinaries are bound to celebrate for the people, Pius IX (see n. 1322. II.) determined to be the following:

Namely, the Lord's days of the whole year; the Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ; Circumcision; Epiphany; Resurrection with the two following ferial days; Ascension; Pentecost with likewise the two following ferial days; Most Holy Trinity; Solemnity of the Body of Christ and Invention of the Holy Cross, and also the feasts of the Conception, Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, and Nativity of the Virgin Mother of God; Dedication of St. Michael the Archangel; Nativity of St. John the Baptist; of Sts. Peter and Paul, St. Andrew, St. James, St. John, St. Thomas, Sts. Philip and James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, Sts. Simon and Jude, and St. Matthias, Apostles of Christ the Lord; likewise St. Stephen, Protomartyr; the Holy Innocents; St. Lawrence, Martyr; St. Sylvester, Pope and Confessor; St. Joseph, also Confessor; and St. Anne, Mother of the Mother of God; the Solemnity of All Saints, and one of the more principal patrons in any kingdom or province, and another likewise more principal in any city, town, or village, where it happens that these patrons are had and venerated.*