

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II - Treatise II: On Baptism

Contents

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II	2
Treatise I: On the Sacraments in General and Treatise II: On Baptism	2
Treatise I	3
On the Sacraments in General	3
Chapter I	3
On the Nature of the Sacraments	3
Article I	3
On the Notion and Distinction of the Sacraments	3
Article II	4
On the Power and Efficacy of the Sacraments	4
§ 1. On the Grace of the Sacraments	4
§ 2. On Character	6
Article III	6
On the Constitution of the Sacraments, or on Matter and Form	6
1. As Regards the Conjunction of Matter and Form	7
2. As Regards Invariability	7
3. As Regards Certitude	8
Chapter II	9
On the Minister of the Sacraments	9
Article I	9
On the Requisites in the Minister That He May Operate Validly	9
Article II	11
On the Requisites in the Minister That He May Operate Licitly	11
1. That He Be Worthy and Fit	11
2. That He Act Worthily and Rightly	12
3. That He Confer the Sacraments on the Worthy	13
Chapter III	16
On the Subject of the Sacraments	16
Article I	17
On the Requisites for Valid Reception of a Sacrament	17
Article II	18
On the Requisites for Licit Reception of a Sacrament	18
Chapter IV	19
On Sacramentals	19
1. On the Power and Efficacy of Sacramentals	19
2. On Exorcisms and Blessings	20
3. On the Sign of the Cross and Lustral Water	21
Treatise II	22
On Baptism	22

Chapter I	22
On the Nature of Baptism	22
Article I	22
On the Notion, Efficacy, and Necessity of Baptism	22
Article II	24
On the Matter and Form of Baptism	24
§ 1. On the Matter of Baptism	24
§ 2. On the Form of Baptism	25
Chapter II	27
On the Minister of Baptism	27
Chapter III	28
On the Subject of Baptism	28
1. Infants in the Womb of the Mother	29
2. Abortive or Monstrous Fetuses	30
3. Children, Against the Will of Parents	31
4. Adults	31
5. The Doubtfully Baptized	32
Chapter IV	33
On the Ceremonies of Baptism	33
I. On the Place and Time of Baptism	34
II. On Sponsors	34
III. On the Accessory Rites	35

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II

Treatise I: On the Sacraments in General and Treatise II: On Baptism

Treatise I

On the Sacraments in General

One must treat: 1. of the Nature; 2. of the Minister; 3. of the Subject of the Sacraments; 4. of Sacramentals.¹

Chapter I

On the Nature of the Sacraments

So that the nature of the Sacraments may become known, 1. certain things must be premised concerning their notion and distinction, whether numerical or specific; 2. their efficacy, or power, must be inquired into; 3. their constitution must be weighed, which is placed in matter and form.

Article I

On the Notion and Distinction of the Sacraments

1390. DEFINITION. A Sacrament of the New Law is a sensible sign of invisible grace, for sanctifying the people of God, permanently instituted by Christ.²

It is said: 1. a sensible sign, that is, one which denotes internal grace and can be perceived by an external sense. For thus the means of salvation are adapted to the nature of man, who, in operating, is subject to the senses, and at the same time they become the foundations of divine worship and of Christian society. 2. Of invisible grace, which the Sacrament produces *ex opere operato*, that is, by force of the divine institution, independently of the work of the one operating, namely of the minister conferring and of the subject receiving, provided the subject is rightly disposed. 3. Instituted by Christ, in distinction both from the Sacraments of the old Law and from the Sacramentals of the Church, which have not been instituted by Christ. There is added: permanently, or stably; for as long as the Christian religion shall remain, so long also will the Sacraments remain.³

“Therefore three things are required for constituting a Sacrament: 1. an external sign; 2. a promise of grace; 3. the institution of Christ, since all the Sacraments have their power from the passion of Christ the Lord.”⁴ See the Dogmatic theologians.

1391. NUMERICAL DISTINCTION. “It is of faith that there are seven Sacraments of the New Law, neither more nor fewer,” as the Council of Trent defined, sess. 7, can. 1.

The Council of Florence, in the Decree to the Armenians, thus demonstrates the fittingness of this sevenfold number: “For spiritual life, just as bodily life, needs seven things: 1. That the faithful be generated, and this Baptism furnishes; 2. that they be increased and strengthened, and this Confirmation gives; 3. that they be nourished, and this the Eucharist furnishes; 4. that they be healed, and this Penance bestows; 5. that the remains of sins be taken away and the powers of the soul be refreshed, and for this there is Extreme Unction; 6. that ministers of the Church be formed, and this Sacred Ordination furnishes; 7. that children be begotten and religiously educated for the worship of God and the conservation of the human race, and this Matrimony gives.”⁵

1392. SPECIFIC DISTINCTION. The Sacraments, according to their various properties, are distinguished:⁶

1. Into Sacraments of the dead, that is, Baptism and Penance, which of themselves are conferred upon the spiritually dead, that is, those lacking grace, and produce first grace; and of the living, which of themselves are not administered except to those having first grace, and work an increase of grace in them.
2. Into repeatable Sacraments, as the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Matrimony; and unrepeatable, as Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, on account of the character which they impress indelibly.

¹On the Sacraments in general see St. Thomas, 3, q. 60-65; Salmanticenses, tr. I; Billuart, etc.; but the Roman Catechism should be read first.

²Cf. book VI, 2, and the work on Trent, sess. 7; *Exam. Ordin.*, n. 1.

³Cf. book VI, 1-5.

⁴*Exam. Ord.*, n. 2.

⁵Cf. *Catech. Rom.*, p. 2, c. 1, n. 15; St. Alph., *Condotta ammir.*, p. 2, c. 1, n. 6-12.

⁶Book VI, 6; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 4.

3. Into a permanent Sacrament, as is the Eucharist, which consists in a permanent thing; and transient Sacraments, as are all the others, “because they are Sacraments only when they are made and applied.”⁷
4. Into Sacraments necessary by necessity of means for salvation, as are, for all, at least in implicit desire, Baptism, and more probably also the Eucharist, as will be explained in its own place (n. 1563); likewise, for those fallen into mortal sin, Penance; and necessary by necessity of precept, such as are Confirmation and Extreme Unction, according to the more probable opinion, altogether to be urged. Order and Matrimony are not necessary for private persons, but for the community.
5. Sacraments are called formed, when in the one receiving they really produce grace; unformed, when indeed they are valid in themselves, but in the one receiving, on account of the obstacle which he places, they do not produce the ultimate form of the Sacrament, that is, grace.⁸

1393. Note. In the old Law there were true Sacraments, as the Council of Trent openly implies when it hands down that the Sacraments of the New Law differ from the Sacraments of the Old Law. Such was the tree of life in the state of innocence; the sacrifice of Melchisedech and circumcision in the state of the law of nature; the paschal lamb, various purifications, and consecrations of priests in the Mosaic law. Yet these Sacraments, and even circumcision itself (as the more probable opinion teaches), did not confer grace by a power proper to themselves, that is, *ex opere operato*, but *ex opere operantis*, that is, from the merit of acts of faith, religion, penance, etc., which those ministering or receiving elicited. But for blotting out original sin there sufficed, more probably, faith in Christ to come, manifested by some exterior sign, especially through circumcision.⁹

Article II

On the Power and Efficacy of the Sacraments

1394. There are two EFFECTS of the Sacraments: one common to all, namely grace; the other proper only to some, namely character.

§ 1. On the Grace of the Sacraments A twofold grace is conferred through the Sacraments: sanctifying grace and sacramental grace.

1395. Principles. I. All the Sacraments confer SANCTIFYING GRACE, which renders man a friend of God (see the Dogmatic theologians).¹⁰

This grace is FIRST or SECOND, namely: the Sacraments of the dead, Baptism and Penance, of themselves and primarily confer first grace, by which namely the sinner is justified; the other Sacraments, which are called of the living, confer of themselves and primarily second grace, that is, an increase of pre-existing grace.

We said of themselves and primarily. For: 1. The Sacraments OF THE DEAD sometimes and accidentally confer second grace, when namely they find grace already existing in the soul; otherwise they would be sterile, which assuredly would be said absurdly and impiously. 2. The Sacraments OF THE LIVING, according to the common opinion, can likewise confer first grace, when namely someone in the state of lethal sin receives the Sacrament with good faith and at the same time with attrition. That this must be said of the Most Holy Eucharist seems to be concluded from the words of Trent (sess. 13, can. 5), defining: “If anyone shall say that the principal fruit of the Most Holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, let him be anathema.” St. Thomas hands down this very thing,¹¹ not only concerning the Eucharist, but also concerning Extreme Unction; and theologians commonly agree with the Angelic Doctor, who affirm the same concerning the other Sacraments of the living. But the reason for the affirmation is that in Trent (sess. 7, can. 6) it is read: “If anyone shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law ... do not confer grace on those placing no obstacle ... let him be anathema”; now indeed, “he who approaches a Sacrament of the living with attrition, which excludes affection for sin, both actual and habitual, already places no obstacle”; therefore.¹²

Note. It can happen in many ways that one guilty of mortal sin receives a Sacrament of the living in good faith, namely: 1. if he invincibly does not know that he is in the state of sin; 2. if he invincibly thinks himself perfectly contrite, or

⁷Book VI, 190, 2.

⁸Book VI, 6, note 4; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 4.

⁹Book VI, 3-4.

¹⁰Cf. Lugo, *De Sacram.*, disp. 4, sect. 3.

¹¹3, q. 72, a. 7, ad 2; and q. 79, a. 3.

¹²Book VI, 6; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 4.

rightly absolved, when he is not; 3. if he invincibly does not know that the state of grace is required for the reception of a Sacrament, etc. (cf. n. 1547).

1396. II. "The Sacraments also confer SACRAMENTAL GRACE, namely helps for obtaining the end for which each Sacrament is instituted."¹³ See again the Dogmatic theologians.

In particular: 1. BAPTISM supplies to a man not placing an obstacle a special help, so that he may be able to conquer concupiscence, despise the enticements of the world, and perform Christian works. 2. CONFIRMATION, so that, when occasion is given, he may profess and defend the faith fearlessly. 3. The EUCHARIST, so that he may remain in the love of Christ and in union with God, by advancing in it from day to day. 4. PENANCE, so that he may detest more perfectly the crimes committed, avoid occasions of sins, persevere in grace, and be able to expiate past faults. 5. EXTREME UNCTION, so that he may be purged from the remains of sin, be relieved in illness, and more easily resist the snares of the demon. 6. ORDER confers on sacred ministers helps by which they may worthily carry out ecclesiastical offices. 7. MATRIMONY bestows powers upon spouses for restraining inordinate concupiscence, for preserving conjugal fidelity, for piously educating offspring, and for constantly fulfilling all the obligations of the conjugal state.¹⁴

1397. Questions. Q. 1. Whether Sacraments received FEIGNEDLY, or WITH AN OBSTACLE, revive when that obstacle has been removed?

Preliminary notes. 1. When a Sacrament is indeed valid, but unformed, it is said to be received FEIGNEDLY, because the one receiving in a certain way feigns that he is disposed for the fruit of the Sacrament, when he is not. 2. This feigning is called an OBSTACLE to grace, and is either material, when namely the omission of the required disposition is inculpable, on account of ignorance, forgetfulness, etc.; or formal, when the omission is culpable, so that it contains the malice of sacrilege.

Resp. 1. The Sacrament of BAPTISM, received with feigning, whether material or formal, when the obstacle has been removed through a subsequent disposition, revives. Thus commonly the authors (except Scotus and a few others) from St. Augustine and St. Thomas.¹⁵ "The reason is that sin before Baptism, or consummated in the very reception of Baptism, is not subject to the keys of the Church; whence it must necessarily be remitted through the power of Baptism alone, which, when the obstacle has been removed, has the effect previously suspended by reason of the feigning."¹⁶

2. Many probably teach the same concerning CONFIRMATION, ORDER, EXTREME UNCTION, and MATRIMONY. The reason is that Confirmation and Order absolutely, Extreme Unction in the same danger of death, and Matrimony while the same spouse is living, cannot be repeated; nevertheless it seems consonant with divine goodness that such recipients should not remain forever deprived of the sacramental grace which they need.
3. The Sacrament of PENANCE does not revive when the feigning is formal, and the reason is that then the Sacrament is invalid. But whether it revives when the feigning is only material depends on the question whether this Sacrament can be valid and at the same time unformed. Some indeed deny it, because the dispositions of the recipient required for the liceity of the Sacrament are at the same time the matter of the Sacrament required for its validity; but others commonly and more truly affirm it, for the case namely in which someone places some material obstacle; if, for example, having two mortal sins, one of theft and the other of sacrilege, he in no way thinks of the sacrilege, nor confesses it, nor grieves over it, not even implicitly, and receives absolution for the theft alone, having conceived attrition from the supernatural turpitude of that sin. For in this case, the Sacrament, in which all the essential parts are found (that is, attrition and sincere confession with absolution), cannot, on the one hand, be called invalid; but on the other hand, it is not informed by grace, because the sin stands in the way, concerning which he neither accuses himself nor grieves. Whence that confession, since it is valid, is not to be repeated, and therefore the Sacrament received with a material obstacle, when this has finally been removed, revives. Thus Suarez, Lugo with St. Thomas¹⁷ and others.
4. The EUCHARIST, as is commonly taught, whether the feigning is material or formal, does not revive, unless the obstacle is removed before the sacred species are consumed. It does not revive if the feigning was formal; "otherwise this absurdity would follow, that a priest who several times in his life had celebrated sacrilegiously, if at death he confessed with remiss attrition, would receive the whole heap of graces of so many sacrilegious Communion;

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Cf. *Exam. Ord.*, n. 22; work on Trent, sess. VII, n. 8-10.

¹⁵3, q. 69, a. 10.

¹⁶Book VI, 87.

¹⁷In 4, dist. 17, q. 3, art. 4, ad 1.

indeed, the more often he had celebrated unworthily, the more abundantly he would be enriched with graces.”¹⁸ Nor, more probably, does it revive if the feigning was only material, because, since this Sacrament from its institution can be frequently repeated, there was no need that a broader efficacy be attributed to it.

Q. 2. How must the OBSTACLE be removed, so that the Sacrament may revive?

Resp. In order that Sacraments validly, but feignedly, received may revive, more probably there is required and suffices the same disposition which was required and sufficient in the reception itself for obtaining grace. Hence: 1. The Sacraments of the dead, namely Baptism and Penance (received with a material obstacle), revive through universal attrition. 2. The Sacraments of the living, that is, Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Order, Matrimony, and, while the sacred species have not yet been consumed, the Eucharist, likewise revive through attrition, if they were received with a material obstacle; for in such a case, even these Sacraments accidentally produce grace in one attrite. Otherwise, if they were received with a formal obstacle, because otherwise they do not seem able to revive except through the Sacrament of Penance received, either in reality with attrition, or in desire with perfect contrition.¹⁹

§ 2. On Character 1398. “Character is a certain spiritual, indelible seal, impressed on the soul of one receiving a Sacrament. It is impressed only in Baptism, Confirmation, and Order; and it signifies the power or dignity received from Sacraments of this kind.”²⁰

It is fitting, according to the Angelic Doctor,²¹ that Sacraments through which a man is constituted in some state which of itself is perpetual should impress a character, by which man is deputed to that state; but through these three Sacraments alone man is constituted in some new state which of itself is perpetual, namely through Baptism he is enrolled forever in the family of Christ, through CONFIRMATION in the army of Christ, through ORDER in the ministry of Christ. Thus there are only three Sacraments which, even if received illicitly, impress a character. Hence: “1. In Baptism character is the sign of the sheep of Christ, by which the faithful are made fit for receiving the other Sacraments. 2. In Confirmation it is the sign of the soldiers of Christ, by which they receive strength for constantly professing the Faith. 3. In Order it is the sign of the ministers of Christ, by which they acquire power for ministering the Sacraments to the faithful.”²²

Article III

On the Constitution of the Sacraments, or on Matter and Form

1399. “All the Sacraments are perfected by three things, namely by things as matter, by words as form, and by the person of the minister conferring the Sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does.” Thus Eugene IV, to the Armenians. We shall treat of the MINISTER in chapter II.

DEFINITIONS. Generally, that has the notion of matter which is determinable and perfectible through another; but that has the notion of form which is determinative and perfective of another.²³ Hence in the Sacraments:

1. MATTER is a sensible thing, to be determined to the notion of a Sacrament through the form. It is twofold: remote, or the pre-existing sensible thing which is employed in the Sacrament, or about which the sacramental action is exercised; and proximate, which 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.
2. FORM is the part of the Sacrament which determines the matter to producing the sacramental effect; and it consists in words uttered by the minister, or, for the Sacrament of Matrimony, and this alone, in signs which can hold the place of words.²⁴

1400. Principles. I. Each Sacrament has its OWN matter and form, divinely instituted. It is certain that Christ determined in species the matter and form of Baptism and the Eucharist, as is clear from the Scriptures. As regards the other Sacraments, the same is not altogether certain. For some, with St. Bonaventure, probably think that the Lord constituted the matter and form of several Sacraments, for example Confirmation and Order, only in a general way, by committing to his Apostles the care of determining those signs more particularly when occasion should be given. Yet others, with St. Thomas, more

¹⁸Book VI, 87.

¹⁹Cf. Lugo, disp. 9, n. 50 ff.

²⁰*Exam. Ord.*, n. 24.

²¹3, q. 63, a. 6.

²²*Exam. Ord.*, l. c.

²³Billuart, *de Sacram.*, diss. 1, art. 4, § 2.

²⁴Cf. book VI, 887.

commonly and more probably affirm that all matters, and also forms as to substance, were determined in species by Christ; and consequently that the diversity of sacramental rites which exists between Latins and Greeks, or between the ancient and present Church, does not pertain to the essence of the things.²⁵

Hence you will deduce: 1. Christ the Lord must be called the immediate author of the Sacraments, because, even in the former opinion, he distinguished all the Sacraments singly. 2. The Church, in the dispensation of the Sacraments, can establish or change those things which she judges to be more expedient for the utility of those receiving or for the veneration of the Sacraments themselves, yet with their substance preserved, as Trent has it, sess. 21, cap. 2.

1401. II. For making a Sacrament, certain matter and form must be applied TOGETHER by the same minister, with every essential VARIATION excluded. But that, from the institution of Christ, conjunction, invariability, and certitude of matter and form are required will be clear from what is to be said; for each must be treated singly.

1. As Regards the Conjunction of Matter and Form 1402. So that a Sacrament may be validly made, two RULES must be observed:

Rule 1. Matter and form must be UNITED or applied by the same minister and toward the same subject.²⁶ The reason is that, if one should place the matter and another the form, the words of the form would not be verified; for example, if Titius should say: "I baptize thee," while Caius pours the water, Titius would utter something false, as is plain.

Rule 2. Between matter and form there must be such a CONJUNCTION that, according to the moral estimation of men, with the nature of each Sacrament considered, the one affects the other; or, in other words, the conjunction must be such that, according to human usage, the words are judged to fall upon such a thing and to constitute with it one moral sign. Otherwise the words of the form would not express the truth.

We said with the nature of each Sacrament considered; for according to the diversity of the Sacraments, the conjunction, or simultaneity, must be diverse.

Whence: 1. In the EUCHARIST physical conjunction is required, since the demonstrative pronoun This and This cannot be verified unless the matter is present. 2. In BAPTISM,²⁷ CONFIRMATION, EXTREME UNCTION, and ORDER it suffices for validity that the matter be applied immediately before the form is pronounced, or immediately after it has been uttered. But a delay of one Our Father between the two would invalidate the Sacrament. Whence, in practice, the opinion of Cajetan, as safer, is to be advised; he requires that the form be begun before the application of the matter is completed, or conversely. 3. In PENANCE, which follows the nature of a judgment, a longer delay of time, for example of one hour, can intervene between accusation and absolution. 4. Finally, in MATRIMONY, the same interval is admitted as in contracts, namely it suffices that the consent of one be placed while the consent of the other perseveres.²⁸

2. As Regards Invariability 1403. Preliminary note. In the matter and form of the Sacraments there can occur a twofold variation or change, namely substantial and accidental. "A substantial change of matter is said to occur when, according to the common use and estimation of men, it differs, in name and in reality, from that which Christ prescribed. An accidental one is said to occur when it retains the same use and name with it. A change of form is essential when the same sense does not remain; accidental, when it remains."²⁹

1404. Principles. I. A SUBSTANTIAL change in matter or in form, whether it is made on purpose and deliberately, or from error or inadvertence, always prevents the validity of the Sacrament. The reason is that through such a change the rite instituted by Christ is taken away (cf. n. 1400).

1405. II. An ACCIDENTAL change does not prevent the validity of the Sacrament; but, according to the gravity or smallness of the change, it induces grave or light sin. The reason for the first is that an accidental change does not take away the institution of Christ. The reason for the second is that it takes away the rite prescribed by the Church: either under grave obligation, for example when she commands that consecrated water be employed in solemn Baptism; or under light obligation, for example when she orders that even the least interruption in pronouncing the words of the form be avoided.³⁰

²⁵Book VI, 12; *H. A.*, XVII, 15; 1 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 60.

²⁶Gury, n. 197, III.

²⁷1 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 59.

²⁸Book VI, 9, 10, 446.

²⁹Book VI, 11.

³⁰Book VI, 109; cf. *Exam. Ord.*, n. 6.

Matter is changed substantially in many ways, the principal of which we shall enumerate in their proper places.

1406. Form can be changed especially in six MODES, as is indicated by these little verses:

Take nothing from the form, add nothing, vary nothing; Beware to transpose, to corrupt words, to delay.

1. By OMISSION: a change of this kind is substantial if essential syllables or words are omitted, for example the word Thee in the conferral of Baptism; but it is only accidental if non-essential words are omitted, for example I, in the same conferral of Baptism.
2. By ADDITION: this is substantial if it takes away the truth of the Sacrament, for example if you say: I baptize thee in the name of the greater Father, of the lesser Son, etc.; accidental, if it does not remove the due sense, for example if you say: In the name of the Father, who created thee, etc.
3. By VARIATION of words: this can be substantial or accidental according as the explicit sense of the form is taken away, for example if you say: In the name of the Most Holy Trinity; or is retained, for example, I wash thee.
4. By TRANSPOSITION; this ordinarily is only accidental, as: Thee I baptize.
5. By CORRUPTION of words, namely from a change of letters. Such a change is more easily substantial at the beginning than at the end of words, because the sense is more easily changed for those hearing, for example if one says: in the name of the mother instead of of the Father; than if one says: chalis instead of chalice.
6. By INTERRUPTION, by which the unity of the speech can be taken away, as if, after having said, This is, you recite a psalm or delay much; but not if, after having said, I thee, you cough, or impose silence on children, and then immediately conclude baptize, etc.

3. As Regards Certitude 1407. Preliminary note. Doubt concerning the matter or form of the Sacraments can be of law or of fact. The first is when it is doubted whether such matter, for example water extracted from flowers in Baptism, or such a form, was instituted by Christ as valid. The other is when it is doubted whether the matter or form to be employed, or already employed, is that which Christ instituted: for example, whether this liquid is water; whether the form was duly uttered.

RULES. In every doubt, whether of law or of fact, concerning matter and form, or generally concerning the VALIDITY of the Sacraments, three rules must be observed: The first is: If there is possibility, let the safest way be chosen, that is, the safer or morally certain opinion. The second: If there is no possibility, let the way be chosen which is nearest to the safest, that is, when certain matter is lacking, let doubtful or probable matter be employed, but under a conditioned form, so that counsel may be taken both for the necessity or grave utility of the recipient, and for the reverence due to the Sacrament. The third: When the impossibility ceases, what the impossibility prohibited must cautiously be supplied.³¹ The first and second rule have already been weighed in the Treatise on Conscience (n. 82). Finally, concerning the third, here:

1408. IT IS ASKED. Whether and when a Sacrament not rightly made can or must be REPEATED?

Resp. 1. If it is prudently doubted whether one of the three unrepeatable Sacraments has been validly conferred, it must again be conferred under condition: Baptism indeed, on account of the greatest necessity of this Sacrament; Order, lest it happen that the Sacraments be invalidly administered; Confirmation, lest the soldier of Christ lack strength for constantly holding and professing the faith. The reason is that, on the one hand, in doubt concerning the validity of a Sacrament, the opinion favoring souls is to be preferred; but on the other hand, no irreverence is inflicted upon the Sacrament when it is conferred under condition from a reasonable cause.

Resp. 2. If there is prudent doubt concerning the validity of a repeatable Sacrament, it CAN be conferred again under condition when notable utility of neighbor is present; but it MUST be, when the Sacrament is necessary. The reason is the same as above.

Resp. 3. To repeat, on account of an empty doubt, a Sacrament, although under condition, is of itself a grave sin. The reason is that a rash repetition of a sacramental action is grave irreverence. Nevertheless, by accident the scrupulous are excused, on account of perplexity. And he seems to sin only venially who repeats a word or syllable in the utterance of the form.

Note. When doubtful Baptism is conferred publicly, the condition must be expressed in words (as the Ritual wills), lest those standing by believe that Baptism is being repeated absolutely against the law of the Church. Indeed, it will be safer

³¹Cf. Haine, *de Sacram.*, cap. 4, dub. 11.

(or at least more becoming) to express the condition in words whenever any Sacrament whatever is ministered under condition, whether publicly or privately.³²

Chapter II

On the Minister of the Sacraments

1409. DEFINITION. The minister of the Sacraments is called the one who, in the name of Christ, whose mandatary he is, completes the sacramental action.

DIVISION. One minister is ordinary, who, according to the customary order constituted by Christ and by the Church, can make the Sacrament. Another is extraordinary, who, outside this order, makes some Sacraments, but on account of a peculiar privilege, delegation, or necessity. Thus in Baptism the ordinary minister is a priest; the extraordinary minister, in a case of necessity, is any man whatever (cf. n. 1411).

These things having been noted beforehand, we shall treat of those things which are required in the minister, 1. that he operate validly, 2. that he operate licitly.

Article I

On the Requisites in the Minister That He May Operate Validly

1410. Principles. I. For the valid making or administration of the Sacraments there is not required in the minister either the STATE OF GRACE, or PROBITY OF LIFE, indeed not even FAITH itself. This is established from Trent, sess. 7, can. 11 and 12; and the reason is that the Sacraments operate not from the disposition of the minister, but through divine power, according to the institution and merits of Christ.³³ But indeed:

1411. II. There is required in the minister POWER divinely granted. The reason is that God alone can join grace to the acts of the minister. But certain Sacraments can be conferred by Bishops alone, either exclusively, as Order, or by ordinary faculty, as Confirmation. Others fall equally under the power of Bishops and simple priests, yet with suitable subordination, as the Eucharist, Penance, and Extreme Unction. Finally others do not require for themselves a specially consecrated or deputed minister, as Baptism, which can validly be conferred by every man; and Matrimony, whose ministers are the contracting parties themselves.³⁴

1412. III. There is required in the minister at least an INTENTION, or will of doing what the Church does; but a VIRTUAL intention suffices. The reason why some intention is required is that the matter and form of the Sacraments are of themselves indifferent to the being of a Sacrament, since they can be ordered to a joke or to another end; therefore they must be determined through intention.³⁵ Now, to denote the object and quality of the intention:

It is said 1. There is required at least the intention of doing what the Church does; this is clear from the Decree of the Council of Florence, where it is said that the Sacraments are made “with the intention of doing what the Church does.” Nicholas I declared the same, who responded that Baptism conferred by a Jew or pagan is valid, “if it was conferred with true matter and form; for such a Baptism is valid, on account of the general intention of doing what the Jew or pagan has heard is done by Christians or by the Church of Christ.”³⁶

From this you will deduce: 1. That for the validity of a Sacrament there is not required an explicit intention of making a Sacrament; or of performing an external rite as formally and absolutely sacred; or of producing the effect of the Sacrament: for these are held implicitly in the intention of doing what the Church does. 2. That a mimicking intention, or another by which the intention of doing a sacred thing would be excluded, does not suffice, as is drawn from the condemnation of Luther;³⁷ nor does an intention, even a serious one, of placing an external act suffice; for that act could be directed to other ends, for example to exciting faith, as heretics will; whence the opinion of Catharinus, teaching that an external intention suffices, is scarcely probable (and therefore in no way safe), although concerning this opinion no express definition of the Apostolic See has come forth.³⁸ 3. The authors add that there is not required the intention of doing what the Roman

³²Book VI, 28-29, and 2 *Elench. qq. ref.*, 17; cf. also the *MISSAL, de Defectibus*, V, 2, where a tacit condition is valid.

³³Book VI, 13.

³⁴*Exam. Ord.*, n. 10; book VI, 113, 170, 539, 761, 897.

³⁵*Exam. Ordin.*, n. 9, 18.

³⁶Book VI, 22, end.

³⁷Trent, sess. 14, can. 9, on Penance.

³⁸Cf. Panzuti, book VI, 19-21.

Church does, but that the intention of doing what the true Church instituted by Christ does suffices. Whence those rightly baptized by heretics, who deny that the Roman Church is the true Church, are not to be rebaptized.³⁹

1413. It is said 2. A VIRTUAL intention suffices (cf. n. 272, 6). For it is certain that an actual intention is not required; although this is excellent, and therefore greatly to be desired, nevertheless it is not always possible to man, “because, besides the intention,” as St. Thomas writes,⁴⁰ “when a man wishes to intend much, he begins to think other things.” It is likewise certain that a habitual intention does not suffice (namely one which someone had at some time and has not revoked, and which endures in no effect); because an intention of this kind does not make the action elicited in a human manner, as is required in the minister, from whom the Sacraments proceed as from an operating cause. Much less sufficient will be the intention which is called interpretative, when someone, for example sleeping or drunk, has no actual intention and never had one, but would have it if he noticed. Therefore a VIRTUAL intention is required and suffices, namely that by which someone, although here and now he does not intend to make a Sacrament, nevertheless acts by force of an actual intention previously had; as if someone, for example, having had in the morning the intention of celebrating Mass, afterwards goes to the church, clothes himself with sacred vestments, etc. For, led by such an intention, the minister operates in a truly human manner, since the intention is the true cause of the act which he places. Thus all.⁴¹

Hence you will deduce: 1. A minister who in the usual manner placed the actions required for a Sacrament, provided he did not exclude the intention, afterwards doubts concerning the same only imprudently; because at least he willed to do what otherwise is usually done by himself or by others, and thus he had the intention in act exercised. 2. Even a coerced intention and one extorted by fear suffices for the validity of the Sacrament, because fear does not take away the voluntary. Matrimony is excepted, from which force and fear must be absent, at least from the definition of the Church. 3. The Sacrament is valid even if the minister perhaps erred concerning the person of the recipient, unless his intention was bound exclusively to some determinate person, which is wont to happen only in Matrimony.

1414. Questions. Q. 1. Whether a Sacrament conferred with a CONDITIONED intention is valid?

Resp. Affirmatively, if the condition is appended concerning a present or past thing; for, since the added condition has already been verified, the conditional intention passes into an absolute one. Nor does an appended condition of this kind prevent the validity of the Sacrament, nor even its liceity, if namely it is appended on account of a just cause, as we shall say in its own place (n. 1663, q. 5).

But the Sacrament is not valid if the condition concerns the future; because no Sacrament is perfected unless the form is applied to present matter. Matrimony is excepted, which, after the likeness of other contracts, can be celebrated under a condition concerning the future; for then the Sacrament is perfected when, the condition having been fulfilled, the contract is perfected.⁴²

Similarly, a Sacrament is not valid if a condition is appended which cannot be known humanly, for example, “I absolve thee, if God truly foreknows that it will be that thou restore.” The reason is that, since God has committed the administration of the Sacraments to the knowledge and will of men, a condition cannot be appended which is impassable to human knowledge.⁴³ Recall what was said, n. 1408, Note.

Q. 2. What if the minister has two contrary intentions?

Resp. 1. If those two contrary intentions are simultaneous, the predominant one prevails, namely that which would be chosen by the minister if he knew that both could not stand together; but if neither is predominant, the minister effects nothing, for the one destroys the other. 2. If one intention succeeds another, the later one prevails. Except if through the former any subsequent will whatever was revoked, at least virtually; for then the prior will, provided it is not expressly revoked, certainly prevails. If doubt perseveres, the validity of the Sacrament will be doubtful. These things can happen especially in the Eucharist and in Matrimony.⁴⁴

Q. 3. Whether, besides intention, ATTENTION also is required in one making a Sacrament?

Resp. Certainly attention is required for LICEITY, as will be seen below.⁴⁵ But the opinion of Lacroix, who affirms that attention is necessary for the VALIDITY of a Sacrament, seems improbable. For all authors say that for the validity of a

³⁹Book VI, 20-23.

⁴⁰3, q. 64, a. 8, ad 3.

⁴¹Book VI, 15-18; *H. A.*, XIV, 2.

⁴²Book VI, 25, 26.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 26; see also St. Alphonsus on Trent, sess. 7, n. 31.

⁴⁴Book VI, 24.

⁴⁵Cf. book VI, 224, and 410, dub. 5.

Sacrament, nothing else is required, besides matter and form, than the intention of the minister, as was defined by the Councils. Nor does it prevent this to say that an action which happens without attention is not human; for although a man, about to operate in a human manner, must attend to the end of the work which he intends to perfect, nevertheless it is not required that he actually attend to the work which he executes. Hence Suarez excellently teaches that a minister, although distracted, truly makes the Sacrament; because, as he says, his action is simply human and free, and proceeds from a prior intention.⁴⁶

Article II

On the Requisites in the Minister That He May Operate Licitly

Besides those things which are necessary for validity, three things are required on the part of the minister, namely that 1. he be worthy and fit; 2. that he act worthily and rightly; 3. that he confer the Sacraments on the worthy.

1. That He Be Worthy and Fit 1415. Principles. I. In order that the minister of the Sacraments be worthy and fit, there is required first that the CHURCH in some way have DEPUTED him. The reason is that the making and administration of the Sacraments is part of the sacred ministry, which Christ committed to his Church.

But one is deputed either generally or specially: generally indeed for private Baptism in a case of necessity, and for Matrimony; specially, however, for the other Sacraments; for these cannot validly be made except by a consecrated or ordained minister, nor licitly administered (indeed, if Penance is in question, not even validly), unless by a minister endowed with some jurisdiction, at least delegated.

1416. II. For the licit making and administration of the Sacraments there is required that the minister (at least if he is consecrated and ministers solemnly) be IN THE STATE OF GRACE. The reason is that holy things are to be treated holily, and because the minister must be conformed to Christ, whose person he bears and in whose name he operates.⁴⁷ “Wherefore” (thus the Roman Ritual) “he will perpetually take care of this, that he conduct life integrally, chastely, and piously; for, although the Sacraments cannot be defiled by the impure, nor the effect impeded by wicked ministers, nevertheless those ministering them impurely and unworthily incur the guilt of eternal death” (cf. n. 583).

1417. From these things it follows: 1. Pastors and other priests upon whom from office it is incumbent to minister the Sacraments are bound always to have themselves prepared for ministering the Sacraments in the state of grace. But if someone, existing in mortal sin, must minister them, he is first bound to elicit an act of perfect contrition; but he is held by no law to confess, except before Communion or the celebration of Mass, according to the Decree of Trent, sess. 13, cap. 7.⁴⁸ “But if he has an abundance of a Confessor, and the account of time and place allows, it is fitting to confess.” Thus the Roman Ritual (cf. n. 1547).

2. One celebrating Mass in mortal sin commits four mortal sins, because he unworthily consecrates, unworthily ministers, ministers to himself unworthy, and unworthily receives.⁴⁹ Yet he sufficiently expresses these in confession if he says: “I celebrated in mortal sin.”
3. A priest (or Deacon) ministering the Eucharist in mortal sin sins mortally, because he unworthily places an act by which he proximately concurs toward the sanctification of those communicating. Thus one must hold with Suarez and many against Lugo and others. Yet he does not commit several sins if he distributes Communion to several, because it is one banquet.⁵⁰
4. A Confessor commits as many sins as the persons whom he absolves while constituted in mortal sin; because each absolution is a complete judgment. But if he only hears confession, more probably he does not sin gravely, because he does not make the Sacrament.⁵¹

NB. See other things n. 1439, on the unworthy MINISTER.

⁴⁶Book VI, 14.

⁴⁷Cf. St. Thomas, 3, q. 64, a. 6.

⁴⁸Book VI, 33, end, and 34.

⁴⁹Ibid., 35, Hence; and *Exam. Ordin.*, n. 11, end.

⁵⁰Book VI, 35; *Exam. Ordin.*, 13; 1 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 62.

⁵¹Book V, 50, q. 6; VI, 36.

1418. Questions. Q. 1. Whether one sins gravely who, necessity compelling, ministers a Sacrament in mortal sin if he HAS NOT BEEN ORDAINED to it; or, if he has been ordained, ministers it NOT SOLEMNLY?⁵²

Resp. The first opinion denies this with St. Thomas; because he does not exhibit himself as a minister of the Church, but aids one suffering necessity. This opinion is indeed probable; but the second opinion, affirming, considered according to reason, seems more probable. The reason is that the obligation of ministering in the state of grace is not derived only from the consecration of the minister, but also from the sanctity of the Sacraments themselves, which must always be handled holily; and indeed under grave obligation, in a grave matter. Moreover, although a minister who is not consecrated does not act in the name of the Church, nevertheless he acts in the name of Christ, cooperating immediately with Him for the sanctification of the soul; whence whoever exercises such an office ought to be endowed with sanctity.⁵³

Hence, more probably, speaking per se, the following sin gravely: 1. a layman, or a priest, ministering Baptism non-solemnly in a case of necessity, if he ministers in mortal sin; 2. one contracting Matrimony in mortal sin; and since such a person at the same time receives and ministers the Sacrament, he stains himself with a twofold sin.⁵⁴ We have said, speaking per se; for, per accidens, a minister, whether consecrated or not consecrated, is excused if he ministers in mortal sin the Sacrament of Baptism or Penance in necessity, for example if he could not be contrite so quickly, and there were danger that the dying person would depart without Baptism or absolution, as is commonly taught.⁵⁵

Q. 2. Whether a minister sins gravely who, in mortal sin, exercises other SACRED FUNCTIONS which are not the making or administration of the Sacraments?

Resp. Some affirm with St. Thomas, who says that all who exercise, from office, the functions of the Order received, from the Bishop even to the Porter, commit grave fault if they are in mortal sin. But others more commonly, and sufficiently probably, deny this with Suarez; and the reason is that, since all the other exercises of Orders, besides the making and administration of the Sacraments, are not proximately ordered to the sanctification of the soul, they do not seem under grave obligation to require the sanctity of those exercising them. Yet these commit venial fault, and indeed the graver, the more their action approaches the ministry of a Sacrament.⁵⁶

Hence: 1. Not improbably several authors assert that he does not sin gravely who, existing in mortal sin, touches the Eucharist immediately or mediately from office, for example by carrying it in procession, or by blessing the people. Yet the opposite opinion of St. Thomas is also very probable.⁵⁷

2. Deacons and subdeacons who, in mortal sin, minister at the altar do not sin gravely, according to a sufficiently probable opinion, even if they minister frequently.⁵⁸
3. A Bishop who, in mortal sin, makes chrism or holy oil does not seem to sin gravely.⁵⁹ Nor does a Bishop or priest sin mortally who, in mortal sin, consecrates a church, blesses sacred vestments or corporals, assists at Matrimony, blesses ashes, lustral water, etc. Thus very commonly against a few.⁶⁰
4. A preacher, preaching in mortal sin, does not sin gravely, as is taught more commonly and more probably. Yet authors commonly do not excuse him from venial sin, on account of some irreverence which is done to the divine word. Nay more, if the preacher inveighs against a vice concerning which he himself is publicly defamed, he does not seem to be excused from mortal sin; because then he gives scandal and impedes the end of doctrine.⁶¹

2. That He Act Worthily and Rightly 1419. Among SACRAMENTAL RITES, some are essential, others only accidental: ESSENTIAL rites are those which Christ the Lord Himself instituted, and without which the Sacrament is invalid. ACCIDENTAL rites are called those which the Church has prescribed for the more fitting decency and splendor of the sacramental action.

⁵²H. A., XIV, 6, end; *Exam. Ordin.*, n. 12.

⁵³Book VI, 32; *Exam. Ordin.*, n. 12.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, end; 1 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 61.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 33.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 37-40.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 35, end.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, 38.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 39.

⁶⁰Book VI, 40.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, 41.

1420. Principles. I. There is a grave obligation of observing all ESSENTIAL rites of the Sacraments. This namely is required: 1. by religion; “for it is in a certain way to mock Christ, the author of the Sacraments, to employ, against His institution, signs for conferring grace in His name which He Himself did not assume for this”;⁶² 2. by charity, because otherwise one’s neighbor is deprived of a great spiritual good; 3. by justice, if the Sacrament is requested; for by the very fact that the minister consents to confer it, he tacitly obliges himself to its valid conferral.⁶³

Hence: 1. One ministering sins mortally if he uses false matter or form, or, outside necessity, doubtful matter or form. 2. He also sins gravely when he pronounces the words of the form corruptly, inarticulately, without devotion, if from this he undergoes proximate danger of erring in substantial matters. Otherwise venially, unless scandal or contempt is present (cf. nn. 1405 and 1406).

1421. II. All rites prescribed by the CHURCH, or received by custom, even IN ACCIDENTAL MATTERS, must be observed with diligent care.

The reason is that the Sacraments, as holy things, must be handled holily, and the precepts of the Church oblige in conscience. Whence Trent (sess. 7, can. 13): “If anyone shall say that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, accustomed to be used in the solemn administration of the Sacraments, may either be contemned, or be omitted by ministers according to pleasure without sin, or be changed into other new rites by any pastor whatsoever of the Churches: let him be anathema” (cf. n. 583).

Hence: 1. If the aforesaid rites are omitted or changed from contempt, it is mortal. 2. If from negligence, it is often mortal, when the omission or change is notable, or in a grave matter. But what omission, in individual Sacraments, is to be held notable matter, will be explained below in the proper places. 3. If some ceremony or laudable custom is omitted which is only of counsel, there will per se be no sin.

1422. It is asked: Whether it is of precept to use the ROMAN RITUAL in the administration of Sacraments and Sacramentals?

Resp. Affirmatively, unless perhaps other rites have been granted somewhere. This is established from the Bull of Paul V, *Apostolicae Sedis*, of June 16, 1614, in which one reads that the Roman Ritual contains “rites ... which ought to be observed” by all exercising the care of souls.⁶⁴ The Sacred Congregation of Rites declared the same thing, on April 7, 1832, and May 23, 1835, saying: “Those books alone are to be employed, and in them only blessings which are conformable to the Roman Ritual; ... nor are other formulas to be employed, provided it is not established that they have been approved by this Sacred Congregation.”⁶⁵ Nor is it licit for Bishops to change the prescriptions of the Roman Ritual at will; and if perhaps a Bishop had established changes, this is not a sufficient dispensation for priests (S. R. C., January 10, 1852).⁶⁶

We have said unless other rites have been granted somewhere; for the Holy See, for diverse dioceses, has approved Rituals differing in several matters from the Roman Ritual. Moreover, customs according to or beside the law can be retained, as is clear from the Roman Ritual itself and from several declarations of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. But customs contrary to the Rubrics and decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites must be eliminated. Yet if abuses are general and inveterate, the Bishop “in correcting these should proceed with all patience and doctrine, and, according to the opportunity given him, should strive to eliminate them in such a way that the faithful suffer no scandal from it.” S. R. C., May 9, 1857, to the Bishop of Limburg.⁶⁷

Note from the ROMAN RITUAL: 1. “In every administration of the Sacraments the priest is to be vested in a surplice, and over it with a stole of that color which the rite of the Sacrament demands; unless in ministering the Sacrament of Penance occasion, or custom, or place sometimes advises otherwise. 2. He shall also employ at least one cleric, if he has one, or several, according as the nature of the place and of the Sacrament requires, in becoming habit and likewise vested in surplice.”

3. That He Confer the Sacraments on the Worthy 1423. Principles. I. A minister conferring the Sacraments on the UNWORTHY sins gravely, unless from denial graver inconveniences would follow.

The first is clear: 1. from Matthew 7:6: “Do not give what is holy to dogs...” And from 1 Corinthians 4:2: “Here now it is required among dispensers that a man be found faithful.” 2. From reason; for a minister who knowingly and willingly

⁶²Reuter, p. 4, tract. 1, cap. 1, n. 14.

⁶³Book VI, 619.

⁶⁴Ibid., 285, dub. 4.

⁶⁵Cf. Gardellini, n. 4681, 5; 4748, 9.

⁶⁶Ibid., n. 5165, 4.

⁶⁷Benger, *Compend*, n. 317.

would dispense the Sacraments to the unworthy would violate both the virtue of religion, because he would handle the Sacraments irreverently and defraud them of their effects, and the precept of charity, because he would cooperate in the sin of those receiving unworthily. The second follows from what was said on Cooperation; for it is licit, on account of proportionately grave causes, and by giving one's work to a good thing, to cooperate materially in the sins of others. Whence it is licit to minister the Sacraments to one asking unworthily, if this is necessary to avoid scandal, or unjust defamation, or violation of the sacramental seal.

1424. II. The minister ought to INQUIRE concerning the worthiness of the recipient, according to the nature of each Sacrament. Namely, Sacraments are to be distinguished in whose administration the priest is judge, from those in whose conferral he is only dispenser. Of the former kind are Baptism of adults, Penance, Order, and Matrimony with respect to the impediments of Matrimony: therefore for these Sacraments the minister ought, from positive indications, to form for himself a prudent judgment concerning the worthiness or fitness of the recipients. Of the latter kind are Confirmation, the Eucharist, and Extreme Unction, to which Sacraments all have a right who live as Catholics. Whence for administering these it suffices that it is not established to the minister that those asking are positively unworthy.⁶⁸

From the preceding principles the following RULES are drawn:

1425. Rule 1. A HIDDEN sinner asking publicly is not to be denied a Sacrament. This is established by the example of Christ, who gave Communion to Judas. And the reason is that in these circumstances Christ is judged to yield His right, both so that the sinner may not lose the reputation to which he has a right, and especially so that many very grave inconveniences, such as scandals, omission of the Sacraments, etc., may be avoided.⁶⁹

1426. Rule 2. A HIDDEN sinner, asking secretly, is to be denied the Sacrament until his penitence is established. The reason is that both reverence for the Sacrament and the good of the one asking demand this.

It is said 1. a hidden sinner, namely one whom the minister knows as such from certain knowledge, but outside confession; 2. asking secretly: this happens when the one asking is found either alone with the minister, or only with a few, and of such condition that no attention should deservedly be paid to them, as little children would be; 3. until his penitence is established; but this is established if it is known to the minister that the guilty man has made confession either with him or with another priest, even secretly. Nor is one to inquire whether absolution was given; for, even if the minister himself had denied it, he could not, without breaking the seal, admonish the guilty man, nor, as the truer opinion holds, repel him from the Sacrament under the pretext of other causes.

1427. Rule 3. A PUBLIC sinner, unless he has given sufficient signs of conversion and has removed scandal, is to be denied the Sacrament, whether he asks for it publicly or secretly. The reason is that the divine precept presses: "Do not give what is holy to dogs"; nor is an excusing cause given, as is plain from what has been said.

It is said 1. a public sinner. But a sinner is called public either absolutely, namely when his unworthiness is certain and notorious to the community, by notoriety of law, or of fact, or of reputation (cf. n. 1199); or respectively, when the unworthiness is known only to those in whose presence the Sacrament is requested. If, therefore, the community, or all those present, know the unworthiness of the one asking, the Sacrament is to be denied. And the same must be said if knowledge of a crime committed in another place will easily come into the parish, or if there already exists so grave a suspicion of it that it is equivalent to moral certainty. More probably, however, it is not to be denied if the unworthiness of the one asking is known only to most of those present. The reason is that such a sinner still possesses his reputation with respect to those who are ignorant of his crime.⁷⁰

It is said 2. the Sacrament is to be denied; under this name not only the Most Holy Eucharist is to be understood, but also the other Sacraments, even though the priest is their simple dispenser. Penance alone is excepted, which, since it was instituted for sinners, is never to be denied to anyone, unless perhaps a special prohibition has been made, for example on account of reserved censures, or because the penitent must first make satisfaction or furnish a guarantee of making satisfaction.⁷¹

It is said 3. unless he has given sufficient signs of conversion. For whenever the crime is certain and notorious, the penitence likewise ought to be certain and notorious. But a sufficient indication of conversion is had if a sinner who is not living in habitual scandal makes confession publicly or before several, so that the penitence is shortly to be manifested. It is otherwise if there were a notorious occasion first to be left, or if some retraction to be made beforehand were pressing.⁷²

⁶⁸Book VI, 43.

⁶⁹Book VI, 50; cf. Lugo, *De Sacram.*, disp. 8, sect. 10-14.

⁷⁰Book VI, 44, 45.

⁷¹Scavini, III, n. 40.

⁷²Book VI, 47.

1428. Let it be noted: 1. Among those who are to be kept from Communion as publicly unworthy are enumerated in the Roman Ritual: excommunicated persons who are notorious, those interdicted, and those manifestly infamous, as prostitutes, concubinarians, usurers, at least those who are public by law or condemned by sentence of a judge, magicians, sorcerers, among whom are fortune-tellers, blasphemers, for example those who are accustomed by writings or words to assail religion and the Church with calumnies, and other public sinners of this kind,⁷³ as are

public customary sinners, those notoriously enrolled in condemned sects, actors and actresses exhibiting impious or shameful plays, those rebelling against the legitimate authority of their prelates, etc. To these, moreover, must be added, as is clear, those who are publicly and actually in sin, for example those manifestly here and now drunk, or women so immodestly uncovered that the uncovering is per se mortal.

2. "The Sacraments, if they are to be publicly denied, must be denied in a prudent manner. Whence all things must be avoided by the minister by which either he himself would become liable to the laws punishing defamation, or a greater impediment would be put in the way of the conversion of the unworthy person. Therefore the motives of the denial are not to be publicly explained; wherefore, if the unworthy person approaches the sacred Table with others, the priest should pass him by in such a way that he reveals nothing either by words or by nod. But if during Mass he alone approaches, let the priest remain at the altar, and through another let him inform him that he cannot offer him the sacred banquet, yet without saying why he cannot."⁷⁴

With respect to the dying in particular, see n. 1854 in the Treatise on Penance.

1429. Questions. Q. 1. What is to be done IN DOUBT concerning the crime or concerning penitence?

Resp. Distinguish. 1. If the crime is certain and penitence doubtful, the Sacrament certainly is to be denied until penitence is established, because infamy possesses. 2. If there is doubt concerning the crime, the Sacrament cannot be denied, except in the case in which a positive sign of the fitness of the one asking would be required, as was said (n. 1424).

There is excepted: 1. The Sacrament of ORDER, from which an unworthy cleric, even though hidden, must altogether be kept; because he who thrusts himself into public offices for which he is not fit is to be repelled even with infamy, if it cannot be done otherwise, on account of the public good. Thus from Trent (sess. 14, cap. 1, *de Ref.*).⁷⁵ Nor is the Bishop obliged to manifest the cause of the rejection; nor does appeal belong to the one rejected, but only recourse to the Holy See⁷⁶ (see n. 1916, q. 2).

2. MATRIMONY, at which the pastor is prohibited from assisting, for example if outside Confession he has known some impediment, as will be said in its place. Yet he can be excused, even though the contracting parties are publicly unworthy, if he assists in order to avoid death or grave evils of the community, or of the contracting parties themselves, for example lest they themselves persevere in sin, e.g. in civil marriage.⁷⁷

Q. 2. Whether fear of DEATH or INFAMY can excuse a minister if he confers a Sacrament on the unworthy?

Resp. 1. "The first opinion affirms, provided the Sacrament is not demanded in hatred of the faith, or in contempt of religion. The reason is that, if the infamy of a sinner publicly asking for a Sacrament excuses such ministration and repairs the irreverence toward the Sacrament, why ought not death or infamy to be undergone by the minister excuse him?"⁷⁸

2. But the second opinion, to which St. Alphonsus adheres, denies; because the adequate reason on account of which the Sacrament is not to be denied to a hidden sinner is not that his reputation be preserved for him, but especially, except in the case of Matrimony, that "grave inconveniences be avoided which would follow from it, namely scandals of others, by which, if a priest could publicly deny Communion on account of a hidden crime, perhaps even the good would be deterred from the reception of Communion, fearing lest because of hatred or imprudence they might be cast away by the priest, etc. But these inconveniences and scandals certainly do not intervene in a minister who would be forced by fear to minister a Sacrament to an unworthy person; indeed it would be an edification to the people if, in order to preserve reverence for the Sacrament, he exposed himself to the danger of death."

Q. 3. Whether it is licit to SIMULATE or DISSIMULATE a Sacrament, lest it be conferred on the unworthy?

⁷³Konings, n. 1233.

⁷⁴Konings, n. 1233.

⁷⁵Book VI, 50.

⁷⁶Ibid., 52.

⁷⁷Ibid., 54.

⁷⁸Ibid., 49; cf. 1 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 63.

Note beforehand. 1. SIMULATION of a Sacrament is had when the minister places its matter and form, or the form alone, without the internal intention of making the Sacrament. It is distinguished into formal and material. Formal is that by which the deception of another is directly intended; material is that by which the deception of another is only permitted. 2. DISSIMULATION of a Sacrament is said to be had when the fiction or defect is so exterior that it can be known of itself: as, for example, if the matter or form of the Sacrament is not placed, but in its place something else is substituted, so that something other than a Sacrament is done.

Resp. 1. It is never licit, not even materially, to SIMULATE a Sacrament. The reason is that every simulation inflicts a grave injury on the Author of the Sacraments, by abusing sacred things instituted by Him. Hence Innocent XI proscribed this proposition: "Urgent grave fear is a cause for simulating the administration of a Sacrament." Say the same concerning reception, because the same reason applies.

Resp. 2. It is licit, for cause, to DISSIMULATE a Sacrament, provided this is done apart from contempt, scandal, intention of deceiving, or another evil circumstance. The reason is that then neither is sacrilege committed, since the sacred sign instituted by Christ is absent, nor a lie, since deception of neighbor is neither intended nor necessarily had; only the truth is hidden, which, when a just cause accedes, all with St. Thomas permit⁷⁹ (cf. n. 1181).

1430. From these things you resolve: 1. It is never licit to utter the words of absolution over one indisposed, or the words of consecration over bread without the intention of consecrating, or to omit the consecration during the celebration of Mass. Nor similarly is it licit to give to one approaching the sacred Table, even one knowing and consenting, a host not consecrated in place of a consecrated one. The reason is that in this case, "although indeed a Sacrament is not simulated, which is not there, nevertheless bread is exposed to the adoration of those standing by and of the recipient himself, who, just as he would sin externally by adoring an idol, even from fear of death, so also would sin externally by adoring an unconsecrated host; and he would sin more gravely than if he communicated unworthily."

2. It is licit for a confessor to pray over one indisposed and to impart a blessing to him, lest his indisposition be disclosed to the others; for this is not an abuse of a sacred thing, since no sacramental thing is placed; nor a lie, because either of itself or from the circumstances the action can be explained, and only for a grave cause is the error of others permitted. Likewise, one can, without simulation, approach the confessional, kneel, and speak about a matter. Likewise, in the case in which someone cannot dispose himself for Communion, it is licit for him, to avoid infamy or scandal, to agree with the priest that the latter only pronounce over him the words: *Corpus D. N. J. C.*, etc., without giving a host; because then a Sacrament is not simulated.

Finally, neither is it illicit for spouses, on account of grave fear, for example of infamy or scandal, to simulate the external celebration of Matrimony; for where voluntary consent is lacking, there the matter and form of the Sacrament are lacking; whence indeed the contract is simulated, but the Sacrament is not simulated.⁸⁰

Note. On the OBLIGATION which a pastor has of ministering the Sacraments, it will be said in the Treatise on the Clerical State (n. 2271). See what has already been said, nn. 485 sqq. and 491 sqq., with respect to the obligation of charity by which other priests are bound.

Chapter III

On the Subject of the Sacraments

1431. The SUBJECT of a Sacrament is he who receives the Sacrament and is capable of the effect of the Sacrament.

That only man as wayfarer is the subject of a Sacrament is established both from Sacred Scripture and from the perpetual tradition of the Church; for he alone is capable of first grace or of its increase. Yet not every man as wayfarer is capable of all Sacraments. Thus infants are incapable of Penance and Matrimony; women, of Order; the healthy, of Extreme Unction.⁸¹

In this chapter we must treat: 1. of the requisites for valid reception of a Sacrament; 2. of the requisites for licit reception.

⁷⁹Book VI, 59.

⁸⁰Book VI, 59-62; *Exam. Ordin.*, 16-17.

⁸¹Book VI, 79.

Article I

On the Requisites for Valid Reception of a Sacrament

1432. Principles. I. For VALID reception of the Sacraments there is not required faith, nor probity in the subject, if you except Penance. This is established from the practice of the Church, which never permitted heretics or wicked men, rightly baptized or ordained, to be baptized or ordained again. A fortiori, ATTENTION is not required, which is not even demanded in the minister.

1433. II. In every recipient, BAPTISM is prerequisite for the validity of the other Sacraments: "The reason is that the Sacraments were instituted for the Church alone, and men become of the body of the Church through Baptism alone, as Eugene IV defined in the Decree of Faith to the Armenians."

Hence: 1. If the Eucharist were ministered to a Jew or pagan, he would indeed receive the Body of Christ, but only materially, as the pyx receives it. 2. The marriage of unbelievers, even if it were made according to the rite of the Church, would always be a mere contract.⁸²

1434. III. In ADULTS, for valid reception of the Sacraments, INTENTION is required, yet diverse according to the diverse nature of the Sacraments. The reason is that God, in His present providence of things, does not will adults to be justified or sanctified without their will and consent; and therefore He has established that the means of salvation be applied only to those willing. Whence Innocent III says: "But he who never consents, but wholly contradicts, receives neither the thing nor the character of the Sacrament."⁸³ Therefore one who has himself merely passively, neither willing nor dissenting, and a fortiori one who resists, or one who intends to make a game, does not perceive the Sacrament.

We have said, intention is required, yet diverse according to the diverse nature of the Sacraments. The reason is that some Sacraments require one cooperation from the recipients, others another. For: 1. Some, as PENANCE and MATRIMONY, are not made except by the acts themselves of the subject, which have themselves as matter or form, and therefore for the validity of these Sacraments there is required in the recipient, as in the minister, at least a virtual intention.

2. Others, as BAPTISM and ORDER, have this proper to themselves, that they impose on the recipients obligations of a new state. But since it is in no way equitable that such obligations be imposed on an adult without his positive consent, it follows that for reception of each Sacrament there is required an intention at least habitual, that is, an intention already had and not retracted. The assertion is confirmed by the practice of the Church; for on the one hand it is prohibited in the Roman Ritual that an adult who has fallen into madness or into a sudden illness be baptized, unless before, when he was in possession of himself, he had desired Baptism; and on the other hand the Church never reiterates the Sacraments of Baptism and Order for those who received them from a will previously had.⁸⁴

3. Finally others, as CONFIRMATION, the EUCHARIST, EXTREME UNCTION, require for themselves only this, that the subject be capable of the sacramental operation, which is a benefit of God from the work worked. Whence, that they be validly received, an interpretative intention suffices, namely that which the recipient indeed never had, but probably would have had, if he were in possession of himself. Specifically concerning Extreme Unction the Roman Ritual has this: "This Sacrament is to be given to those destitute of their senses, who previously asked for it, or who would probably have asked for it." The same is also commonly admitted concerning Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist, with Lugo, Sporer, etc.⁸⁵ Yet take notice that it is illicit, outside danger of death or perpetual madness, to confer Sacraments on adults while they do not enjoy the actual use of reason.

1435. IV. In INFANTS, and the perpetually insane, for VALID reception of the Sacraments of which they are capable, namely Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, and Order, no disposition or intention is required. This is established from the practice of the Church and the common opinion. The reason is that infants are not justified or sanctified through an act of their own will, of which indeed they are incapable, but through the will of another; whence Christ and the Church are judged to supply their intention, just as in civil matters a tutor supplies for a ward.⁸⁶

⁸²Book VI, 79.

⁸³Cap. *Majores*, v. fin., *de Baptismo*.

⁸⁴Book VI, 82; *Exam. Ordin.*, 19.

⁸⁵Book VI, 82.

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 80.

Article II

On the Requisites for Licit Reception of a Sacrament

In infants and the perpetually insane, that no disposition is required in order that they usefully receive the Sacraments of which they are capable is the common opinion. But in adults, besides those things which are required for valid reception, several other things are required for licit reception of a Sacrament. Hold the following:

1436. Principles. I. For licitly and fruitfully receiving the Sacraments OF THE DEAD, namely Baptism and Penance, there are required in adults acts of FAITH, HOPE, at least virtual, and sorrow for sins, which must at least be ATTRITION. This is established from Trent, sess. 14, cap. 1, where the dispositions necessary for justification are set forth at length. Yet sorrow in one to be baptized ought to concern actual sins, not original sin; because no one repents of the deed of another.⁸⁷

1437. II. For licitly and fruitfully receiving the Sacraments OF THE LIVING, by divine law the preexisting STATE OF GRACE is required. The reason is that the Sacraments of the living were instituted primarily for increasing sanctifying grace; therefore, speaking per se, they already presuppose

it present in the subject, although per accidens they can generate it (cf. n. 1395).

Hence: 1. He who knowingly receives a Sacrament of the living in the state of mortal sin sins gravely; and indeed more gravely than the minister who makes or ministers it, because he not only handles it unworthily, but also renders it useless, and thus impiously mocks Christ the Lord, the Author of the Sacraments. 2. He who is conscious to himself of grave fault is held to confess before he receives the Eucharist, as Trent commands.⁸⁸ If the matter concerns the other Sacraments of the living, he is held to be contrite;⁸⁹ whether he is also held to confess is denied more commonly and more probably (cf. nn. 1500 and 1684, 2).

1438. III. Besides the said conditions, the reverence owed to the Sacrament requires actual DEVOTION; the greater this is, the more abundant are the fruits perceived from the Sacrament. This is established from Trent, sess. 6, cap. 7. The reason of the first part is clear of itself. The reason of the second is that, although the Sacraments confer grace from the work worked, nevertheless divine wisdom, which in all things and through all things strives to promote the good will of man, has so instituted the Sacraments that, according to the greater disposition of the subject, a more abundant supply of graces is conferred. "Thus from the same fire," says the Angelic Doctor, "he receives more heat who approaches it more, although the fire, as far as concerns itself, pours forth its heat equally to all"⁹⁰ (cf. n. 534).

Hence it follows that in practice one must not admit the opinion which makes licit the RECEPTION of the Sacraments with a probable opinion; because such an opinion, although speculatively it is not destitute of some foundation, "almost never will be able to be brought down into practice by recipients without detriment to their own soul."⁹¹

Moreover, there are also other CONDITIONS, from the law of the Church, to be fulfilled in reception of the Sacraments; these we shall explain when we have come to the individual Sacraments. Meanwhile:

1439. It is asked: Whether it is licit for a faithful person to RECEIVE or ASK for Sacraments from an unworthy minister?

Resp. 1. When the minister is unworthy ON ACCOUNT OF SOME CENSURE or INABILITY, it is licit to ask Sacraments from him, even without grave cause, if he is tolerated; because the Council of Constance absolutely conceded to the faithful communication with tolerated persons. But if he is not tolerated, but one to be avoided, or is a heretic or schismatic, then only in extreme or very grave necessity is it licit to receive from him Penance or Baptism; probably also the Eucharist and Extreme Unction, namely in the case in which the sick person cannot receive the other Sacraments, provided scandal or suspicion of communication with intruded ministers or heretics is avoided.⁹² And these things indeed are from the law of the Church concerning censures (cf. n. 1292, 2 and 1327, Question). With respect to natural law, attend to the following RULE:

2. If the minister is certainly unworthy ON ACCOUNT OF MORTAL SIN, it is not licit, without grave cause, to ask Sacraments from him. The reason is that from the law of charity we are held to impede the sin of neighbor, when we can impede it without grave inconvenience. And this holds, even if the one ministering is the pastor, or is otherwise already prepared; because even external sin must be impeded. "Only," says St. Alphonsus, "would I except him who

⁸⁷Ibid., 86.

⁸⁸Book VI, 86.

⁸⁹Ibid., 34.

⁹⁰3, q. 69, a. 8.

⁹¹Book I, 51.

⁹²Book VI, 88; cf. VII, 339 and II, 79; cf. also 2 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 19.

would receive the Eucharist from an unworthy priest who was actually ministering it to others, according to the opinion ... that it is only one sin to minister the Eucharist to several.” We have said, without grave cause, namely of necessity or notable utility: when this stands, it is licit to ask Sacraments from an evil minister, because cooperation with his sin is merely material (cf. n. 519).

“Hence the doctors say that Sacraments are LICITLY received from a sinner minister: 1. if the precept of confession or communion presses; 2. if from delay of reception danger of a fall is imminent; 3. if you must fulfill the precept of hearing Mass; 4. if otherwise you must remain for a long time in mortal sin, and you cannot, indeed if you do not wish to, approach another confessor, nor wait an hour, because to be liberated from sin as soon as possible is not a small utility; 5. if you must be without Communion, at least for a long time, or without the fruit of confession, even if you do not have mortal sin; 6. if otherwise you cannot gain a jubilee; 7. if you need a skilled director and do not have another, provided, adds Sporer, you would have to wait a long time for another; 8. if you wish to apply Mass for a deceased friend.”⁹³

What, YOU WILL ASK, in doubt whether the minister is unworthy?

Resp. 1. Any minister is presumed worthy, unless the contrary is established. Hence, probably, you can ask a Sacrament even from him whom you know to have sinned a little before, because he is to be presumed to have already disposed himself, at least by contrition. 2. A minister is judged unworthy if he is a customary sinner, or if he is voluntarily living in a proximate occasion of sin. Likewise, if after sin he has not confessed beforehand, before the celebration of Mass.⁹⁴

Chapter IV

On Sacramentals

1440. DEFINITION. Sacramentals are ecclesiastical ceremonies, or external acts of religion accommodated to worshipping God.⁹⁵

DIVISION. Sacramentals are reduced to four species, which 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 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 prayer in a dedicated church, the Lord’s Prayer, especially recited in the name of the Church, striking of the breast, the *Confiteor*, alms prescribed by the Church.⁹⁶

The principal Sacramentals are customarily expressed by this verse:

Praying, sprinkled, eating, confessed, giving, blessing.

1. On the Power and Efficacy of Sacramentals 1441. I. “Sacramentals have some EFFECTS, yet not infallible, of which those using them piously and duly are made participants. The first is the excitation of pious movements through prevenient graces. The second is remission of venial sins, by means of movements of this kind, penance expressed or implicit. The third is remission of temporal punishment due to sins. The fourth is the putting to flight or repression of the devil. The fifth is bodily health, or a similar temporal benefit.”⁹⁷

What particular effect, in the temporal order, this or that Sacramental can especially produce is to be gathered from the institution of each, from the manner and prayers of the Church by which they are made; for individual Sacramentals have not been instituted for the same singular end, although all tend to divine worship and to our progress.⁹⁸

1442. II. “Sacramentals cause these effects, not from the work worked, but FROM THE WORK OF THE WORKER: namely by the prayer of the Church impetrating them; also by the prayer of the faithful piously using Sacramentals, for example the sign of the cross, blessed water.”⁹⁹ “Hence, after the taking of blessed water, etc., it is advised to all the faithful to excite themselves to an act of sorrow or of love.”¹⁰⁰

⁹³Book VI, 89.

⁹⁴Ibid., end.

⁹⁵Cf. Cavalieri, tom. IV, cap. 11-15 and cap. 23-28.

⁹⁶Book VI, 90.

⁹⁷Polman, 3, p. n. 197; cf. Suarez, in 3 P., disp. 15, q. 65, sect. 5.

⁹⁸Book VI, 93.

⁹⁹Polman, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁰Book VI, 92.

2. On Exorcisms and Blessings The principal place among Sacramentals is held by Exorcisms and liturgical Blessings.

1443. I. EXORCISMS, from the common opinion of the doctors, have this special property, that they infallibly expel or at least repress demons quasi from the work worked, on account of the peculiar power, conceded by Christ the Lord to the Church, of commanding demons. Recall what was said, n. 622.

1444. II. LITURGICAL BLESSINGS are rites which, in the name of the Church, are performed by sacred ministers, and thus they differ from blessings which are given in a private name by laymen, for example by parents to children. They are DIVIDED in various ways:¹⁰¹

1. By reason of effects, they are constitutive or invocative. 1. CONSTITUTIVE or consecratory blessings are those by which either persons or things are deputed to divine worship, or are permanently constituted in a sacred and religious being; they are called permanent Sacramentals, because they imitate the Sacraments which imprint a character. Of this kind are: 1. with respect to PERSONS, first tonsure, the consecration of an Abbot, Abbess, nun, etc.; 2. with respect to THINGS, the blessing of a church, oratory, cemetery, chalice, paten, chrism, sacred oils, salt for baptism, vestments for the Sacrifice, altar, wax lamb, etc. 2. INVOCATIVE blessings are those by which the kindness of God is invoked, that He may bestow something good on persons or things to be blessed; they are called passing Sacramentals, because the things so blessed do not change their state, or do not become strictly sacred, and therefore can be turned to profane uses, provided these are honorable.

Of this kind are the blessing of the Supreme Pontiff, of a Bishop, and of a presbyter in Mass, and much more the Blessing with the Most Holy Sacrament, the nuptial blessing, the blessing of a woman after childbirth, etc.; likewise the blessing of houses, fields, produce, foodstuffs, etc.

2. By reason of rite, some are REAL, in which an anointing is employed; others VERBAL, which are perfected by words alone. Likewise, some are solemn, others simple, according as they are done with greater pomp or without preparation.
3. By reason of minister, some are PAPAL, as the blessing of the Pallium, wax lamb, golden rose, and prince's sword; others EPISCOPAL or PRIESTLY, concerning which fuller things must be said.

A) To BISHOPS belong: 1. Real blessings, as of a chalice, altar, bell; likewise the blessing of chrism itself and of the sacred oils. These are found only in the Pontifical, and are so proper to Bishops that without a Pontifical Indult they cannot be delegated to presbyters. Whence things which have been blessed without an Indult of this kind ought before use to be blessed anew, if it can be done without scandal (S. R. C., decree of September 22, 1703, ad 3).¹⁰² 2. Blessings which are found in the Missal and Ritual under the title: Blessings to be done by Bishops, or by others having faculty, namely: the blessing of priestly garments, cloths and corporals, the tabernacle, that is, the pyx and lunette; likewise of a cross or images if it is done solemnly with concurrence of the people; then: the blessing and reconciliation of a church not yet consecrated, of a public oratory, or cemetery, or of the primary stone. In these, from the Ritual itself, and in those, from the Holy See by indult, Bishops receive the faculty of delegating. Yet the blessing of a cross can be done by permission of the Bishop.¹⁰³

B) To PRIESTS, without delegation, belong all blessings which are contained in the Missal and Ritual, from the blessing of water up to the blessings to be done by Bishops, or by others having faculty. Yet not a few of them are by right of the pastor, and are noted in the Ritual as to be done by the Pastor, or by another priest, understand, by permission of the pastor, according to the common interpretation. Of this kind are the blessing of nuptials, the blessing of the baptismal font, the blessing of houses on Holy Saturday, the common blessing over produce, and the blessing of fields, at least if it is done solemnly; likewise the blessing of women after childbirth, to which only women who have given birth in legitimate marriage have a right,¹⁰⁴ where custom or synodal statutes so dispose.¹⁰⁵

1445. It is asked: With what rite are blessings to be done?

Resp. "Blessings which by precept or publicly in churches or in public oratories before the people gathered for this are done, outside Mass are to be given with surplice and stole according to the nature of the time, standing and with head uncovered, with 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 Sacred Congregation of Rites. For blessing those things for

¹⁰¹Cf. Quarti, *De sacris Bened.*; and Ferraris, verb. *Benedictio*.

¹⁰²Gardellini, n. 3663.

¹⁰³Gardellini, n. 764.

¹⁰⁴S. C. Conc., June 18, 1859.

¹⁰⁵Konings, n. 1247-D.

which no special blessing is had, the blessing *ad omnia* can be used; 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 to be sprinkled with blessed water.

"If the cross has the image of the Crucified, the blessing for images is to be used. If the blessing is done at the altar, all things are recited on the Epistle side, and the priest uses a cope. The things to be blessed, if they are priestly vestments, can be placed upon the altar; otherwise, if they are candles and other things of this sort, they are to be placed upon a table before the altar, or on the Epistle side."¹⁰⁶

3. On the Sign of the Cross and Lustral Water 1446. I. In blessings, in ceremonies, and in our actions we often use the SIGN OF THE CROSS, and most fittingly; for this sign has power: 1. by way of invocation, namely of Christ crucified and His merits; 2. as a work of faith and a profession of the Christian religion; 3. on account of the honor which we give to the cross.¹⁰⁷

II. The use of LUSTRAL OR BLESSED WATER is commended by antiquity; for learned men teach that it flowed from Apostolic tradition and always flourished in the Church. The sprinkling of lustral water is a symbol of interior washing; and, sanctified through the prayers of the Church, it has, from the merits of the same Church, much efficacy for producing salutary effects, and especially for warding off demons. Hence, "the sick are sprinkled with blessed water according to the prescription of the RITUAL, that they may be stronger for repelling the temptations of the demon. The corpses themselves of the dead are sprinkled with prayer, that for the souls of Purgatory the ardor may be mitigated and wholly extinguished."¹⁰⁸

Note. 1. To blessed water, when a cause accedes, water not blessed can be added, provided the latter is always in a lesser quantity. 2. In time of Interdict the sprinkling of blessed water can be done, provided the people are sprinkled without any solemnity. For obtaining the effects of blessed water, moral contact suffices.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶Konings, n. 1248.

¹⁰⁷Scavini, book III, n. 211.

¹⁰⁸Scavini, II, 212.

¹⁰⁹Cf. Ferraris, v. *Aqua*; Quarti, *De sacris Benedictionibus*.

Treatise II

On Baptism

1447. Baptism is placed first among the Sacraments, and not without cause; for it is first, not indeed in dignity, but in necessity and order of reception.

We shall discuss: 1. the nature of Baptism; 2. its minister; 3. the subject; 4. the ceremonies of solemn Baptism.¹¹⁰

Chapter I

On the Nature of Baptism

We must treat: 1. of the notion, efficacy, and necessity of Baptism; 2. of the matter and form by which it is constituted.

Article I

On the Notion, Efficacy, and Necessity of Baptism

1448. DEFINITION. Baptism is derived from the Greek verb βαπτίζω, that is, I wash, dip, immerse, and it is customarily distinguished as threefold, namely, of blood, of spirit, and of water.

1. Baptism of blood is the pouring out of blood, or death endured for the faith, or for another Christian virtue.
2. Baptism OF SPIRIT, or of desire, is perfect conversion to God through contrition, or love of God above all things, with the explicit or implicit vow of true Baptism of water.
3. Baptism OF WATER is the Sacrament itself, concerning which we must now treat.

It is defined: A Sacrament of the New Law instituted by Christ, for spiritual regeneration, through external washing of the body, under the prescribed form of words.

1449. Principles. I. It is of faith that BAPTISM is a true Sacrament of the New Law. The reason is that the three requisites for a true Sacrament concur in it: 1. a sensible rite, namely washing with water and the express invocation of the Most Holy Trinity. 2. The institution of Christ, as is proved from Matthew 28:19. More probably, it was instituted before His Passion, namely at the time when He Himself was baptized by John; whence it is said, John 3:22: "Jesus came ... and baptized," namely through the disciples, as is established from chapter 4:2: "although Jesus Himself did not baptize." 3. The conferral of grace, from divine institution: "Unless anyone shall have been born again, etc." (John 3:3).

1450. II. The EFFECTS of the Sacrament of Baptism are: 1. Remission of all guilt, original and personal, which it finds in the soul; whence Trent (sess. 5, can. 5): "In those reborn God hates nothing" (see, with respect to adults, n. 1475). 2. The condonation of all punishment, eternal namely and temporal, so that absolutely nothing delays the baptized from entrance into heaven, as the same Council of Trent has (ibid.); and hence no penance, at least laborious and satisfactory, ought to be imposed on baptized adults, from the Council of Florence.¹¹¹ 3. The bestowal of sanctifying grace, by which we are made sons of God and heirs of heaven; and at the same time the infusion of the gifts of the Holy Spirit and of all virtues, both theological and moral, as the Roman Catechism has. Moreover, in view of the same grace, actual graces accommodated to the end of Baptism are conferred in their own time, namely for living holily and Christianly, as befits adoptive sons of God. 4. The impression of character, which is as it were the seal of Christ, a sign of eminent dignity, by which the baptized person is consecrated to God and bound forever to His service.¹¹² 5. Co-optation into the company of the faithful, by which namely the baptized person becomes a member of the Church and is subjected to her authority.¹¹³

"Yet there remains in the baptized the tinder of sin, which is not sin, and if it is resisted, it will profit unto the crown."¹¹⁴ There remain also the penalties of this life, for example pains, death, etc., both so that we may be conformed to Christ, and because God, in raising man up, did not will that he put away the traces of his fall.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰On Baptism St. Thomas treats in 3, q. 66 sqq.; see especially Tournely; book VI, 95-97.

¹¹¹Decree to the Armenians.

¹¹²Cf. St. Thomas, 3, q. 63.

¹¹³Book VI, 138.

¹¹⁴Ibid.

¹¹⁵On these see the Roman Catechism, n. 41-48.

1451. III. Baptism, after the sufficient promulgation of the Gospel, IS NECESSARY for all unto salvation, by necessity of means, unless the vow of the Sacrament or martyrdom supplies its place. It is of faith, from Trent, defining thus: "If anyone shall say that Baptism is free, that is, not necessary for salvation, let him be anathema."¹¹⁶ Declaring this necessity, it teaches that the translation of man from the state of original sin into the state of grace, after the Gospel has been promulgated, cannot be done without the laver of regeneration or its vow, from that which is written (John 3:5): "Unless anyone shall have been born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."¹¹⁷

From these things it follows: 1. that any adult, as soon as he has been sufficiently instructed, is held, and indeed by divine law, to receive Baptism, and through this to enter the Church of Christ and profess her faith. 2. That little children, since they are incapable of a vow or desire, cannot be saved, outside the cause of martyrdom, except through Baptism in reality;¹¹⁸ whence St. Augustine: "Do not say, do not teach, that infants overtaken by death before they are baptized can arrive at indulgence of original sins, if you wish to be Catholic."¹¹⁹ 3. That those sin gravely who, without an urgent cause, notably delay the Baptism of an infant. But a notable delay, more commonly and more probably, is judged to be that which would run beyond 10 or 11 days.¹²⁰ Hence several Synods threaten the penalty of excommunication to parents who through negligence prolong Baptism beyond the eighth day.¹²¹

1452. Questions. Q. 1. How does Baptism OF SPIRIT and OF BLOOD supply the place of the Sacrament?

Resp. 1. Baptism OF SPIRIT supplies from the work of the worker, inasmuch namely as man, the divine Spirit breathing upon him, is justified by force of charity with respect to original sin, but by force of perfect contrition with respect to actual sins of which he is conscious. Nor, for producing these effects, is it required that the vow of Baptism be explicit, but there suffices, at least in him who is ignorant of the law of Baptism, or does not advert to it, an implicit vow, such namely as is included in the disposition of doing all things whatsoever have been enjoined by God. Thus St. Alphonsus¹²² with St. Thomas.¹²³ Yet this baptism does not impress a character, nor confer a right to the other Sacraments; nor does it remit all temporal punishment, unless perhaps charity is so intense that it merits relaxation of every punishment (cf. n. 1674).

Resp. 2. Baptism OF BLOOD OR MARTYRDOM is equated with true Baptism, because quasi from the work worked, after the manner of true Baptism, it remits every guilt and punishment. It is said quasi, because it does not operate so strictly as the Sacrament, but from a certain privilege by reason of imitation of the passion of Christ.¹²⁴ Therefore martyrdom profits even infants. The practice of the Church confirms this, for she honors as Saints and true martyrs both the holy Innocents slain for Christ and those witnesses of the faith who were slaughtered without having perceived Baptism of water.¹²⁵

Q. 2. What is required that martyrdom be true and produce the aforesaid effects?

Resp. 1. There is required the suffering of death, or of lethal torment, or of such evils as by their own nature lead to death, even if someone miraculously escapes from them, as Benedict XIV affirms according to the common doctrine of theologians.¹²⁶

2. A pious cause is required; because "punishment does not make martyrs, but the cause," says St. Augustine.¹²⁷ Whence it is necessary that violent death be sustained for the profession of faith, as is established from Luke 9:26; 12:8; or for the exercise of some other Christian virtue, because the works of all virtues are certain protestations of faith, as the Angelic Doctor says.¹²⁸ Indeed, as true martyrs, more probably, those are to be held who, in service to those suffering plague, die from charity; and St. Alphonsus affirms that for this opinion stand 12 Academies, 13 Cardinals, and more than 300 authors against Hurtado and others.¹²⁹

¹¹⁶Sess. VII, can. 5.

¹¹⁷Sess. VI, cap. 5.

¹¹⁸Cf. St. Alphonsus on Trent, sess. VII, n. 45.

¹¹⁹Book 3, *De Anima*, cap. IX, n. 12.

¹²⁰Book VI, 118.

¹²¹*Analecta J. P.*, series 2, p. 1807.

¹²²*H. A.*, XIV, 7.

¹²³3, p., q. 68, a. 2.

¹²⁴Cf. St. Thomas, in 4, dist. 4, q. 3, art. 3, ad 3am q., ad 1.

¹²⁵Book VI, 97.

¹²⁶*De Beatific. SS.*, book 3, cap. 12.

¹²⁷*In Psalm. 34*, n. 13.

¹²⁸2, 2, q. 124, a. 5.

¹²⁹Book VI, 100.

3. In adults there are required certain positive dispositions, which are: 1. acceptance of death, at least habitual, from a supernatural motive, as is commonly held against some; because death, that it be meritorious, must be in some way voluntary in those who are capable of voluntary acts. Whence there must be absent the will to defend oneself, as also the rash exposure of one's own life; and therefore soldiers who are killed in a war of religion are probably not true martyrs, because they defend themselves. 2. Supernatural sorrow for sins; otherwise these are not remitted.

But whether perfect charity is required is indeed denied by some; but more probably it is affirmed by others with St. Alphonsus,¹³⁰ both from 1 Corinthians 13:3 and because martyrdom does not necessarily import perfect charity, namely when someone from fear of hell prefers to die rather than to sin. St. Thomas seems to agree, when he says: "The outpouring of blood does not have the notion of baptism, if it is without charity."¹³¹ From this it is clear that baptism of spirit is included in baptism of blood, but not vice versa.

Article II

On the Matter and Form of Baptism

§ 1. On the Matter of Baptism The remote matter of Baptism is water; but the proximate matter is the washing itself.

I. On the Remote Matter 1453. Principles. I. The VALID matter of Baptism is natural or elemental water. It is of faith, as is established from the Councils, especially from Trent, sess. 7, can. 2, on Baptism: "If anyone shall say that true and natural water is not of the necessity of Baptism, and therefore shall twist to some metaphor the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Unless anyone shall have been born again of water and the Holy Spirit: let him be anathema."

Hence: 1. Matter certainly valid is: 1. water of springs, wells, the sea, rivers, lakes, ponds, cisterns, and rainwater; and thus any simple and pure water which retains the proper species of water; nor does it matter whether it is cold or warm, from the Roman Ritual; 2. water resolved from snow, ice, and hail; 3. sulphurous or mineral water; 4. water flowing in stormy weather from a wall, leaves, etc.; 5. turbid water mixed with another thing, provided water is the predominant matter; 6. dew, and water collected from condensed vapors, for example on the lid of a pot; 7. water simply distilled, roses or other leaves having been infused in the water.¹³²

2. Matter certainly invalid is: 1. blood, milk, wine, urine, phlegm, saliva, sweat, tears; 2. juice expressed from flowers, herbs, and roots.¹³³
3. Doubtful matter is: 1. broth and lye; 2. water from dissolved salt; 3. thin beer, thin ink, water flowing from a vine or other trees, and ice or snow not melted; 4. water drawn out by chemical art from flowers, plants, roots, wine, or oil; 5. one or another drop of water.¹³⁴

1454. II. The LICIT matter of Baptism is clean water alone, and in solemn Baptism it must moreover be consecrated. The reason is that this is required both from the prescription of the Church and on account of reverence for the Sacrament.¹³⁵

Hence: 1. He commits sacrilege who without necessity uses impure, turbid, or muddy water, although natural. 2. He sins gravely against the precept of the Church who does not use consecrated water in solemn Baptism. 3. If the consecrated water has been corrupted, natural water is to be preferred; but if time is sufficient, new water should be consecrated by the brief formula, as is contained in the Ritual. Thus from the Response of the Holy Office, April 17, 1839.¹³⁶ 4. In private Baptism, unconsecrated water is probably licit; nevertheless care must be taken that at least blessed or lustral water be employed, for greater decency.¹³⁷

1455. III. In cases OF NECESSITY, when certainly valid matter is lacking, doubtful matter is to be employed, but with this CONDITION added: "If this matter is sufficient"; for then even a slight probability concerning the value of the matter suffices (see nn. 82 and 1407). But if one so baptized survives, once a supply of matter certainly valid has been had, he must again be baptized under this condition: "If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee, etc."¹³⁸

¹³⁰Ibid., 98.

¹³¹3, q. 66, a. 12, ad 2.

¹³²Book VI, 103, 104.

¹³³Book VI, 103, 104.

¹³⁴Ibid.; H. A., XIV, 8; see Ninzatti, n. 1001.

¹³⁵Book VI, 102.

¹³⁶Collectanea S. Sedis, n. 186.

¹³⁷Book VI, 102, end; thus also Collectanea S. Sedis, n. 185.

¹³⁸H. A., XIV, 8; book VI, 103, end.

II. On the Proximate Matter 1456. Principles. I. For the validity of Baptism there is required a true WASHING of the body through water: that is, such an application of water as, in moral estimation, is necessary that a man be said truly washed or bathed.¹³⁹

Whence there is required: 1. That water immediately touch the body of the one to be baptized. Therefore Baptism is invalid if, the child not yet having been born, the body of the mother is washed; likewise, if the water touches only the garments of the one to be baptized; but doubtful, if only his hair, or the afterbirth. 2. That it be done on the head, as is becoming, because in it all the senses flourish, or at least, as is very commonly taught, on another notable part of the body, for example on the shoulders or on the breast. Whence, if from necessity Baptism has been conferred on a less notable part, for example on the hand, fingers, or foot, it must altogether be repeated under condition; nay more, the same seems to be done for caution, even if Baptism has been conferred on a notable part; “because, from St. Thomas,¹⁴⁰ in none of the exterior parts does the integrity of life consist as in the head.” 3. That the contact of water be successive, namely in such a way that either water is applied successively to the body, or the body to water. Hence Baptism would be doubtful if the one to be baptized were thrown into water from which he did not emerge. 4. That there be a quantity of water truly sufficient for washing: therefore he would validly baptize who would put the one to be baptized under water flowing from a roof and would pronounce the form; but, according to the common opinion, he would not validly baptize if he touched the body of the one to be baptized with only one or another drop. Baptism conferred thus, especially if the drop has not flowed, would be altogether doubtful. Yet if the one baptizing, by motion of a moistened finger, were to wash a part of the body of the one to be baptized, authors commonly hold such Baptism as certain, although not a few still doubt concerning its validity.¹⁴¹

For validity it makes no difference whether the washing is done by immersion, or by sprinkling, provided water flows; whether by threefold or single infusion.¹⁴²

1457. II. With respect to LICEITY, the manner of washing which is used in individual Churches must be observed, and indeed generally under grave obligation. The Greeks indeed retain threefold immersion, which they can also employ while they stay among Latins, as is established from Benedict XIV’s Constitution *Etsi pastoralis*. But the ROMAN RITUAL has these things: “The priest takes baptismal water with a small vessel or pitcher, and from it pours three times over the head of the infant in the manner of a cross, and at the same time pronouncing the words, says distinctly and attentively only once: N... I baptize thee in the name of the Father, he pours the first time; and of the Son, he pours the second time; and of the Holy Spirit, he pours the third time.” But where there is the custom of baptizing by IMMERSION, for example in the Milanese Church, the priest receives the infant, and taking care lest he be injured, cautiously immerses his head, and baptizes by threefold immersion, saying only once: N... I baptize thee, etc.¹⁴³

The threefold washing, outside the case of necessity, from the truer opinion, is prescribed under grave obligation; because a rite of this kind is sufficiently grave matter: for in it the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity is expressed. And it must be noticed that the form is not to be ended before the third washing.¹⁴⁴

§ 2. On the Form of Baptism 1458. I. The valid and legitimate FORM of Baptism in the Latin Church is: I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.¹⁴⁵

Thus the Council of Trent defined according to the words of the Lord Himself (Matthew 28:19): “Going therefore teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” Among the Greeks it is equivalently said: The servant of Christ is baptized in the name of the Father, etc. This form is valid from the Instruction of Eugene IV to the Armenians; but it is licit only in the Greek Church.¹⁴⁶

1459. II. That, in a variation of the form, the validity of Baptism may be discerned from invalidity, attention must be paid to whether the substance of the sense remains or not. Now, the substance requires that there be expressed: 1. the person baptizing, at least in the act exercised; 2. the person baptized; 3. the action of the one baptizing; 4. the invocation of the

¹³⁹Book VI, 105.

¹⁴⁰3, q. 68, a. 11, ad 4.

¹⁴¹Cf. book VI, 105-107; *H. A.*, XIV, 11-12.

¹⁴²*H. A.*, *ibid.*, 13; cf. St. Alphonsus on Trent, sess. 7, n. 56.

¹⁴³Scavini, book III, 55, note 3.

¹⁴⁴Book VI, 107, q. 5; *H. A.*, XIV, 13.

¹⁴⁵*Inst. catech.*, p. 2, cap. 2, n. 6; and *Conf. dir.*, XIII, 10; according to the Roman Ritual amended by Benedict XIV; cf. *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 192.

¹⁴⁶Gury, II, 241.

Most Holy Trinity expressing both the unity of the divine nature and the distinction of the Persons, and more probably with the proper words.¹⁴⁷

Hence it follows: 1. The form is VALID per se, although illicit at least venially, if a Latin uses the words of the Greeks; if the language is changed, although it is better for lay persons, especially women, to use the vernacular tongue, to avoid the danger of erring; if synonymous words are substituted, for example “I bathe thee, wash, dip, etc.”; if the words are corrupted at the end, because Pope Zacharias declared valid this form employed from ignorance of the Latin tongue: “I baptize thee in the name of the Fatherland, and Daughter, and Holy Spirita”; likewise, if the word I is omitted, because the sense is still rendered sufficiently, though otherwise in a vernacular tongue, for example in French, English, German; or the conjunction and, provided it is set before the third Person; likewise if one says “with the name of the Father, etc.” from the decision of the S. C. C., May 24, 1823.¹⁴⁸ The form is also valid if words not corrupting the sense are added, for example if someone should say: “In the name of the almighty Father” or “who created thee, etc.”; or if transpositions are made: “In the name of the Son and of the Father, etc.”; because the name of Father of itself sounds as being the principle of the Son, and therefore there the confession of the Most Holy Trinity is still right substantially; nor does it obstruct that the minister errs internally concerning the faith, because internal error does not prejudice the value of the Sacrament.¹⁴⁹ We have said per se; because, as St. Thomas notices, if someone, by so changing the form, intended to introduce another rite, he would no longer intend to do what the Church does, and thus the Sacrament would be invalid.¹⁵⁰

2. INVALID is this form: “I anoint thee in the name, etc.” or “I baptize in the name, etc.”; because the word thee, or an equivalent, is of the essence.¹⁵¹ Likewise, if someone should say: “I baptize thee in Father and Son, etc.” or “with Father and Son, etc.”; or “in the name of the Father through the Son”; or “in the names of the Father, etc.”; because these and similar things either signify diversity of divine nature, or do not express its unity sufficiently. Likewise, if he should say: “In the name of the greater Father and of the lesser Son”; for thus the truth of the Sacrament would openly be taken away. Likewise, if someone were to use these words: “I baptize thee in the name of God,” or “in the name of Christ.” Nor do the things which are read in Acts 8:12 obstruct; because, according to the more probable opinion, there by the name of Christ is understood Baptism instituted by Christ, in distinction from the baptism of John.¹⁵²
3. DOUBTFUL is the form of Baptism: “In the name of the Most Holy Trinity,” or “in the name of God one and triune,” or “in the name of the three Persons”; indeed, according to several, it would certainly be invalid. Likewise Baptism conferred “In the name of the Begetter and of the Begotten and of the One Proceeding from both” must be held doubtful, from St. Thomas, because the common names must more probably be used. Likewise, if someone says: “In the name of the Father, in the name of the Son, etc.”; because, although this repetition more probably does not change the sense, nevertheless the opposite opinion is not altogether improbable.¹⁵³ Likewise, the omission of the word in introduces some doubt concerning value; and much more the total omission of the word and, if namely one says: In the name of the Father, Son, Holy Spirit.

But if someone should add the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary to the names of the three Persons, St. Thomas says¹⁵⁴ that, if he did this with a heretical mind, intending to confer Baptism in the name of the Virgin as in the name of the Most Holy Trinity, it would be invalid; because the true confession of Divinity would be perverted. Otherwise, if some rustic should add the name of the Virgin only from intrusive devotion.

Note. The pastor must take care, says the ROMAN RITUAL, that the faithful, especially midwives, know and observe well the right rite of baptizing.¹⁵⁵

¹⁴⁷Book VI, 108.

¹⁴⁸Thesaurus, tom. 83, p. 134, 137.

¹⁴⁹H. A., XIV, 14; book VI, 109-112.

¹⁵⁰3, q. 60, a. 8.

¹⁵¹Cf. *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 190.

¹⁵²Book VI, 112, dub. 3.

¹⁵³Book VI, 109, Whether; and 111; cf. also work on Trent, sess. 7, n. 57-58.

¹⁵⁴3, q. 60, a. 8.

¹⁵⁵Cf. Scavini, book 3, n. 223.

Chapter II

On the Minister of Baptism

1460. Every man using reason validly baptizes, provided matter and form and the intention of the Church are observed.¹⁵⁶ It is of faith from the Decree of Eugene IV to the Armenians, and from the Fourth Lateran Council, cap. *Firmiter*.

With respect to LICEITY, several things must be distinguished; for, because Baptism can be conferred either solemnly, that is, with the rites prescribed by the Church, or privately, namely on account of a case of necessity, hence the minister is either the minister of solemnity or the minister of necessity. Then, in order to Baptism itself, the minister of solemnity is either ordinary or extraordinary, according as by force of his ordination he confers it; but in order to the one to be baptized, he is either the proper minister or a delegated minister, according as, from the disposition of ecclesiastical law, he confers it by proper right or by delegated right.

These things having been premised, we establish the following:

1461. Principles. I. The ORDINARY minister of solemn Baptism by divine law is the priest; by ecclesiastical law it is the Bishop in his diocese, and the pastor in his parish. The first is established from the Decree of Eugene IV, in which it is handed down: "The minister of this Sacrament of Baptism is the priest, to whom it belongs from office to baptize." The second is established from canon law and from the Roman Ritual; and the reason is that through Baptism each one is aggregated not only to the universal Church, but also to a particular one. But to aggregate to a particular Church belongs to him who presides over this Church. Yet the pastor cannot attribute this right to himself if in his church there does not exist a baptismal font, but the Provost of the church in which the baptistery is found; for he alone, from the prescription of the Roman Ritual, ought to confer Baptism.¹⁵⁷

It suffices, however, that the permission be tacit, or even presumed from a just and reasonable cause.¹⁵⁸

3. "Pilgrims or those who do not have domicile can be baptized in the church which they have chosen. But if a woman by chance gives birth in a village not her own, the offspring is to be baptized by the pastor of that village; nevertheless, if that village is little distant from her own village, for example by two or three hours, the offspring can also be baptized in her own church."¹⁵⁹
4. Strangers, according to the more common and more probable opinion, can receive Baptism and the other Sacraments from the pastor of the place where they have already contracted quasi-domicile.¹⁶⁰

Note. The Sacred Congregation DE PROPAGANDA FIDE, on January 21, 1789, decreed: "A suspended and interdicted priest can at no time administer Baptism with solemnities; but when because of urgent necessity he must baptize, let him baptize privately."¹⁶¹

1462. II. The EXTRAORDINARY minister of SOLEMN Baptism is a Deacon. This is established from canon law and from the Pontifical. But although a Deacon, by force of his ordination, can baptize solemnly, nevertheless he cannot do this licitly unless from the commission of the ordinary minister. Nor indeed can such commission be given at the will of the pastor or of the Bishop himself, but only on account of necessity, or on account of great utility of the Church: for example, if other priests are lacking and a multitude of those to be baptized is present; or if the pastor is gravely ill, or excommunicated, or otherwise occupied with hearing confessions or preaching. But if a deacon, without legitimate delegation, even in a case of necessity, baptizes solemnly, according to the very common opinion, he incurs irregularity; and clerics of a lower Order certainly incur this penalty;¹⁶² for these, that they may be able to baptize solemnly, are not sufficiently supplied in any case by the commission of the pastor or Bishop; but delegation of the Supreme Pontiff himself is required.¹⁶³

1463. III. The legitimate minister of PRIVATE Baptism, in a case of NECESSITY, is any man using reason. For the Roman Ritual has thus: "Whenever an infant or adult is in danger of life, he can without solemnity be baptized by anyone in any

¹⁵⁶Book VI, 113; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 27.

¹⁵⁷Book VI, 115.

¹⁵⁸Book VI, 115, end.

¹⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 115, beginning.

¹⁶⁰*Ibid.*, But here.

¹⁶¹Cf. *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 196.

¹⁶²From cap. *Si quis 1, de cler. non ord. min.*

¹⁶³Book VI, 116.

language, whether cleric, or layman even excommunicated, whether faithful, or unbeliever, whether Catholic, or heretic, whether man, or woman, provided however that the form and intention of the Church are observed.”

But the order to be observed among ministers is that which the RITUAL thus designates: “If a priest is present, let him be preferred to a deacon, a deacon to a subdeacon, a cleric to a layman, and a man to a woman; unless for the sake of modesty it is becoming that a woman rather than a man baptize an infant not wholly brought forth; or unless a woman knew better the form and manner of baptizing.” Likewise, from the Ritual and from Canon Law, outside utmost necessity, neither the father nor the mother is permitted to baptize their own offspring. A stranger, if any is present, should baptize this offspring brought into danger of life. But a layman not excommunicated is to be placed before a priest who is excommunicated, since an excommunicated person is no longer numbered among the members of the Church.¹⁶⁴ The Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, August 20, 1671, responded: “Let the Bishop not permit schismatics to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, except in a case of necessity, and when any other person whatsoever is lacking.”¹⁶⁵

From these things you resolve: 1. Anyone who omits to confer Baptism in a case of necessity sins gravely; because, as Tertullian says, “he is guilty of a lost man.”¹⁶⁶ But the principal SIGNS of danger for an infant are these: “if he is born without crying and tears; if he breathes moderately; if he appears livid, especially in face or head; if he is born after much labor of the midwife, or before the seventh month; if he has the cranium soft, or sutures too open, or other parts disjoined.”¹⁶⁷

2. Likewise a layman who, the order having been spurned, baptizes in the presence of a priest sins gravely, as also does the priest himself who, without a legitimate reason, yields his office of baptizing to a layman. In the other cases, inversion of the order of ministers is only a venial sin; which probably must also be said if a layman baptizes in the presence of a deacon not deputed by the pastor.¹⁶⁸

1464. Questions. Q. 1. Whether several can baptize ONE at the same time, or ONE several?

Resp. 1. If each of those baptizing intends to act independently of the other, as a particular and individual cause, Baptism is valid; because all requisites are present, as is clear from the similar case in Ordination, by which newly ordained priests consecrate together with the Bishop; and in such a case, he who first completes the form, he alone baptizes. But if one intends to act dependently on the other, as a common and simultaneous cause, Baptism is INVALID, whether he says: “I baptize thee,” or says: “we baptize thee.” For, as St. Thomas says,¹⁶⁹ “a man does not baptize except as minister of Christ and bearing His place. Whence, just as Christ is one, so there must be one minister who represents Christ.” In each case one acts ILLICITLY, unless haste excuses.¹⁷⁰

Resp. 2. Illicitly, outside a case of necessity, several are baptized at the same time by one; for the Ritual reprobates that form “I baptize you,” directed to several at once, unless there is danger of death and time does not allow that individuals be baptized separately. “Yet they are validly baptized; because, by acting thus, the necessary form is not diversified, since the plural is the singular doubled.”¹⁷¹

Q. 2. Whether someone can baptize HIMSELF?

Resp. He cannot, either licitly or validly; both because the person baptizing must be altogether diverse from the person baptized,¹⁷² and because Baptism is spiritual generation: now, no one can generate himself. But see what was said, n. 1452, q. 1.

Chapter III

On the Subject of Baptism

1465. The SUBJECT capable of Baptism is every and only living man descending from Adam, not yet baptized. This is established from the words of Christ the Lord, who says indiscriminately of all: “Unless anyone shall have been born

¹⁶⁴H. A., XIV, 16; book VI, 117.

¹⁶⁵Cf. *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 195.

¹⁶⁶*De Bapt.*, cap. 17.

¹⁶⁷Book VI, 106, v. end.

¹⁶⁸Book VI, 117.

¹⁶⁹3, q. 67, a. 6.

¹⁷⁰Book VI, 120.

¹⁷¹Book VI, 124, end.

¹⁷²*Ibid.*, 118.

again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” (John 3:5).

Hence, validly and licitly baptized are: 1. infants, as was expressly defined by Trent (sess. 7, can. 13, on Baptism); 2. the perpetually insane, who have never used reason; because they are judged of the same condition as infants.¹⁷³ Recall what was said, n. 1435.

These things having been premised in general, we must now treat specifically: 1. of infants to be baptized in the womb of the mother; 2. of abortive fetuses and monsters; 3. of the children of unbelievers or heretics; 4. of adults; 5. of the doubtfully baptized.

1. Infants in the Womb of the Mother 1466. I. Outside danger of death, no infant is to be baptized unless he has been perfectly born. The reason is that to be born is prior to being reborn, and this is what Christ the Lord seems to suggest when He says: “unless anyone shall have been born again, etc.”

We have said outside danger of death; for the Roman Ritual has these things: “But if the infant has put forth the head, and danger of death is imminent, let him be baptized on the head, nor afterwards, if he escapes alive, is he again to be baptized. But if he has put forth another member which indicates vital motion, let him, if danger is impending, be baptized on that; and then if when born he lives, he will be baptized under condition.”

1467. II. “If a pregnant mother has died, the fetus is to be cautiously extracted as soon as possible, and if it is alive, it is to be baptized.” Thus the Roman Ritual, and it is plainly established from the obligation of charity (cf. n. 483, Rule 2). Wherefore parents sin gravely who neglect that incision of the womb be done; and likewise surgeons or other experts, who omit or delay doing it; but also the pastor is held to take care that the mother not be buried, incision having been omitted.¹⁷⁴

Today, however, in diverse regions the local Prefect must be admonished concerning the matter, and witnesses approved by him must be employed, both for recognizing the death and for greater certainty of the matter, and especially lest the author of the operation be brought forward as guilty of homicide.¹⁷⁵

1468. Questions. Q. 1. Whether an infant in danger of death can be baptized enclosed in the womb of the mother?

Resp. 1. If he is altogether enclosed in the womb, so that water cannot reach him, he cannot be baptized: this is certain among all.

2. If, the mouth of the womb already having been opened, he can be reached by water through an instrument, the doctors dispute. Some indeed deny, because no one is said to be reborn unless he has first been born; but others very probably affirm, because such an infant is already a man as wayfarer, and can be said to have been born inchoatively, according to that (Matthew 1:20): “That which is born in her,” that is, conceived, “is of the Holy Spirit.” Therefore, in practice, he is to be baptized by the surgeon or midwife under condition: “If thou art capable, etc.” (cf. n. 1456). But indeed: “A fetus baptized in the womb upon the crown is after birth to be rebaptized anew under condition.” Thus the S. C. C., July 12, 1794, in *Sutrina*.¹⁷⁶

Q. 2. Whether the mother can and is held to undergo a CAESAREAN SECTION, that the offspring may be baptized?

Resp. Affirmatively, if the following conditions concur together, namely: 1. if she herself cannot give birth naturally; 2. if the section, in the judgment of an expert surgeon, will not bring her into proximate danger of death, and from the powers both of the mother and of the fetus, and from the other circumstances, the safety of each can prudently be hoped for; for where the danger of death is judged only slight and remote, death, if it follows the incision, must be held to have happened per accidens; 3. if the offspring cannot otherwise be baptized. For in these circumstances there presses the obligation of suffering any temporal inconvenience whatever, for procuring the spiritual and eternal life of the infant.¹⁷⁷ But if only slight hope shines forth that the offspring can be saved, the mother can indeed, but is not held to, undergo the operation; because charity does not press in such uncertainty of the event (cf. n. 744).

For the rest, prudence will for the most part advise that the mother, who is in good faith, not be admonished concerning the grave obligation. She is only to be exhorted to consent to the section, lest perhaps, on account of denied consent, she

¹⁷³Cf. *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 218.

¹⁷⁴Book VI, 106; cf. Konings, n. 1269, where more; Craisson, *Notiones theol. circa Sextum*, n. 342.

¹⁷⁵Cf. *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 208, where response is made to several difficulties raised.

¹⁷⁶*Collect. S. Sedis*, n. 218.

¹⁷⁷Book VI, 106; *H. A.*, VIII, 26; cf. Capellmann, *Med. pastor.*, p. 21.

die in a bad state, as Cangiamila rightly observes.¹⁷⁸

Note. A girl dishonestly and secretly pregnant, and near death, if on account of advanced pregnancy it is probable that Baptism can be conferred on the fetus, is held to reveal her state outside confession, so that the operation may be done after she has died. Yet she must not be admonished if she is living in good faith and no fruit is at all hoped for from the admonition.

2. Abortive or Monstrous Fetuses 1469. I. An ABORTIVE fetus, however small, must be baptized; and indeed absolutely, if its animation and formation are established; but under condition, if there is doubt concerning its life or formation. Nor is Baptism to be omitted because the fetus is very recent; for, “today the opinion flourishes, not without applause received by experts,” says St. Alphonsus, “that fetuses are informed by a soul from the beginning of conception, or at least after some days.” And hence it is that, whenever some sign of life is found in them, and it is not established that they are destitute of a soul, they are to be baptized, with much caution indeed, lest they be killed, and with the condition added: If thou livest. “How many abortive fetuses,” says Roncaglia,¹⁷⁹ “through ignorance of midwives and mothers, the privy receives, whose soul, if it were not defrauded of Baptism, would see God eternally, and whose body, although it was unformed, would be more decently buried! But to whom especially under grave fault does it belong to expel ignorance? Is it not to pastors?”¹⁸⁰

Let the following things be noted: 1. The fetus is to be baptized which has at least the first outlines of a human body, which experts assert already happens on the third day, as Cangiamila reports.¹⁸¹ Yet recognition of a fetus as such within the first weeks is difficult; but after a month easy, as Capellmann testifies.¹⁸² 2. An incomplete fetus, or one not yet formed, is to be baptized by immersion in a basin or cup full of lukewarm water: absolutely indeed, if vital motion is apprehended in it; under condition, IF THOU LIVEST, when it appears without motion but is certainly distinguished from a mole; finally under the condition IF THOU ART CAPABLE, when it is doubtfully a human fetus. 3. A fetus or embryo which is enclosed in the membranes of the afterbirth,

and which softens and yields when touched by the finger, must be broken; but a mole appears as formless flesh, of bloody or varied color, hard to the touch.¹⁸³

1470. II. MONSTROUS births are to be baptized in a similar way. But these according to the following rules:

1. “A monster which does not show forth the human species must not be baptized: but if there is doubt concerning this, let it be baptized under this condition: If thou art a man...” Thus the ROMAN RITUAL. Hence, if the monster has a human head, it is to be baptized absolutely, whatever may be the case concerning the other members; indeed, even if it has a bestial head, it is to be baptized at least under condition, If thou art capable; because, as today’s physicians testify, the bestial species is to be ascribed only to the woman’s imagination, or to a defect of conformation.¹⁸⁴
2. A monster concerning which there is doubt whether it is one person or several is not to be baptized until this is discerned. But it can be discerned: 1. if it has several heads and several distinct breasts; for then there are the same number of distinct men, and in that case each is to be baptized separately. But if danger of death is imminent, and time is not sufficient that each be baptized separately, the minister will be able, pouring water on the heads of each, to baptize all at once, saying: “I baptize you, etc.” 2. If it has two heads and one breast, or two breasts and one head, or finally two heads and two breasts not well distinct, then first one must be baptized absolutely, and afterwards the other under condition, in this way: “If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee, etc.” Thus the ROMAN RITUAL. If it has one head and two breasts, after the baptism of the head, each breast is to be baptized under condition: “If thou art not baptized”; because it is unknown by which breast the soul of the head is informed.

For the rest, in these cases, unless necessity presses, the matter is not to be done hastily; both so that the Ordinary of the place, or another expert, may be consulted, as the RITUAL admonishes, and so that with the lapse of time nature may explain itself.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁸Book VI, 106.

¹⁷⁹*De Bapt.* cap. 17.

¹⁸⁰Book VI, 106, v. end.

¹⁸¹Cangiamila, l. c., n. 12 and 13.

¹⁸²Capellmann, loc. cit.

¹⁸³Cangiamila, l. c., n. 12 and 13.

¹⁸⁴Cf. Capellmann, loc. cit., where he adds: “Generation between man and beast, which Liguori indeed thinks incredible, most certainly does not exist.”

¹⁸⁵Book VI, 125.

3. Children, Against the Will of Parents 1471. Children are indeed VALIDLY baptized against the will of parents; for it is not written, says St. Augustine, unless anyone shall have been reborn from the will of parents, but unless anyone shall have been reborn of water, etc. But here it is asked whether always LICITLY? Concerning this, hold these things:

Principles. I. It is certain that with the Church there is the right of baptizing infant children of HERETICS or SCHISMATICS, and of preventing them from being imbued with the errors of their parents, nor can any doubt be raised concerning this right of the Church (cf. n. 132 sq.). But indeed, for the sake of prudence, “that a Catholic minister licitly furnish Baptism, it is necessary that he conceive a probable hope that such a baptized child can, in his own time, be instructed in the true faith. But if in no way he can have such a moral hope, he certainly ought rather to abstain from Baptism, supposing the little child not to be in extreme necessity, in which anyone else can be baptized.” S. C. de PROP. FID., April 17, 1777.¹⁸⁶

Note. The same Sacred Congregation, on November 29, 1672, declared: “It is licit for a pastor to baptize a child, with one Catholic parent consenting, even if he knows certainly that the other will afterwards take care that the infant be baptized by a heretical minister; but the Catholic spouse is held to admonish the heretical spouse that the son has already been legitimately baptized.”¹⁸⁷

1472. II. It is licit to baptize children of UNBELIEVERS, against the will of parents, in the following cases: 1. If they have the use of reason, or, in doubt, have completed seven years, and ask for Baptism, yet precaution having been taken against the danger of perversion. 2. If they are in danger of death and can be baptized secretly, without violence inflicted on parents, and without scandal of unbelievers.¹⁸⁸ 3. If they have been placed outside the care of parents, and fear is absent lest they return to them, as if they were exposed or abandoned. 4. If they are perpetually insane. 5. If they have been captured by right of war; likewise, if their parents are slaves of Christians. 6. If one of the parents consents to Baptism, the other resisting. The same must be said if, the father being dead, the paternal grandfather consents to Baptism, although the mother resists.¹⁸⁹

1473. III. Outside the aforesaid cases, it is NOT LICIT to baptize the children of unbelievers AGAINST the will of parents. The reason is that, if they are left in the power of the parents, the Sacrament would certainly be exposed to the danger of profanation on account of the undoubted danger of perversion and apostasy; if they are withdrawn from the parents, the natural right of parents would be injured, by which children, as long as they do not enjoy the use of reason, are under the power and care of parents, just as their other things are. Thus the more common opinion of the doctors against the Scotists, confirmed by the use of the Church and by the Constitution of Benedict XIV *Postremo mense*, February 28, 1747.¹⁹⁰

IV. Offspring baptized, whether licitly or illicitly, against the will of parents, ARE TO BE WITHDRAWN from their power, that they may be INSTRUCTED in the faith received and persevere in it. The reason is that man through Baptism is subjected to the jurisdiction of the Church, and consequently is by right liberated from paternal care in those things which look to the government of the soul, insofar as it can be contrary to the acquired right of the Church; for the right of natural paternity ought to yield to the right of the spiritual paternity of the Church.¹⁹¹ Yet scarcely today can this doctrine be brought into practice, since civil laws obstruct it.

4. Adults In ADULTS certain dispositions are required, both for the valid and for the licit reception of Baptism. Concerning this, hold these things:

1474. Principles. I. For the VALID reception of Baptism in adults there is REQUIRED and SUFFICES an intention at least habitual, that is, had and not retracted, of receiving Baptism (cf. n. 1434).

Hence it is inferred: 1. Baptism received from grave fear is valid. For since it is sufficiently voluntary, the Sacrament is received, although the thing or grace of the Sacrament is not received. 2. Likewise, Baptism conferred on one sleeping or insane is valid, if before, when in possession of himself, he asked for it, or in whom, as the Roman Ritual says, the desire of Baptism appeared.¹⁹²

1475. II. For the LICIT and FRUITFUL reception of Baptism there are required in adults, besides intention, the DISPOSITIONS which the Council of Trent teaches are necessary for the justification of the impious (cf. n. 1644).

¹⁸⁶ *Collect. S. Sedis*, n. 217; cf. *Nouv. rev. th.*, XVII, 605.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, n. 200.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, n. 211, ad 3.

¹⁸⁹ Book VI, 128-131; cf. Ninzatti, n. 1022.

¹⁹⁰ Book VI, 132.

¹⁹¹ Book VI, 127, 128.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 139; *H. A.*, XIV, 28.

Hence you will deduce: 1. If some adult has already been justified beforehand through charity or contrition, nothing further is required in him except the will of receiving the Sacrament, by which character is impressed, the punishment of sin is remitted, and grace is increased (cf. n. 1450).

2. If he has not been justified, yet has only original sin, there is required and suffices in him explicit faith of the mysteries of faith which are to be believed by necessity of means, and implicit faith of the others which have been revealed by God; then hope of justification and eternal life, with the beginning of love, by which namely he begins to love God as the fountain of all justice, and proposes to himself to observe the divine commandments.
3. If he also has personal sins, there is moreover required supernatural sorrow for sins, according to that (Acts 2:38): "Do penance, and let each one of you be baptized"; and the reason is that actual sins cannot be destroyed without the retraction of the sinner. But the doctors more truly hand down that attrition suffices; for since Baptism has been instituted for destroying even actual sins committed before its reception, if it should pre-require contrition, which covers a multitude of sins, it would pre-require the effect for the producing of which it was instituted; therefore. Thus very commonly with St. Thomas, who says: "For this, that man prepare himself for grace to be perceived in Baptism, faith is pre-required, but not charity; because preceding attrition suffices, even if it is not contrition."¹⁹³

The ROMAN RITUAL admonishes: "1. If some adult is to be baptized, he ought first, according to the apostolic rule, to be diligently instructed in the Christian faith and holy morals, and for some days to be exercised in works of piety, and his will and purpose are to be explored more often, and he is to be baptized only knowing and willing, and well instructed."¹⁹⁴ In antiquity, diverse times had been prescribed for proving and instructing CATECHUMENS; now the whole matter is left to the judgment of the Bishop.¹⁹⁵

2. For reverence of the Sacrament, it is fitting that both the one baptizing and those to be baptized who are healthy be fasting. Thus also the RITUAL.

5. The Doubtfully Baptized 1476. It is asked: Whether and when Baptism must be repeated UNDER CONDITION?

Resp. 1. There has always been in the Church the practice of baptizing, at least under a tacit condition, those concerning whom it was doubted whether by the laver of regeneration they had been expiated from original fault, as Benedict XIV proves at length against Natalis Alexander.¹⁹⁶ But Alexander III established thus: "Concerning those of whom it is doubtful whether they have been baptized, let them be baptized with these words premised: If thou hast been baptized, I do not baptize thee; but, if thou hast not yet been baptized, I baptize thee, etc."¹⁹⁷

2. "Baptism must be repeated under condition, not everywhere and without cause; but only then when a prudent and probable doubt underlies whether someone has been baptized, nor, diligent inquiry having first been made, could the truth of the matter become known," as the same Benedict XIV has.¹⁹⁸ And this is to be observed under grave obligation, both in doubt of law, namely when it is established that baptism was conferred with doubtful matter, or form, or intention, or with one concerning whose value there is controversy; and in doubt of fact, when it is prudently doubted, whether positively or negatively, whether Baptism has been given or not: because in each doubt, the salvation of man is equally endangered. Hence the rule which the Fifth Council of Carthage hands down: "Whenever there are not found most certain witnesses who testify without doubt that they have been baptized, they are to be rebaptized without scruple."¹⁹⁹

1477. From what has been said you will deduce:²⁰⁰ I. The following MUST be baptized under condition: 1. Exposed infants who are found without a certificate concerning Baptism. And the same must be thought with Benedict XIV, even if they carried on the neck testimony of Baptism, when the paper does not produce certainty, that is, when it is not discovered that the author of the paper is worthy of faith. Thus from the declaration of the S. C. C., December 18, 1723.²⁰¹ 2. All those for whom no sign can be had of received Baptism, nor of the marriage of the parents. 3. Many heretics. But these are to be rebaptized, not because they have been baptized by heretics, but because heretics baptizing are not accustomed

¹⁹³In 4, dist. 6, q. 1, a. 3, ad 5.

¹⁹⁴Cf. *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 224 and sqq.

¹⁹⁵Cf. Scavini, book III, n. 76.

¹⁹⁶*De Synodo*, book 7, cap. 6.

¹⁹⁷Cap. 2, *De Baptismo*.

¹⁹⁸Loc. cit.

¹⁹⁹Can. *Placuit*, 111, *de Consecr.*, dist. 4.

²⁰⁰With respect to the manner of proceeding, see Craisson, n. 6120; book VI, 135-137.

²⁰¹*Thesaur. Resolut.*, tom. 2, p. 413; cf. also *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 246 and 247.

to fulfill the conditions which the Church prescribes. And St. Alphonsus asserts this by name concerning Lutherans and Calvinists, who, since they judge Baptism not to be absolutely necessary, care little for matter and form. "Some of them," he says, "use distilled waters; others are accustomed in baptizing to observe this custom, that one pronounces the form and another applies the matter; some pour water upon the garments only, and others more commonly fail in intention."²⁰²

Note. 1. The Greek Schismatics, Eutychians, Nestorians, and other Oriental heretics are accustomed to confer Baptism accurately and VALIDLY; likewise the French Schismatics (*petite Eglise*), Old Catholics, and among Anglicans Ritualists. 2. Less accurately, and therefore DOUBTFULLY, Methodists and Presbyterians administer Baptism, who are accustomed to baptize by sprinkling; also Episcopalians, who especially today judge Baptism to be a bare rite without true efficacy; then finally Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Universalists, who consider Baptism as something free. 3. Baptists baptize adults only, and indeed doubtfully, because they pronounce the whole form before the immersion begins. Socinians and Quakers confer no baptism at all.²⁰³

Moreover, let it be noticed that Sects are changeable, and that today, in various places, they approach Rationalism more and more.

1478. II. The following are not to be baptized again, not even under condition: 1. Infants whose Baptism at least one witness worthy of faith affirms, as Benedict XIV himself teaches.²⁰⁴ And this, even if the witness is a woman, provided she is above exception, and there are not other witnesses deposing the contrary. 2. An adult who was born from truly Christian parents and was educated among the faithful; because, unless most evident reasons to the contrary are given, for his Baptism stands a violent presumption, which produces certitude. Yet if he is to be ordained, positive testimony of Baptism is required. 3. One baptized by a midwife, or by another skilled person, unless, the matter having been diligently examined, a probable suspicion of error is present.²⁰⁵

1479. Let the following Responses of the HOLY OFFICE be noted: I. To the proposed doubt whether Baptism should be conferred under condition on heretics who are converted to the Catholic faith, from whatever place they come, and to whatever sect they belong, the Eminent Fathers responded Negatively; but in the conversion of heretics, from whatever place or from whatever sect they have come, inquiry must be made concerning the validity of Baptism received in heresy. Therefore, an examination having been made in individual cases, if it has been found either that none was conferred or that it was conferred invalidly, they will have to be baptized absolutely. But if, according to the account of times or places, the investigation having been completed, nothing is detected either for validity or for invalidity, or a probable doubt concerning the validity of Baptism still remains, then they are to be baptized secretly under condition. Finally, if it has been established that it was valid, they are to be received only to abjuration or profession of faith²⁰⁶ (Decree, Wednesday, November 20, 1878).

II. It was asked: "1. Whether, in a case of doubt concerning the value of Baptism, Japanese persons who have thus received Baptism are still to be considered as Christians or unbelievers? 2. Whether, if doubt concerning the value of Baptism remains, and it has not seemed opportune to solve the doubt concerning those who have thus been doubtfully baptized, in matters which look to Matrimony, judgment must be made as if they had truly and validly been baptized, or not? To 1. Generally speaking, those concerning whom it is doubted whether they have been validly baptized are to be held as Christians. To 2. Baptism is to be judged valid in order to the validity of Matrimony" (Decree, September 9, 1868).²⁰⁷

Chapter IV

On the Ceremonies of Baptism

1480. Things to be noted beforehand. 1. "Private Baptism is called that in which no other ceremony prescribed by the Ritual is employed except the washing of the one to be baptized, with the words of the form pronounced, namely those things which by divine law are necessary for Baptism. But it is judged solemn when those rites and ceremonies are employed which the Roman Ritual records as having been received and approved from Apostolic and most ancient tradition, and as pertaining to its solemnity."²⁰⁸

²⁰² *H. A.*, XIV, 26; cf. Scavini, III, 219.

²⁰³ Sabetti, n. 662; Konings, n. 1264.

²⁰⁴ *Inst.* 8, n. 8.

²⁰⁵ *H. A.*, XIV, 23, 27; book VI, 134-137, where more.

²⁰⁶ Cf. *Nouv. Rev. theol.* (year 1884), tom. XVI, p. 264.

²⁰⁷ *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 243.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, n. 270.

2. It was asked: “Whether in places where there is no parochial church, nor baptismal font, Baptism can be conferred with all the solemnities and ceremonies customary in the Church?” And by a Decree of the HOLY OFFICE, on February 29, 1663, it was prescribed to missionaries that they can, indeed are held to, use those ceremonies which they can use. “Wherefore it is at once clear that private Baptism is not to be substituted for solemn Baptism because some ceremony cannot be done; for, this being omitted, the others are to be fulfilled.”²⁰⁹

These things having been premised, we shall treat: 1. of the place and time of solemn Baptism; 2. of sponsors; 3. of the accessory rites of Baptism.

I. On the Place and Time of Baptism 1481. I. The place of solemn Baptism regularly cannot be except a church in which a sacred font is found constituted. This is established from the Roman Ritual and from the Decree of Clement V in the Council of Vienne. Whence St. Alphonsus says: “It is mortal to baptize outside the church without necessity.”²¹⁰

We have said regularly; for there is excepted: 1. The case of necessity, which is judged present not only when danger of death is imminent for the infant, but also when the infant cannot be carried into the church without danger of infamy of the parents, or of another grave harm: in which case, from at least the permission of the Bishop, Croix with others affirms that Baptism can be conferred solemnly at home.²¹¹ 2. The privilege of Kings and Princes, whose sons and descendants it is licit to baptize solemnly in their chapels. But by the name of Princes, according to the more probable opinion, magnates are not to be understood, even those having temporal jurisdiction, but only those who possess absolute authority. “Yet, I think,” says St. Alphonsus,²¹² “that where the custom has been introduced of baptizing the sons of magnates at home, it is not easily to be disapproved, as Croix says.”

1482. II. Formerly the TIME of solemn Baptism was assigned twice in the year, namely on the Vigil of Easter and on the Vigil of Pentecost. And this custom indeed still flourishes at Rome for the Baptism of Hebrews or other converted unbelievers; but elsewhere it has now gone into desuetude.

II. On Sponsors SPONSORS are as it were spiritual parents, who receive the baptized person from the sacred font into their care.²¹³

1483. Principles. I. In SOLEMN Baptism at least one sponsor is to be employed, and indeed under grave obligation, whether this is a man or a woman; nor can more than TWO be licitly employed. Thus the Council of Trent established (sess. 24, *de ref. matr.*, cap. 2). “But the presence of sponsors in Baptism, from most ancient tradition, has always been held as a principal ceremony in the Church of Christ, so that the signification of spiritual generation might be preserved through sponsors, and the religious education of the child might be placed in safety by their pledge.”²¹⁴

We have said: 1. in solemn Baptism; for although a sponsor can be employed, indeed is laudably employed, in private Baptism, nevertheless he is licitly omitted.²¹⁵ 2. Whether man or woman: these are the words of Trent, from which it is more probably gathered that, if there is only one sponsor or one sponsa, a male or a female can be employed, of whatever sex the one to be baptized may be. 3. Nor can more than two be licitly employed, namely one man and one woman, lest relationships be multiplied.

Hence: 1. A pastor who admits no sponsor, or more than two sponsors, sins gravely; for he transgresses the precept of the Church imposed under grave obligation. The sponsor and sponsa cannot be two males or two females, although it is controverted whether this would be mortal or only venial. Yet it seems more truly to St. Alphonsus to be mortal, if the sponsors or sponsae differ in sex from the one to be baptized, because thus relationships would be multiplied, contrary to the intention of the Council of Trent.²¹⁶

2. The carelessness of parents is to be disapproved, who entrust the office of sponsor not to chosen and suitable persons, but to anyone whoever first comes, even though they know for certain that he is never again going to visit his spiritual son.²¹⁷

²⁰⁹Ibid.

²¹⁰Book VI, 142; *H. A.*, XIV, 30.

²¹¹Ibid., 142.

²¹²Ibid., 118, end.

²¹³Ibid., 146.

²¹⁴*Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 270, p. med.

²¹⁵Book VI, 147, end.

²¹⁶Book VI, 155; *H. A.*, XIV, 36.

²¹⁷*Collect. S. Sedis*, n. 270, end.

3. It is most fitting that sponsors be at least at the age of puberty and marked by the Sacrament of Confirmation.
ROMAN RITUAL.

1484. II. That someone VALIDLY be sponsor and contract the obligations annexed to the office of sponsor, the following conditions are required: 1. That he have the use of reason and be baptized. 2. That he have the intention of carrying out that office. Whence the laws require: 3. That he be designated by the parents, or at least by the pastor, if the parents had not designated him; but it is not licit for the pastor, unless a grave reason is present, concerning which see n. 1486, to change the sponsor designated by the parents. 4. That in Baptism itself, by himself or by a proxy, he physically hold or touch the infant while he is baptized, or immediately lift or receive him from the sacred font, or from the hands of the one baptizing.²¹⁸

1485. III. From the receiving of the baptized person from the sacred font there arises the office of pedagogue and spiritual relationship. 1. The OFFICE OF PEDAGOGUE; for sponsors are held to have care concerning the baptized person, that is, to instruct him concerning faith and morals. Yet this obligation presses only when true necessity demands it, for example in the case in which the baptized were being nourished among unbelievers. “But when they are nourished among Catholic Christians,” says St. Thomas,²¹⁹ “they can sufficiently be excused from this care, presuming that they are diligently instructed by their own parents. Yet if in any way they should perceive the contrary, they would be held, according to the manner, to expend care upon the salvation of their spiritual children.” 2. SPIRITUAL RELATIONSHIP, which arises between those lifting, the sponsor and sponsa, and the baptized person, and his father and mother, and between the one baptizing and the baptized person and the father and mother of the baptized.²²⁰ This relationship is an impediment diriment of matrimony, concerning which there will be speech in the Treatise on Matrimony, n. 2021 seq.

1486. It is asked: Who are PROHIBITED from being sponsors?

Resp. Illicitly, although validly, sponsors are: 1. Apostates, heretics, publicly excommunicated persons, and all those infamous from crimes. 2. Those ignorant of the rudiments of faith; for no one becomes a teacher unless he first has been a disciple. 3. Monks, Nuns, and all Regulars separated from the world, unless Regulars have been made Bishops. 4. Spouses with respect to spouses, and parents with respect to children; for, with respect to those of others, at least from today’s custom, both spouses can be admitted.²²¹ And “nothing prevents parents, in a case of necessity, from performing the place of sponsors, materially holding their infants, and responding for them to the one baptizing, yet apart from the prerogative of true and properly so-called sponsorship, namely apart from the necessity of undergoing the burdens which an office of this kind carries with itself, of contracting the impediment of spiritual relationship prohibiting the use of matrimony.”²²²

Note. From the ROMAN RITUAL public sinners must be kept from the office of sponsor. “But it is necessary: 1. that they truly be such, publicly known; 2. that the rejection be done prudently, for example by taking care beforehand in good ways that they do not present themselves, or by calling them to a secret conversation and saying that the Church cannot admit them as sponsors, although they can assist as witnesses; but let the motive never be publicly indicated, and often not even privately, to avoid quarrels; and, if another sponsor cannot conveniently be called, let Baptism be conferred without a sponsor; 3. that the rejection can be carried out in such a way that greater evils are not provoked; concerning which in our cities there will scarcely ever be no reason for fear”²²³ (cf. n. 1294).

PARTICULAR STATUTES are to be observed, where they are in force, which remove certain others from the office of sponsor, for example secular clerics, lay persons not fulfilling the precept of annual confession or Easter Communion, etc. In involved cases, the Bishop is to be consulted, as far as this can be done.²²⁴

III. On the Accessory Rites 1487. I. The ACCESSORY rites or Ceremonies preceding, accompanying, or following Baptism must be employed under grave precept. The reason is that they are prescribed by the Roman Ritual for a grave end, and have special fruits, so that it is mortal, without grave cause, to omit all the ceremonies of Baptism, or some notable one from among them, especially the use of consecrated water, the anointing of the oil of catechumens, and of chrism.²²⁵ Hence Laymann judges that magnates sin gravely who, outside necessity, have their sons baptized at home, or

²¹⁸H. A., XIV, 32; book VI, 146-154.

²¹⁹3, p., q. 67, a. 8.

²²⁰Book VI, 156, end.

²²¹Ibid., 156, 157; H. A., XIV, 37.

²²²Collect. S. Sed., n. 270, p. med.

²²³Berardi, *Prax.*, n. 757, X.

²²⁴Cf. Scavini, book III, 228-230.

²²⁵Book VI, 141, and work on Trent, sess. 7, n. 62.

privately in church, so that afterwards, with pomp, the ceremonies may be completed in church after the sponsors have arrived; who, moreover, Baptism having already been conferred before, are not truly made sponsors.²²⁶ (Cf. n. 2021 seq.)

1488. II. When the ceremonies have been omitted on account of necessity or negligence, they are to be SUPPLIED solemnly, and indeed under grave obligation, in church. This is established from the Roman Ritual, title *Order of supplying omitted things*, and from the common opinion. Yet this is not the custom in converted heretics, lest the people think that we disapprove their Baptism, even if rightly conferred. But whether the ceremonies are to be repeated when Baptism solemnly conferred is discovered to be invalid is controverted. Yet it is safer to repeat them, and in practice it is advised, unless danger of scandal or infamy obstructs.²²⁷

Various decrees of the HOLY SEE pertain here:

1. To the question: "Whether, in the administration of Baptism, the questions to which the sponsor of the infant ought to respond can be made in the vernacular tongue whenever the said sponsor is ignorant of Latin; or whether at least the question made in Latin, as the Ritual bears, can immediately be translated into the common tongue?" The S. Rit. C., August 31, 1867, in Ambianen., responded: Negatively to each, according to the Decree in Molinen., of September 12, 1847.²²⁸ "For the rest, nothing obstructs that in the vernacular tongue all those things which pertain to the Sacrament of Baptism itself be explained." Thus the S. C. DE PROP. FIDE to the Vicar Apostolic of Siam, April 30, 1808.²²⁹
2. If a priest baptizes, in a case of necessity, outside the church, he ought to omit all ceremonies which precede Baptism, even if the infant seems about to live so long. But Baptism having been conferred as above, he ought to anoint him on the crown with chrism if he has it, impose the white garment, and provide the lighted candle. But when the infant has recovered, he is to be presented in church; and there the omitted ceremonies which precede Baptism are to be supplied. Thus the S. Rit. C., September 23, 1820, in Colagurit.²³⁰
3. It was asked: 1. What ceremonies are to be supplied over a Catholic adult: those which in the Ritual are assigned for the Baptism of adults, or for the Baptism of infants? 2. What are to be observed for an adult heretic converted to the Catholic Faith, when he is to be baptized under condition, on account of a founded doubt concerning the validity of Baptism? And the S. Rit. C. responded (August 27, 1836, in Rhedonen., under 3 and 4): To 1. "Let the ceremonies and prayers be observed which in the Ritual are assigned for the Baptism of infants." To 2. "Insofar as the ceremonies are to be supplied, and are believed to be supplied, as in doubt, those are to be supplied which are prescribed for the Baptism of adults."²³¹

"For ENGLAND faculty was given of conferring Baptism in this case without ceremonies, which for AMERICA, when the Bishops asked in the year 1866, was denied. Yet in a particular case, from a grave cause, it seems that the Bishop can dispense so that it is licit to omit the ceremonies, as you may conjecture from the note itself which is added in the Collection of Gardellini to the decree just cited in Rhedon."²³²

4. To the question of the Bishop of Tonkin: "Whether in these places, where there is no common church or oratory, it is licit for a priest solemnly, that is, with all

the ceremonies and prayers prescribed in the Roman Ritual employed, to baptize the children of Christians in their private homes?" The S. C. Prop., on January 21, 1789, responded: Not only that it is LICIT, but that he MUST.[^vol2-0013-fn-1]

1489. Questions. Q. 1. How is the prohibition of using OLD CHRISM, or chrism of another year, to be understood?

Resp. It is to be taken strictly when new chrism is had. Therefore a priest would sin gravely who, new chrism having been set aside, should use old. But it is licit, whether in Baptism itself or in the blessing of the Font to be carried out on Holy Saturday, to use chrism of the preceding year, when fresh chrism cannot be had. Nor is the ceremony prescribed by the Roman Ritual to be deferred until new oils are received. From the response of the S. R. C. in Oriolen., September 23, 1837[^vol2-0013-fn-2] (cf. n. 545, end).

Q. 2. What must be noted concerning the imposition of the NAME?

²²⁶Book VI, 118, end; cf. *Nouv. Revue theol.*, tom. X, p. 149 and XI, p. 614.

²²⁷Book VI, 144.

²²⁸Gardellini, n. 5382, ad I.

²²⁹*Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 273 and 274.

²³⁰Gardellini, ad n. 4572.

²³¹Gardellini, n. 4780; cf. also *Collectanea S. Sedis*, n. 285; and Konings, n. 1264, II.

²³²Lehmkuhl, II, n. 69, note 4.

Resp. Generally a name must be imposed: except if danger of death presses and there is doubt concerning the sex. But the ROMAN RITUAL admonishes: "Let the pastor take care that obscene, fabulous, or ridiculous names, or names of empty gods, or of impious pagan men, not be imposed, but rather, as far as can be done, names of Saints." Whence it is only prohibited to impose obscene names, etc., and it is advised to impose names of Saints. But names imposed in Baptism can licitly be changed in Confirmation, indeed also at other times, even by private authority.[^vol2-0013-fn-3]

Q. 3. What ought the minister to do AFTER Baptism?

Resp. The pastor ought: "1. to note down in the Book the names of the baptized person and of his parents and sponsors; 2. to admonish the sponsors concerning the relationship contracted and their obligation; 3. to inculcate to mothers and nurses that they not lie down with infants, on account of danger of suffocation." Yet if "the bed is wide, the child inconsolable, who cannot otherwise be defended from cold, and the woman is accustomed in sleep to retain her own position and place," the danger seems absent.[^vol2-0013-fn-4]

1490. Note. Concerning DESCRIPTION in the Book let these things also be noted: 1. Since the inscription of Baptism and of the names of the baptized and of the sponsors is necessary, for making faith concerning the existence of Baptism and the impediment of relationship, the pastor is held under grave obligation to write and preserve accurately the book of Baptisms. 2. If an infant has been validly baptized privately at home, or in church under condition on account of a positive doubt concerning the value of prior Baptism, it is better to note each diligently.[^vol2-0013-fn-5] 3. The inscription of an illegitimate infant must be cautious. Concerning an adulterine child there is no difficulty; for, unless it is established concerning the adultery by sentence of a judge, one must stand by the saying of law: "He is the father whom the nuptials demonstrate." If he was born from a merely civil marriage, let him be inscribed as such, without another note. If he is natural, acknowledged by no one, let him be inscribed as born from unknown parents; if he is acknowledged by the father before witnesses, let his declaration be inserted, to be subscribed by him and the witnesses; likewise concerning the mother, if she by herself, or in writing, or through suitable witnesses, acknowledges the infant as her own. Thus Martinet.[^vol2-0013-fn-6]

When the baptism of illegitimate children is celebrated, the same solemnities in extrinsic apparatus as for legitimate children are not to be employed (S. C. Conc., July 31, 1867).[^vol2-0013-fn-7]