

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II - Treatise IV: On the Most Holy Eucharist

Contents

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II	3
Treatise I: On the Sacraments in General and Treatise IV: On the Most Holy Eucharist	3
Treatise I	4
On the Sacraments in General	4
Chapter I	4
On the Nature of the Sacraments	4
Article I	4
On the Notion and Distinction of the Sacraments	4
Article II	5
On the Power and Efficacy of the Sacraments	5
§ 1. On the Grace of the Sacraments	5
§ 2. On Character	7
Article III	7
On the Constitution of the Sacraments, or on Matter and Form	7
1. As Regards the Conjunction of Matter and Form	8
2. As Regards Invariability	8
3. As Regards Certitude	9
Chapter II	10
On the Minister of the Sacraments	10
Article I	10
On the Requisites in the Minister That He May Operate Validly	10
Article II	12
On the Requisites in the Minister That He May Operate Licitly	12
1. That He Be Worthy and Fit	12
2. That He Act Worthily and Rightly	13
3. That He Confer the Sacraments on the Worthy	14
Chapter III	17
On the Subject of the Sacraments	17
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	20
On Sacramentals	20
1. On the Power and Efficacy of Sacramentals	20
2. On Exorcisms and Blessings	20
3. On the Sign of the Cross and Lustral Water	22
Treatise IV	23
On the Most Holy Eucharist	23

Dissertation I	23
On the Most Holy Eucharist Insofar as It Is a Sacrament	23
Chapter I	23
On the Nature of the Eucharist	23
Article I	23
On the Notion and Effect of the Eucharist	23
Article II	26
On the Matter and Form of the Eucharist	26
§ 1. On the Matter of the Eucharist	26
§ 2. On the Form of the Eucharist	32
Chapter II	34
On the Minister of the Eucharist	34
Article I	34
On the Required Power of Order in the Minister	34
Article II	35
On the Required Jurisdiction	35
Article III	36
On the Order to Be Observed in the Administration of the Eucharist	36
§ 1. On the Manner of Administering Holy Communion	36
§ 2. On the Order to Be Observed in Administering Sacred Viaticum	38
Chapter III	40
On the Subject of the Eucharist	40
Article I	40
On Those Who Can Receive the Most Holy Eucharist	40
Article II	41
On the Dispositions Required for Receiving the Most Holy Eucharist	41
§ 1. On the Dispositions Required on the Part of the Soul	41
§ 2. On the Dispositions on the Part of the Body	45
1. Fasting	45
2. Cleanliness and Decent Habit	48
Article III	49
On the Obligation of Receiving the Eucharist	49
§ 1. On Viaticum	50
§ 2. On Paschal Communion	51
Article IV	54
On Frequent Communion	54
Chapter IV	57
On Reserving the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist	57
Dissertation II	60
On the Most Holy Eucharist insofar as It Is a Sacrifice	60
Chapter I	60
On the Sacrifice of the Most Holy Mass Considered in Itself	60
Article I	60
On the Notion of the Sacrifice of the Mass	60
Article II	62
On the Value and Fruit of the Sacrifice of the Mass	62
Article III	63
On the Application of the Sacrifice of the Mass	63

Chapter II	67
On the Celebration of the Sacrifice of the Mass	67
Article I	67
On the Obligation of Celebrating	67
§ 1. On the Obligation of Celebrating by Reason of the Priesthood	67
§ 2. On the Obligation of Celebrating by Reason of Office	68
§ 3. On the Obligation of Celebrating by Reason of Stipend	70
Article II	77
On the Things to Be Observed in the Celebration of Mass	77
§ 1. On the Time and Place of Celebration	77
§ 2. On the Things Required for the Celebration of Mass	82
§ 3. On The Observance Of The Rubrics	87

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II

Treatise I: On the Sacraments in General and Treatise IV: On the Most Holy Eucharist

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 unworthily, 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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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 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.

⁶³Book VI, 619.

⁶⁴Ibid., 285, dub. 4.

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

⁶⁶Ibid., n. 5165, 4.

⁶⁷Benger, *Compend.*, n. 317.

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

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,

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.

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?

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:

⁷³Konings, n. 1233.

⁷⁴Konings, n. 1233.

⁷⁵Book VI, 50.

⁷⁶Ibid., 52.

⁷⁷Ibid., 54.

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

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.

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.

⁷⁹Book VI, 59.

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

⁸¹Book VI, 79.

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

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

⁸²Book VI, 79.

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

⁸⁴Book VI, 82; *Exam. Ordin.*, 19.

⁸⁵Book VI, 82.

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 80.

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 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

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.

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

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

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.

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

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 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

¹⁰²Gardellini, n. 3663.

¹⁰³Gardellini, n. 764.

¹⁰⁴S. C. Conc., June 18, 1859.

¹⁰⁵Konings, n. 1247-D.

¹⁰⁶Konings, n. 1248.

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.[^vol2-0008-fn-1]

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.”[^vol2-0008-fn-2]

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.[^vol2-0008-fn-3]

Treatise IV

On the Most Holy Eucharist

1508. “Of all the sacred mysteries which our Lord and Savior commended to us as most certain instruments of grace, there is none which can be compared with the most holy Sacrament of the EUCHARIST,”¹⁰⁷ in which He “as it were poured out the riches of His divine love toward men, making a memorial of His wonders.”¹⁰⁸

But why this most august Sacrament was instituted, the Roman Catechism brings forward two chief causes, saying: “The one is that it should be the heavenly FOOD of our soul, by which we might be able to guard and preserve spiritual life; the other, that the Church might have a PERPETUAL SACRIFICE, by which our sins would be expiated, and the heavenly Father, often gravely offended by our crimes, would be brought from wrath to mercy, from the severity of just punishment to clemency.”¹⁰⁹

From this it is clear that this treatise is aptly divided into two dissertations: the former of which will treat of the Eucharist insofar as it is a Sacrament, the latter insofar as it is a Sacrifice.

Dissertation I

On the Most Holy Eucharist Insofar as It Is a Sacrament

In this dissertation one must treat: 1. of the nature of the Eucharist; 2. of the Minister; 3. of the Subject; 4. of the reservation and worship of the Eucharist.

Chapter I

On the Nature of the Eucharist

We shall investigate the nature of the Eucharist in a twofold article. Speech will be in the first on its notion and effect; in the second on its constituents, that is, on its matter and form.

Article I

On the Notion and Effect of the Eucharist

1509. DEFINITION. The Eucharist, that is, good grace, is the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, under the species of bread and wine, divinely instituted for the spiritual refreshment of the soul.¹¹⁰

It is said 1. is a Sacrament; “for in it there are external signs and signs subject to the senses; it then has the signification and efficacy of grace; moreover, concerning the institution of Christ neither the Evangelists¹¹¹ nor the Apostle¹¹² leave a place for doubting.”¹¹³

It is said 2. of the Body and Blood of Christ, under the species of bread and wine: for the Tridentine Synod teaches that “in the nourishing Sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of bread and wine, Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is contained truly, really, and substantially, under the species of those sensible things.”¹¹⁴

It is said 3. divinely instituted for the spiritual refreshment of the soul: by which words the principal effect of this Sacrament is expressed. For “just as earthly bread nourishes the body, so heavenly bread nourishes the soul, and makes it grow in divine love.”¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁷ *Catech. Rom.*, p. 2, cap. 4, n. 1.

¹⁰⁸ Trent, sess. 13, cap. 2.

¹⁰⁹ Loc. cit., n. 70.

¹¹⁰ Book VI, 189.

¹¹¹ Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19.

¹¹² 1 Corinthians 11:24, 25.

¹¹³ *Catech. Rom.*, p. 2, c. 4, n. 7.

¹¹⁴ Trent, sess. 13, c. 1.

¹¹⁵ *Inst. catech.*, p. 2, c. 4, n. 3.

1510. Since, therefore, the Most Holy EUCHARIST consists both of the body of Christ and of the species under which the body of Christ lies hidden, if it is asked in what precisely the essence of this Sacrament is situated, St. Alphonsus responds: "There are several opinions, but two more received. Some say the essence of the Eucharist consists directly in the species of bread and wine; and that the body of Christ pertains to the Sacrament only obliquely, that is, as something extrinsically connoted. Others say that it consists directly equally in the species and in the body of Christ. Each opinion is probable."¹¹⁶

But if it is asked IN WHAT MANNER the Body of Christ begins to become present, it must be said that it becomes present neither by production from nothing, nor by being brought from heaven, but "by the conversion of the whole substance of bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of wine into the substance of His Blood; which conversion has fittingly and properly been called TRANSUBSTANTIATION by the holy Catholic Church."¹¹⁷

1511. Principles. I. The whole CHRIST under each species, and under any part of each species, is REALLY PRESENT. The first part of the proposition is of faith; likewise the second, if it is understood of separated parts of the species.¹¹⁸ But if it is understood of continuous parts, before separation has been made, it is certain, and altogether to be held.¹¹⁹

The COUNCIL OF TRENT speaks thus aptly to the matter: "This faith has always been in the Church of God, that immediately after consecration, the true body of Our Lord and His true blood exist under the species of bread and wine, together with His soul and divinity; but the body indeed under the species of bread, and the blood under the species of wine, by force of the words; but the body itself under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under each, by force of that natural connection and concomitance by which the parts of Christ the Lord, who has now risen from the dead, no longer to die, are joined among themselves; moreover the divinity, on account of that admirable hypostatic union of it with the body and soul. Wherefore it is most true that just as much is contained under either species as under both: for whole and entire Christ exists under the species of bread, and under any part of that species; likewise whole under the species of wine, and under its parts."¹²⁰

Therefore Christ EXISTS in the Sacrament in a singular and altogether ineffable MANNER, which St. Thomas thus expresses: "The Body of Christ is in this Sacrament by way of substance, that is, by the manner in which substance is under dimensions... But it is manifest that the nature of substance is whole under any part of the dimensions under which it is contained, just as under any part of air there is the whole nature of air, and under any part of bread there is the whole nature of bread. And this indifferently, whether the dimensions are actually divided, as when air is divided or bread is cut, or even are actually undivided, but divisible in potency."¹²¹

And hence it is why some teach that the whole specific notion of this Sacrament is saved in the species of bread or wine alone, taken separately. This opinion is indeed probable; but the opposite is more probable, since only through each species is signified a BANQUET or refreshment of food and drink, in which the specific notion or essence of this Sacrament consists.¹²²

It is asked: Whence is the NUMERICAL UNITY of this Sacrament taken?

Resp. Some say it is taken from the unity of the body of Christ; others from the physical continuation of the parts themselves of the species; finally others, and more probably, from the moral conjunction which the species have while they are proposed or taken after the manner of one thing. Whence, if diverse consecrated species, or several parts of the same species, are proposed at the same time and on the same altar, or ministered to the same person, there will be one Sacrament; but if the same species are divided, and proposed on diverse altars, or ministered to diverse persons, or to the same person at diverse turns morally distinct, there will be diverse Sacraments.¹²³

1512. II. The Eucharist is a PERMANENT Sacrament. "That excellent and singular thing is found in it, that the remaining Sacraments then first have the power of sanctifying when someone uses them; but in the Eucharist the Author Himself of sanctity is before use; for the Apostles had not yet received the Eucharist from the hand of the Lord, when nevertheless He Himself truly affirmed that what He was giving was His Body."¹²⁴

¹¹⁶Book VI, 189, 190.

¹¹⁷Trent, sess. 13, cap. 4.

¹¹⁸Ibid., sess. 13, cap. 3 and can. 3.

¹¹⁹Cf. Lugo, *De Euchar.*, disp. 7, sect. 3.

¹²⁰Sess. 13, cap. 3.

¹²¹3, p., q. 76, a. 3.

¹²²Book VI, 191, q. 1; cf. Laymann, book V, tr. 4, c. 1, n. 2.

¹²³Book VI, 191, q. 2.

¹²⁴Trent, sess. 13, cap. 3.

Q. When does the body of Christ CEASE to be under the species?

Resp. It ceases when so great a change of the species has been made as would have had to be made in order that the substance of bread and wine in unconsecrated species would be corrupted.¹²⁵

Hence: 1. If a little consecrated wine is mixed with other wine, at least of the same species, as happens in the first ablution, Christ does not cease to be there. If the wine is very diverse, it is disputed whether from the mixing of the species such a change arises as would suffice to destroy the substance of consecrated wine. Yet, in this doubt, it must be held that the species are not corrupted. But if to consecrated wine there is mixed a liquid of another species, for example water, in so great a quantity that the accidents of wine are corrupted, namely in such a way that the substance of wine, if it were present, could not be conserved, Christ ceases to be present under those species.¹²⁶

2. The species, in one receiving the Sacrament, are consumed sooner or later according to the greater or lesser digestive power. Yet commonly, in a healthy man, the species are judged to be corrupted at least after a quarter hour from Communion, even in a priest.¹²⁷ Otherwise in a sick person, who even after an hour can reject the species plainly incorrupt.
3. "Species rejected by vomiting, if they are such that under them bread or wine can exist, are truly to be adored; and if they are again taken, they again confer grace, as Cardinal de Lugo teaches."¹²⁸

1513. III. The EFFECT of the Eucharist is the NOURISHMENT of souls through the perfection of charity. The Most Holy Eucharist indeed has this in common with the other Sacraments of the living, that it confers an INCREASE OF GRACE, but not first grace except per accidens, as was said above, n. 1395. But its proper effect is that this increase of grace imports the refreshment of the soul, namely for fostering charity and perfecting UNION with Christ, as He Himself promised in John 6:57, saying: "He who eats My flesh and drinks My blood abides in Me, and I in him."

But since this nourishing Sacrament has the notion of FOOD, "therefore, every effect which material food and drink makes with respect to bodily life, namely that it sustains, increases, repairs, and delights, this whole thing this Sacrament does with respect to spiritual life." Thus St. Thomas.¹²⁹

Therefore the principal EFFECTS of the Eucharist in the SOUL, besides the increase of grace, are the following.¹³⁰

1. REMISSION OF VENIAL SINS (it repairs); for this Sacrament, according to Trent,¹³¹ "is an antidote by which we are freed from venial faults and preserved from mortal sins." "But the Salmanticenses think with others that Communion of itself destroys venial sins from the work worked, through the very infusion of grace by which the soul is refreshed. But Tournely says better that the Sacrament destroys venial sins not immediately of itself, but by means of an act of charity which it excites in the soul."¹³² And in the same way it remits temporal punishment due for sins.
2. PRESERVATION FROM MORTAL SINS (it sustains); as is established from the praised words of Trent. But the Eucharist preserves us from death of the soul through the help of sacramental grace, by which devotion is excited, temptations are more strongly resisted, demons are put to flight, etc. Indeed, grave authors assert that from the reception of the Eucharist the soul is fortified by such external protection that God does not permit it to be living in occasions in which it would fall into sin.¹³³
3. INCREASE OF VIRTUES (it increases); for just as the body through natural food is not only conserved, but also grows, so similarly the soul through supernatural food, that is, the Eucharist, is not only sustained, but also strengthened and enriched with a supply of graces, by which the exercise of all virtues, especially charity, is promoted more and more.
4. SPIRITUAL SWEETNESS (it delights); and this effect indeed is infallible, unless it is impeded on account of the fault of the recipient. But this sweetness consists in a certain cheerfulness of the will for accomplishing all things which are known to be pleasing and acceptable to God (cf. n. 536).

¹²⁵Book VI, 225.

¹²⁶Ibid., 229.

¹²⁷Ibid., 225.

¹²⁸Ibid., 223.

¹²⁹3, p., q. 79, a. 1.

¹³⁰Book VI, 269; cf. St. Bonaventure, in 4 Sent., dist. 12, a. 1, q. 3.

¹³¹Sess. 13, cap. 2; cf. St. Thomas, 3, q. 79, a. 4.

¹³²H. A., XV, 5.

¹³³Salmanticenses, *De Euch.*, c. 6, n. 30.

5. ATTAINMENT OF GLORY, according to that of Christ (John 6:59): "He who eats this bread will live forever." "By the grace of this Sacrament, namely, the faithful, while they pass this life, enjoy the highest peace and tranquillity of conscience; then, recreated by its power, not otherwise than Elias, who by the strength of the hearth-baked bread walked even to the mountain of God Horeb, when the time of departing from life has come, ascend to eternal glory and beatitude."¹³⁴

1514. Nor do the effects of the Eucharist extend to the soul alone, but also to the BODY itself, as the Fathers teach. But they are the following:

1. THE QUIETING OF CONCUPISCENCE and of the tinder of sin. But the Eucharist works this quieting partly by putting demons to flight, lest they excite species of a shameful object, partly by repressing the powers of the humors, mitigating ardor, etc.¹³⁵
2. The future RESURRECTION AND GLORY of the body, on account of a special title, namely because of the union of our bodies with the life-giving flesh of Christ, which is the cause of our resurrection, as Christ promised, saying in John 6:55: "I will raise him up on the last day."

It is asked: Whether the Eucharist, insofar as it is a Sacrament, can profit OTHERS than those receiving?

Resp. 1. It cannot profit DIRECTLY and from the work worked; because it was instituted by way of food; but food does not profit except the one taking it. 2. It can profit INDIRECTLY and from the work of the worker, both the living by way of impetration, and the departed by way of satisfaction and suffrage, if namely the one communicating offers this act of religion to God in their favor. Add that the prayers which accompany or follow Communion are more acceptable to God than those which are poured forth at another time. Whence the Congregation of the INDEX, under Innocent X, condemned the book of Theophilus Raynaud, who attacked the custom of communicating for the departed.¹³⁶ See the dogmatic authors.

Article II

On the Matter and Form of the Eucharist

§ 1. On the Matter of the Eucharist 1515. "Just as in the other Sacraments there is a twofold matter, namely proximate and remote, so also here, but in an inverted order: for in the others, the remote matter is a permanent thing; but the proximate is its use, which passes away; here, however, the remote passes away, and the proximate remains, namely the species of bread and wine."¹³⁷ And since, for practice, one must treat only of the remote, that is, of that which, through consecration, passes into the body and blood of Christ, we shall treat: 1. of the remote matter in general; 2. of the matter of bread; 3. of the matter of wine; 4. of the conditions required for consecration on the part of the matter.

I. On the Remote Matter in General 1516. Principles. I. The matter of the Eucharist is BREAD and WINE. It is of faith, from the definitions of the Council of Florence,¹³⁸ Lateran IV,¹³⁹ and Trent.¹⁴⁰ The reason is that Christ, in instituting this Sacrament, employed bread and wine, and commanded His Apostles to do the same.¹⁴¹

1517. II. Each matter, namely bread and wine, is REQUIRED for making the Sacrament LICITLY. "It is certain that it is necessary by necessity of precept to consecrate the Eucharist under each species, as St. Thomas teaches¹⁴² with others commonly... Whence it is common and certain among all that it is not licit, even in the article of death, to consecrate one species in order to offer Viaticum to the sick person."¹⁴³

But that this precept is not only ecclesiastical, but also divine, "is clear from Trent, sess. 22, cap. 1, where it is said that Christ commanded priests to offer His body in no other way than under each species. Behold the words of the Council: 'Christ offered His body and blood under the species of bread and wine to God the Father, and under the symbols of the

¹³⁴*Catech. Rom.*, p. 2, c. 4, n. 54.

¹³⁵Lugo, *De Euch.*, disp. 12, n. 100.

¹³⁶Decree of December 18, 1646.

¹³⁷Book VI, 194.

¹³⁸Decree to the Armenians.

¹³⁹Cap. *Firmiter*, I, 1, 1.

¹⁴⁰Sess. 13, cap. 3 and sess. 22, cap. 1.

¹⁴¹Matthew 26:26 sqq.

¹⁴²3, p., q. 80, a. 12, ad 3.

¹⁴³Book VI, 196.

same things, note, handed them to the Apostles that they might receive them, and to the same and their successors in the priesthood commanded that they offer, by these words: Do this in commemoration of Me; as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught.”¹⁴⁴

But whether the Supreme Pontiff can DISPENSE so that it is licit to consecrate in only one species is controverted. Commonly, however, authors deny, both because the Church cannot change the divine institution in the manner of making the Sacraments and offering Sacrifice to God, and because it is not improbable that outside sacrifice a Sacrament is not made; whence the affirming opinion cannot be brought down into practice, and “the Church never dispensed in this precept, nor ever will dispense.”¹⁴⁵

1518. It is asked: Whether the consecration of one species without the other is VALID?

Resp. 1. No one doubts that it is valid if this happens by accident, for example if someone through error had consecrated water for wine. 2. But if a priest should have the positive intention of consecrating only one species without the other, it is disputed. “Lugo denies, because, as he says, the notion of Sacrament cannot be divided from the notion of sacrifice... But others commonly affirm, because in every Sacrament, whenever the minister pronounces the form over the matter, with due intention, he perfects the Sacrament. This opinion is indeed very probable; but the opposite does not seem improbable.”¹⁴⁶

II. On the Matter of Bread 1519. Principles. I. The VALID matter of the Eucharist for the first consecration is only WHEATEN and USUAL BREAD; such namely as, in the moral judgment of men, is judged to be only that which is mixed from wheat flour and natural water, and cooked or baked by fire, and incorrupt in its species: because this alone is simply called BREAD. It is established from the Decree of Eugene IV, where it is said concerning the Eucharist: “whose matter is wheaten bread and wine from the vine”; and from the Rubrics of the Missal, where one reads: “If the bread is not wheaten, the Sacrament is not made.”¹⁴⁷

It is the same for the value of the Sacrament whether the bread is unleavened or leavened. Yet from the precept of the Church, which obliges under grave obligation, Latins are held to use unleavened bread, Greeks leavened.¹⁴⁸

Hence: 1. By defect of wheat flour, INVALID matter is bread from rice, oats, millet, and similar grains: for these differ in species from wheat, according to common estimation. DOUBTFUL matter would be bread from spelt; likewise from rye. The admixture of a foreign substance in notable quantity, for example in equal or almost equal quantity, renders the matter invalid.

2. By defect of natural water, INVALID matter is bread kneaded from oil, butter, milk, eggs, sugar, or another liquid; because it would not be usual bread. The admixture of artificial water renders the matter at least doubtful.
3. By defect of preparation, INVALID would be raw wheaten dough, hardened by the heat of the sun, or not cooked after the manner of bread, but fried or boiled after the manner of a cake.¹⁴⁹

1520. II. Matter, although valid, is ILLICIT if it is not fitting and made according to the prescription of the Church. Now:

1. Bread would not be fitting if, for example, some grains or drops of another species were mixed with the wheat and water, even if the wheat and water greatly predominated. Likewise, moldy bread, which already tends toward corruption, would be unfitting or illicit. “This would be,” says St. Alphonsus,¹⁵⁰ “if the taste were changed in some way, and then it would be mortal to use it.” Therefore one must watch carefully that hosts and particles be fresh, made within one month at the most. For the Sacred Congregation of Rites condemns, as an enormous abuse, the custom of consecrating hosts which had been made three or four months before.¹⁵¹ Nor must they only be fresh, but also whole and clean. Yet “scandal being excluded, it is only venial, without a reasonable cause, to consecrate a broken or stained host; unless the fracture or stain were enormous; for then it would be mortal. Yet if the fracture is discovered after the oblation, such a host will licitly be consecrated, unless scandal of the people is feared.”¹⁵²

¹⁴⁴Ibid., dub. 1.

¹⁴⁵Book VI, 196, dub. 2.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., dub. 3 and n. 197.

¹⁴⁷Book VI, 198.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., 202.

¹⁴⁹Book VI, 199, 200.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., 201.

¹⁵¹Decree of December 16, 1826, Gandaven. (Gardellini, n. 4623).

¹⁵²Book VI, 204.

2. With respect to the FIGURE of the bread, among Latins a round host is required, larger for the celebrant, on which the sign of the cross is expressed, as is the constant custom of the Church.¹⁵³ If a larger host is lacking, the priest can probably, even for the sake of devotion, consecrate a smaller one, provided scandal is avoided: which can be avoided if, for example, the people are admonished concerning the lack of a larger host. Indeed, authors are not lacking who teach that a priest is HELD to consecrate in a smaller host if, from precept, the people would have to attend Mass, or if Viaticum had to be given to a sick person. But it is never licit for a priest, the larger host being set aside, for example for exposing in the monstrance, to take a smaller one, unless he has also consecrated this in the same Mass; because he must communicate from his own Sacrifice.¹⁵⁴

1521. It is asked: Whether a Latin can ever celebrate in LEAVENED bread, or a Greek in UNLEAVENED.

Resp. 1. In places where a church of one's own rite is had, this is absolutely prohibited, and indeed under penalty of perpetual suspension from Divinis;¹⁵⁵ even if Viaticum had to be given to a dying person: because in this case reverence toward so great a Sacrament is to be preferred to the utility of neighbor, for whom such a Sacrament is not simply necessary.¹⁵⁶

Resp. 2. But in places where a church of one's own rite is not had, for example if a Greek passes through places of Latins, or a Latin through the territories of Greeks, it is licit to celebrate either in leavened or in unleavened bread.¹⁵⁷

III. On the Matter of Wine 1522. Principles. I. Valid matter of the second consecration is only WINE FROM THE VINE, and indeed USUAL wine. This is established from Matthew 26:29: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until the day, etc."; and from the Florentine Decree already cited, which the constant practice of the Church confirms.

Hence, the following is not apt matter for valid consecration:

1. "Strong drink, and any liquid from mulberries, pomegranates, apples, etc., whether it is called wine or not. 2. Verjuice, or *omphacium*, that is, juice expressed from immature grapes; because it is not wine, but on the way to wine, whose nature it has not yet put on. 3. Vinegar, which is wine substantially corrupted; whence, if the priest after consecration prudently doubts whether it was vinegar or wine, the consecration is to be repeated, but under condition, on account of the doubt. 4. Grapes, or wine contained within grapes, or imbibed in a morsel of bread; because it is not so much drink as food. 5. *Sapa*, or boiled-down must, that is, must cooked down to a half or third part; because it is no longer wine, nor drink, but food. 6. *Lora*, that is, water poured over pressed grapes. 7. Spirit of wine, since it is not properly wine."¹⁵⁸

1523. II. Valid but ILLICIT matter is true wine, VITIATED in some way, or MIXED. The reason is that it is against the reverence owed to the Sacrament. Whence exotic wine must be employed cautiously, because it is very often mixed with foreign substances and therefore illicit; indeed, not rarely one finds that which is altogether artificial, and consequently invalid.

Hence, consecration is indeed valid, but illicit: 1. in must, and indeed under mortal sin, according to Suarez, at least outside necessity; for although it is substantially wine, nevertheless it is not perfect wine, nor pure, as being not yet ripened nor separated from the lees. 2. In wine so moderately mixed with other liquids or aromatics that it indeed retains the nature of wine. But if the mixing is immoderate, the matter will be doubtful. 3. In wine becoming sour: as is established from the Rubric, where it is said: "If the wine has begun to become sour or to be corrupted, or has been somewhat sharp..., the Sacrament is made, but the one making it sins gravely." Yet when other wine is lacking, it is licit to use wine only slightly becoming sour; for the Rubric does not seem to be accepted with so great rigor that it includes even the very first degrees of sharpness. 4. In frozen wine; whence it is gravely prohibited to consecrate it unless it has been liquefied. But in the case in which the priest had illicitly consecrated frozen wine, it must be held as truly consecrated, nor could he licitly consecrate another wine; for from the Rubric it is clearly evident that the consecration is valid; and the reason is that, although frozen wine is not actually drinkable, nevertheless it is drinkable from its nature.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵³Gardellini, n. 4723 (April 26, 1834, Immolen.).

¹⁵⁴Book VI, 205.

¹⁵⁵Book VI, 202.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., 203, dub. 2.

¹⁵⁷Ibid., dub. 1.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., 206; cf. 1 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 75.

¹⁵⁹*Exam. Ord.*, n. 98; book VI, 207, from the 6th edition.

To the QUESTION: “Whether it is licit to celebrate with wine made from dried grapes?” the S. C. DE PROPAG. FIDE, July 23, 1706, responded: “It is licit, provided the liquid is recognized from color and taste to be true wine.”¹⁶⁰

1524. III. WATER is to be mixed ceremonially with the wine to be consecrated; not indeed from necessity of the Sacrament, but by force of a precept gravely obliging. Let Trent be heard.¹⁶¹ “Then the Holy Synod admonishes that it has been prescribed by the Church to priests that they mix water with the wine to be offered in the chalice: both because Christ the Lord is believed to have done thus, and also because from His side water came forth together with blood: which sacrament is recalled by this mixing; and since in the Apocalypse of Blessed John waters are called peoples, the union of the faithful people themselves with Christ the Head is represented.”

But the water ought to be natural: “but he who would mix rose water or another artificial water, even in necessity, although he would validly consecrate, nevertheless would sin mortally.”¹⁶² With respect to quantity, one drop suffices, provided it is sensible; but it is required, even if the wine is very strong, that it never exceed its third part. Indeed, if the wine is not very strong, this quantity is already held by many as excessive; wherefore it is advised that the priest not exceed eight or ten drops.¹⁶³ Hence, if he pours in too much water, some wine must again be added.

But the mixing is to be done in the chalice itself and within the Sacred itself; for otherwise it would not suffice for the signification of the sacrament, and it would be a grave omission of the Rubrics. Hence, in the case in which it had been omitted, it must be supplied, if the omission is discovered before the consecration of the chalice; otherwise, if it is discovered after consecration.¹⁶⁴

It is certain, although it is not of faith, that that mixed water is converted into the Blood of Christ. Thus St. Thomas,¹⁶⁵ who denies that the opposite opinion can be defended. But how this conversion is made, whether immediately or mediately, namely through a prior conversion of the water into wine, is affirmed on each side probably.¹⁶⁶

IV. On the Conditions Required for Consecration on the Part of the Matter 1525. Principles. I. For VALID consecration, besides apt matter, it is required that this matter be PRESENT and DETERMINATE.

It is required 1. that the matter be morally and sensibly PRESENT to the consecrating priest. The reason is taken from the institution of Christ and from the demonstrative words of the form; likewise from the notion of Sacrifice, which requires a present victim. But for moral presence it suffices that the thing can be seen or touched, whether in itself or in another.

Hence: 1. Matter so small that it cannot be perceived by sense, or very remote, for example at a hundred paces, or placed behind the back, or enclosed in the tabernacle, is invalidly consecrated; because it is not judged morally present to the priest. 2. A blind man, or one existing in darkness, validly consecrates if he is otherwise morally certain concerning the presence of the matter. Likewise, the wine in a covered chalice, hosts in a closed ciborium, or lying hidden in a heap under others, or under a pall, veil, etc., are validly consecrated. Moreover, here it must be noted that the practice of those is commonly disapproved who move their mouth close, that they may breathe their breath into the chalice and bread.¹⁶⁷

It is required 2. that the matter be CERTAIN and DETERMINATE in the individual through the intention of the one consecrating. And this opinion indeed is common, both because the pronouns This and This require this, and because actions are concerning singulars, which must be certain and determinate.¹⁶⁸ But a virtual intention suffices, as was said above (n. 1413).

Hence: 1. “He would invalidly consecrate who wished only to consecrate a third or half part of a host, or, from many, for example twenty present, only four or five, designating none; because there is no reason why one should be consecrated more than another. Likewise, a host is not consecrated which, the priest being unaware, is placed either on the corporal, yet separated from the heap, or beneath it. The reason is that it is not determined in the mind of the priest, whose will is not borne toward the unknown.”¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁰ *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 318.

¹⁶¹ *Sess. 22*, cap. 7.

¹⁶² *Book VI*, 208.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 210.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 208.

¹⁶⁵ 3, q. 74, a. 8.

¹⁶⁶ *Book VI*, 209.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 211-213; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 99.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 214.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 214, 215.

2. But consecration is valid if the priest consecrates several hosts in a heap, although he is in error concerning their number: the reason is that he is always presumed to wish to consecrate whatever is decently consecrable. Whence, if after consecration he notices two hosts joined together at once, let him take each as consecrated, according to the Rubric of the Missal. But if before consecration, after he has offered, he notices it, let him set one aside and after Mass either he himself or another take it as blessed bread. Likewise, consecration is valid if he himself has brought several particles to the altar to be consecrated, or in a reasonable manner has noticed that they are brought by another to be consecrated by him, or before the Sacrifice has been admonished concerning those to be consecrated already placed on the altar; for then, even if within the act of consecration he does not remember them so expressly, or even does not uncover them at the oblation, nevertheless he consecrates all, provided they are present on the corporal; because the intention had with respect to them virtually perseveres.¹⁷⁰

1526. II. "For LICIT consecration of matter there is required: 1. That there not be a greater quantity than can be consumed at a suitable time, because there would be danger lest the species rot. 2. That the celebrant not depart from the usage of the Church, especially prescribed in the Missal."¹⁷¹ Concerning this, these things especially are to be held:

1. The matter to be consecrated is to be placed upon the corporal and sacred stone: this obligation presses under grave obligation.¹⁷²
2. The hosts which are to be consecrated in Mass for the Communion of the faithful are to be placed upon the corporal or upon the paten, or in some chalice or in a pyx. This pyx is then to be opened at the first oblation and at the consecration, so that the celebrant may direct his intention also to offering and consecrating those.¹⁷³ Yet to consecrate in a closed pyx does not seem gravely unbecoming.¹⁷⁴
3. "If a little after the oblation has been made, small hosts are brought for communicating the people, these are licitly consecrated, the oblation being supplied mentally." If, the Canon already having been begun, they are brought, one must distinguish: in the case in which several would remain without Communion, it is licit to consecrate; but in the case in which only one would remain, it is not licit; to him, however, for a just cause, a part of the large host should be offered. Moreover, a cause would be sufficiently just if the one about to communicate would have to wait a long time, or if Viaticum had to be given to a sick person.¹⁷⁵

1527. Questions. Q. 1. Whether a ciborium is to be judged consecrated which, from forgetfulness, has been left outside the CORPORAL or SACRED STONE?

Resp. 1. If the celebrant intends with actual intention to consecrate, not noticing that the ciborium is located outside the corporal, it is certainly consecrated, since it is really present, and the intention of the priest is borne absolutely toward it, although, if the defect were known, this would not be done.¹⁷⁶

Resp. 2. Likewise, the consecration is certain if the ciborium is placed indeed outside the stone, but ON THE CORPORAL extended over the stone, even if thought does not recur concerning the ciborium to be consecrated. For in this case it is already morally found on the stone; whence the consecration is valid from the virtual intention of consecrating whatever apt matter is placed on the corporal.¹⁷⁷

Resp. 3. If the ciborium remains OUTSIDE THE CORPORAL, without the priest thinking of consecrating it, it is controverted: "The first opinion, which various authors hold as probable, affirms; because, as they say, the will of consecrating was already present and was not retracted. Yet the second opinion, common and more probable, denies. The reason is that, since the intention of consecrating outside the corporal would have been a grave sin, you are not presumed to have had that intention. But because the first opinion does not seem improbable, the matter remains doubtful." Therefore those particles thus doubtfully consecrated are either to be consumed after the precious Blood and ablution, but before the purification, since the remains of the Blood are certainly the Sacrament, while concerning those hosts it is doubted whether they are the Sacrament; or, if a just cause is had, they are to be consecrated in another Mass, under condition. Moreover, the cause would be just if those particles were in too great a quantity, so that they could not easily be consumed, or if, at

¹⁷⁰Book VI, 216.

¹⁷¹Ibid., 218.

¹⁷²Ibid., 217.

¹⁷³*Rit. celebr. Miss.*, tit. II, 3; VII, 3; VIII, 5, 6.

¹⁷⁴Gury, II, 283, q. 2.

¹⁷⁵Book VI, 217.

¹⁷⁶Elbel, *De Euch.*, n. 48.

¹⁷⁷Konings, n. 1283, q. 1.

a suitable time, other particles could not be had.¹⁷⁸

Q. 2. Whether hosts are judged consecrated if the ciborium indeed was placed on the corporal, but at the time of consecration, from forgetfulness, remained CLOSED?

Resp. Affirmatively; for: 1. the matter was sufficiently present in the closed pyx; 2. intention was not lacking, since the one previously had was not retracted by the aforesaid forgetfulness.¹⁷⁹ But the intention which any good priest has, of violating no precept of the Church, in no way includes the intention of not consecrating whenever, while he does not notice, some defect occurs.

Q. 3. What is to be done by the priest if, by some accident, unconsecrated hosts are MIXED with consecrated ones?

Resp. The whole heap is to be brought to the altar, so that the priest either intends to consecrate the unconsecrated ones, or, according to others, consecrates the whole heap under condition, if they are not consecrated. "And this rather must be done, because in consecrating unconsecrated hosts,

true determination of the matter is lacking, nor can the word This be verified; whence all the hosts ought to be consecrated under condition, that they may be validly consecrated."¹⁸⁰

Q. 4. Whether DROPS OF WINE adhering to the chalice are judged consecrated, if the priest has intended nothing concerning them?

Resp. 1. Drops adhering exteriorly to the chalice are not consecrated, because the intention of consecrating them cannot be presumed, since it would be gravely illicit. 2. More probably neither are drops adhering interiorly consecrated, because the intention of the Church seems to be, and therefore that of the priest ought to be, to consecrate that which is in the chalice by way of one continuous thing. Whence, for guarding against every anxiety, the priest will do well if, once for all, he determines the intention. But it is expedient that he intend to consecrate separated drops, but only those which are nearest the bottom, not those remote. Similarly, "the priest ought to consecrate crumbs adhering to hosts, but not those separated on the paten or corporal. Nor does it obstruct that, by taking them, the fast would be injured; for then the irreverence of the Sacrament seems more to be guarded against than injury of the fast. But if crumbs are in the ciborium, let him also intend to consecrate them, since danger of losing them is absent."¹⁸¹

1528. Q. 5. What is to be done by the celebrant if he has noticed some DEFECT concerning the matter, whether of bread or of wine?

Resp. From the Rubric of the Missal these things are to be held:

I. With respect to a defect of BREAD: 1. "If the celebrant before consecration has noticed that the host is corrupted, or is not wheaten: that host having been removed, let him place another, and the oblation having been made, at least conceived in the mind, let him proceed from that place where he ceased."

2. "If he has noticed this after consecration, even after the reception of that host, another having been placed, let him make the oblation as above, and begin from the consecration, namely from those words: Who the day before He suffered; and the former, if he has not received it, let him receive after the reception of the Body and Blood, or let him give it to be received by others, or let him reverently preserve it somewhere. But if he has received it, nevertheless let him receive that which he consecrated: because the precept concerning the perfection of the Sacrament is of greater moment than that it be received by those fasting."

3. "But if this happens after the reception of the blood, new bread, and wine with water, must again be put; and the oblation having first been made as above, the priest should consecrate, beginning from those words: Who the day before: and immediately receive each, and proceed with the Mass, lest the Sacrament remain imperfect, and so that due order may be preserved."

4. "If the consecrated host disappears, or by some accident, as by wind, or by miracle, or having been taken by some animal, and cannot be found; then another is to be consecrated, beginning from that place: Who the day before He suffered, its oblation having first been made, as above."¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸Book VI, 217.

¹⁷⁹Ibid.

¹⁸⁰Book VI, 216.

¹⁸¹Ibid., 215.

¹⁸²Rubric *De defectibus*, tit. III, 4-7.

- II. With respect to a defect of WINE: 1. "If the celebrant BEFORE the consecration of the blood, although after the consecration of the Body, notices that either wine, or water, or each is not in the chalice, or that the wine is corrupted, he ought immediately to put wine with water; and the oblation having been made as above, to consecrate, beginning from those words: In like manner, etc."
2. "If after the words of consecration he notices that wine had not been put, but water: the water having been placed in some vessel, let him again put wine with water in the chalice, and consecrate, resuming from the aforesaid words: In like manner, etc."
3. "If he notices this after reception of the Body or of water of this kind, let him put another host again to be consecrated, and wine with water in the chalice, offer each, and consecrate and receive, although he is not fasting. Or if Mass is celebrated in a public place, where several are present, to avoid scandal, he will be able to put wine with water, and the oblation having been made as above, consecrate, and immediately receive, and proceed with the rest."¹⁸³

The same is to be done if after reception, with foundation, it is doubted whether the liquid drunk was pure or corrupted wine; but among the doctors it is not agreed whether the words of consecration are to be pronounced absolutely or conditionally. "I think," says St. Alphonsus, "that another certain wine is not to be consecrated again absolutely, because then the same danger would press of making a second mutilated Sacrifice, if perhaps the prior matter was truly apt; I say therefore that this second consecration ought to be made under condition, namely if the prior matter was not consecrated; for the danger of not leaving the Sacrifice mutilated will be a just cause of repeating the consecration under the aforesaid condition."¹⁸⁴

4. "If it happens that all the Blood is spilled after consecration, if indeed something, or a little, remained, let that be received, and concerning the rest of the spilled Blood let it be done as was said in the preceding Rubric" of the Missal. "But if absolutely nothing remained, let him again put wine and water, and consecrate from that place, In like manner, yet the oblation of the chalice having first been made, as above."¹⁸⁵

It must be noted: "If the matter which would have to be put, by reason of the defect either of bread or of wine, could in no way be had; if this is before the consecration of the body, one must not proceed further: if after the consecration of the body, or even of the wine, the defect of the other species is discovered, the other already consecrated; then if it can in no way be had, one must proceed and the Mass must be completed, yet in such a way that the words and signs are omitted which pertain to the lacking species. But if by waiting for some time, for example for an hour, it can be had, one must wait, lest the Sacrifice remain imperfect."¹⁸⁶

§ 2. On the Form of the Eucharist 1529. The FORM of the Sacrament of the Eucharist is the very words by which Christ the Lord made this Sacrament. For in the name and in the person of Christ the priest speaks and operates in making the Sacred.

Principles. I. The form prescribed for the consecration of BREAD is taken from St. Matthew the Evangelist, and consists in these words: FOR THIS IS MY BODY. The word for is placed according to the custom of the Roman Church derived from Blessed Peter; but it is inserted that the form may cohere with the preceding words.

In this form, the essential words are: "This is My body"; for they signify completely and import the conversion of bread into the Body of Christ. Hence, the word for does not pertain to the essence, and therefore its omission is judged to be only venial. "But not improbably Concina and Roncaglia condemn this as mortal; and in truth, in a matter of so great moment, any change deliberately placed does not seem light."¹⁸⁷ And the same must be said concerning the same word in the following form.

1530. II. For the consecration of the CHALICE the following form is assigned: FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH WILL BE POURED OUT FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS. All these words are taken either from diverse places of Sacred Scripture, or from Apostolic tradition, as St. Thomas teaches.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³Rubric *De defect.*, tit. IV, 3-5.

¹⁸⁴Book VI, 206.

¹⁸⁵Rubric, l. c., tit. X, n. 13.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., tit. IV, n. 8.

¹⁸⁷Book VI, 220.

¹⁸⁸3, p., q. 78, a. 3, ad 9.

The essential words are more probably these alone: "This is the chalice of My Blood," since they perfectly express the presence of the Blood of Christ under the species of wine. Nor, however, does the other opinion lack probability, which teaches that the other words also, as expressing the power of the passion of Christ, are essential, excepting only these: eternal and mystery of faith, which are included virtually in the others. Hence a priest would certainly sin gravely if he did not pronounce all the words which are contained in the consecration of the chalice; and if perhaps he had said only the first words, he ought indeed to repeat, under condition, the whole form.¹⁸⁹

1531. III. "The form of the Eucharist ought to be pronounced RECITATIVELY AND SIGNIFICATIVELY, that is, by referring the words of Christ and applying them to the present matter, so that it may be transmuted into the Body and Blood of Christ."¹⁹⁰ Thus all with St. Thomas.

IV. A change of words which imports no change of sense does not render the consecration invalid. This is established from the rubric of the Missal: "But if someone should diminish or change something from the form of consecration, and the words would not signify the same, he would not make the Sacrament. But if he added something which would not change the signification, he would indeed make it, but would sin most gravely."¹⁹¹ Nor similarly does faulty pronunciation impede the consecration from being valid. "The reason is that words have been so constituted that, if sometimes they are pronounced with a fault, they signify the same thing; for it suffices that the words of the form convey the sense intended by Christ; otherwise, if they conveyed another sense."¹⁹²

From these things you resolve: 1. Consecration is valid but GRAVELY ILLICIT if it is said: This food is my body, this chalice is my blood; *colpus* for *corpus*, *meus* for *meum*, *es* for *est*, *calis* for *calix*, *sanguis* for *sanguinis*, etc. Whence, he cannot be excused from venial sin who does not employ due diligence for pronouncing the words of consecration rightly.¹⁹³

2. Consecration is invalid if it is said: This for my body, omitting is.¹⁹⁴ Likewise, if it is said: Here, adverbially, is my body; this body is mine; or this blood is mine; because these words do not have the sense by which that is signified which they ought to effect. Likewise, if it is said: That is my body; that is my blood; for the sense of the form is changed, as is clear of itself.¹⁹⁵

3. Consecration is doubtful if it is said: This is my flesh; this thing is my body; this is my blood.¹⁹⁶

1532. Questions. Q. 1. Whether in consecration these words are to be held as essential: WHO THE DAY BEFORE, etc.; IN LIKE MANNER, etc.?

Resp. The common and most probable opinion denies, and it is proved: 1. from the Decree of Eugene IV to the Armenians, where it is said that consecration is made by no other than the words of Christ, which are only these: This is the body, etc., This is the chalice, etc.; 2. from the rubric of the Missal, which teaches that the words required by necessity of the Sacrament are the words of the form, namely This is My body, etc., This is the chalice, etc.¹⁹⁷

Q. 2. What is to be done by the celebrant if he DOES NOT REMEMBER that he has pronounced all the words of consecration?

Resp. From the rubric of the Missal these things are to be held: "If the celebrant does not remember that he has said those things which are commonly said in the consecration, he ought not therefore to be troubled. Yet if it is certain to him that he has omitted something of those things which are of the necessity of the Sacrament, let him resume the form. But if he very probably doubts that he has omitted something essential, let him repeat the form, at least under a tacit condition."¹⁹⁸

¹⁸⁹Book VI, 223.

¹⁹⁰*Exam. Ord.*, n. 100.

¹⁹¹*De defect.*, V, 1.

¹⁹²Book VI, 224.

¹⁹³Book VI, 221; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 100.

¹⁹⁴Book VI, 223, q. 4.

¹⁹⁵*Ibid.*, 221.

¹⁹⁶Thus rightly in Busembaum in his *Medulla*, editio princeps 1650, p. 591.

¹⁹⁷Book VI, 222.

¹⁹⁸*De Defect.*, tit. V, 2.

Chapter II

On the Minister of the Eucharist

The minister of the Eucharist ought to be rendered FIT for his office through the power of Order, to have jurisdiction, and to observe the order prescribed by the Church. Hence there will be a threefold article: 1. on the power of Order required in the minister; 2. on the required jurisdiction; 3. on the order to be observed.

Article I

On the Required Power of Order in the Minister

A twofold minister of the Eucharist is distinguished: the minister consecrating and the minister dispensing.

1533. Principles. I. The CONSECRATING minister of the Eucharist is only a priest rightly ordained. This is established from the words of Christ, who said only to the Apostles and to their successors in the priesthood: “Do this in commemoration of Me.”¹⁹⁹ Hence the Fourth Lateran Council²⁰⁰ defined thus: “No one can make this Sacrament of the Eucharist, except a priest who has been rightly ordained.”

It is asked: Whether SEVERAL priests can consecrate the SAME matter at the same time?

Resp. Affirmatively, if they pronounce the words of the form at the same instant. It is common. “Conversely, if one of them completes the form before the others independently of the intention of the others, he then makes the Sacrament, so that the others would afterwards complete the form in vain. Hence, new priests, who consecrate with the Bishop, first ought to take care, as far as can be done, to complete the form together with the Bishop. Moreover, they ought to have the intention of consecrating only then when at the same time with the Bishop they complete the form; indeed, beyond this, in the consecration of the chalice they should also intend not to consecrate, if perhaps they themselves have not consecrated the bread.”²⁰¹

1534. II. The ordinary minister of DISPENSING the Eucharist is the priest alone.²⁰² This is established from Trent, sess. 13, cap. 8, where it is said: “It has always been the custom in the Church of God that laymen receive Communion from priests; but that priests communicate themselves.” The theological reason also advises the same; for since consecration is ordered to distribution, it ought to belong to him to distribute, to whom it belongs to consecrate. And this the universal practice of the Church confirms.

It is asked: Whether a priest can communicate himself OUTSIDE MASS?

Resp. “It is probable that, even outside danger of death, from a grave cause, scandal being removed, it is licit for a priest to take the sacred Host from the sacrarium, or brought to him by a deacon, and give it to himself, for example if in a long illness he had not communicated for a long time. Indeed Croix, Suarez, and others say that for the cause of devotion alone a priest can always communicate himself; because, scandal being removed, there is no irreverence, nor is it forbidden anywhere, unless another priest is present.”²⁰³

1535. III. A Deacon, by force of his Ordination, is the EXTRAORDINARY minister of the Eucharist, so that the dispensation of this Sacrament can be committed to him FROM A JUST CAUSE. This is established: 1. from the practice of the first centuries, in which deacons universally ministered the Eucharist, especially the divine Blood; 2. from various Councils, for example Nicaea I general, Carthage IV, etc.²⁰⁴

We have said from a just cause; which is not only extreme necessity, as Habert and Tournely wish, but also grave or notable necessity, as if the pastor were occupied on a day of a great feast, or the number of those communicating were great. In extreme necessity, when a priest is absent, a deacon not only can, but IS HELD to minister Viaticum, even without express commission. But in other cases, if without the commission of the Bishop or pastor legitimately conceded, he dispenses the Eucharist, he sins gravely and incurs irregularity.²⁰⁵

¹⁹⁹Book VI, 231.

²⁰⁰Cap. *Firmiter*.

²⁰¹Book VI, 232.

²⁰²Ibid., 230.

²⁰³Ibid., 238.

²⁰⁴Ibid., 237.

²⁰⁵Book VI, 237, and *H. A.*, XV, 9.

Note. Grave theologians assert with Suarez, although St. Thomas dissents, that a simple CLERIC, indeed even a LAYMAN, can in a case of extreme necessity, or in time of plague, furnish Viaticum to himself or to others. The reason is that then the divine precept of communicating presses, nor is any injury done to the Sacrament if, in such necessity, the Eucharist is ministered by a layman, as formerly the usage had obtained in the primitive Church. Nor does scandal obstruct; for such scandal or wonder can be forestalled if those standing by are admonished that this is permitted in such necessity. But neither can contrary custom be objected; since this case happens very rarely, this contrary custom cannot be proved.²⁰⁶

Article II

On the Required Jurisdiction

1536. Principles. I. ORDINARY jurisdiction of dispensing the Eucharist belongs only to pastors of souls, namely to Bishops in their diocese, pastors in their parish, regular Prelates in their Religion. The reason is that it is proper to pastors to feed, which is done chiefly through the Sacraments.²⁰⁷ Hence, he who dispenses the Eucharist without due permission sins mortally, because he injures the jurisdiction of the legitimate pastor in a grave matter; unless he can reasonably presume his consent.²⁰⁸ Wherefore this must be noted: if faculty of celebrating is conceded to someone, by that very fact faculty of ministering the Eucharist is also conceded: for thus common usage bears. But indeed, the consent of the pastor is not easily to be presumed if Communion to be received from obligation is in question.²⁰⁹

Moreover, in a case of necessity, namely “if a sick person is to be fortified with sacred Viaticum, and his proper pastor is absent, or being present cannot carry the Eucharist; any other priest, whether regular or secular, and this one lacking, even a deacon, can confer it on him; because then the will of the Bishop or Pope is presumed, even if the pastor refuses, but unjustly.”²¹⁰

1537. II. From privilege, REGULARS can in their churches, by themselves or by other priests celebrating there, dispense Communion to any of Christ’s faithful, excepting only Easter Communion and Viaticum.²¹¹ Concerning this, these things have been established:

1. Regulars are prohibited on Easter day²¹² and in some places, for example Rome, also on Thursday in the Supper of the Lord, to dispense Communion to the faithful in their churches, excepting only those to whom it has been conceded to satisfy the Easter precept in these churches (cf. n. 1571). But if in some place contrary custom has been introduced, they can, on Easter day, offer Communion to all the faithful, since custom furnishes jurisdiction.²¹³
2. Regulars cannot minister Viaticum except to those who enjoy the privilege of exemption: such are Religious both professed and novices; likewise servants of monasteries, “who actually serve, reside within their enclosures and houses, and live under their obedience.”²¹⁴ “But Religious presuming to minister the Sacrament of the Eucharist by way of Viaticum to clerics or laymen, outside a case of necessity, without the permission of the pastor,” incur excommunication reserved to the Pope (cf. n. 1341).²¹⁵

1538. Questions. Q. 1. Whether it is licit for Regulars to carry the Eucharist to the sick, for Communion from DEVOTION?

Resp. “Never, without the permission of the Bishop or pastor, is it licit for Religious publicly to carry the Eucharist through streets, since this derogates from the right of pastors obtained by custom.” But indeed, on the occasion of a Mass which the Religious legitimately celebrates in the house of the sick person, he can licitly offer Communion to him.²¹⁶

Q. 2. What, for the minister, is the OBLIGATION of ministering the Eucharist?

Resp. Pastors of souls and their coadjutors, or others delegated by them, are held, from justice, to minister Communion not only to the dying, but also to the healthy, whenever they have been reasonably and opportunely required.²¹⁷ When

²⁰⁶Book VI, 237, qq. 2 and 3; *H. A.*, XV, 10; cf. Laymann, *De Euch.*, c. 7, n. 3, 6.

²⁰⁷Book VI, 230.

²⁰⁸*Ibid.*, 234.

²⁰⁹*Ibid.*, 235.

²¹⁰*Ibid.*, 236.

²¹¹Book VI, 239.

²¹²*Ibid.*

²¹³*Ibid.*, 240, 5.

²¹⁴*Ibid.*, 240, 10; cf. Benedict XIV, *De Synodo*, book 7, c. 42.

²¹⁵From Const. *Apostol. Sedis*, sect. II, n. XIV.

²¹⁶Book VI, 240, 7.

²¹⁷*H. A.*, XV, 8.

the pastor is lacking, any other priest is held to this from charity, and indeed under grave obligation, if the ministering of Viaticum is in question (cf. n. 2271).

Note. Besides power and jurisdiction, the state of grace and exemption from censure are also required, as was said above (n. 1416).

Article III

On the Order to Be Observed in the Administration of the Eucharist

There are two matters concerning which one must treat here, namely: 1. concerning the manner of administering sacred Communion in general; 2. concerning the order to be observed in administering sacred Viaticum.

§ 1. On the Manner of Administering Holy Communion 1539. The prescribed order regards both the due place, and the time, and the rite; concerning this, these things are to be held:

I. With respect to place. The Most Holy Eucharist can be dispensed to the faithful in all churches or public oratories, but not in private oratories, unless by express permission of the Ordinary.²¹⁸ It can also be dispensed in a private house, if a sick person is to be communicated.

1540. II. With respect to time. The dispensation of the Most Holy Eucharist is permitted: 1. on any day whatever, except in time of local Interdict (cf. n. 1308, 2), and, unless Viaticum is in question, in the time from the reposition of the Most Holy Sacrament on Thursday of Greater Week until the end of the solemn Mass on Holy Saturday;²¹⁹ and also within this Mass, where custom flourishes. Thus S. R. C., September 23, 1837, in Brundusina.²²⁰

2. It is permitted at any hour of the day; but it is not permitted when it has now begun to grow dark or become much evening, unless a just cause is present. But at an untimely hour of night, that is, when many hours of the night have already elapsed, it is never licit, unless Viaticum must be carried in necessity.²²¹ Yet in Communities where the Most Holy Eucharist is reserved in the domestic chapel, it can be ministered even during the time of night, when a just cause is present, for example if some sick person cannot prolong the fast.

It is asked: Whether it is licit to dispense Communion in the Mass of the Nativity of the Lord which is celebrated AT MIDNIGHT?

Resp. Negatively, unless from special privilege.²²² This was conceded to some Bishops of France under this law, that no danger of scandal be present.²²³

1541. III. With respect to rite: 1. Communion, as far as can be done, is to be offered within Mass, namely after the Communion of the celebrant himself. The Roman Ritual brings forward the reason for this matter, saying: "since the prayers which are said after Communion look not only to the priest, but also to the others communicating."²²⁴ Moreover, from a reasonable cause, it is to be offered also outside Mass, for example if those about to receive Holy Communion cannot conveniently wait, or if many are to communicate, lest those who do not communicate be affected by weariness. And in many places the usage has already prevailed of ministering Communion indifferently either within or outside Mass.²²⁵

2. A priest about to minister the Most Holy Eucharist should be vested in sacred vestments, namely outside Mass in surplice, or alb, and stole of a color suitable to the Office of that day; a deacon, if he ministers, should wear this transversely. Let candles burn, let the general confession be premised, and let the accustomed prayers be said, as is prescribed in the Ritual.

On these matters let it be noted: 1. If necessity demands it, Communion can be given by a priest vested in Mass vestments, who has celebrated or is about to celebrate Mass at another altar. Thus S. R. C., March 12, 1836, in Trident.²²⁶

²¹⁸Benedict XIV in Const. *Magno*, § 15.

²¹⁹Book VI, 252.

²²⁰Gardellini, n. 4815, ad II.

²²¹*H. A.*, XV, 17.

²²²Book VI, 252.

²²³Gury, II, 297, end.

²²⁴Cap. 2, *Ordo admin. S. Commun.*, n. 10.

²²⁵Cf. Gardellini, n. 4984 (Januen., December 7, 1844).

²²⁶Gardellini, n. 4777, ad 12.

2. In offering sacred Communion, the priest must use only the thumb and index finger; for, although the whole hand is consecrated, nevertheless the thumb and index finger alone, from the rite of the Church, are deputed for this ministry. Yet authors commonly except a case of extreme or most grave necessity²²⁷ (cf. n. 1544, q. 3 and 4).
3. If a minister serving the priest is lacking, the one about to communicate himself, if he is a man, can respond; but a woman indeed cannot do this, unless she is a nun within the cloister. Therefore let the priest supply, saying the *Confiteor*, responding Amen, etc.
4. In the Communion of Nuns, *Misereatur*, *Ecce Agnus*, etc., are to be said facing the Nuns, not facing the people. But the priest ought to descend and return by the front steps of the altar, not by the side steps.²²⁸ The practice received among Nuns of making the renewal of vows immediately before Communion is licit. S. R. C., September 12, 1857, in Taurinen.²²⁹
5. Communion is first to be ministered to the serving ministers, not by reason of preeminence, but of ministry (S. R. C., July 13, 1658).²³⁰
6. "According to the present discipline it is never licit, without dispensation of the Pontiff, even for furnishing Viaticum, to administer the Eucharist under each species, or in the species of wine alone; for the precept of Viaticum does not oblige when it cannot be received according to the rite of the Church."²³¹ It is similarly prohibited TO GIVE the one communicating several particles or one larger one: from Decree of the S. C. C., February 12, 1679.²³²
7. Communion having been given outside Mass, "the priest, having returned to the altar, will be able to say: *O sacrum convivium*, etc.; soon he says: *Domine exaudi*, etc.; *Dominus vobiscum*, etc."; then the Prayer *Deus qui nobis*, etc., with the whole conclusion. In Paschal time the prayer *Spiritus nobis*, etc., is said with the shorter conclusion. After these things, the fingers having been washed, and the sacred Ciborium having been replaced in the tabernacle, let him bless with the hand, not with the pyx, unless after Viaticum, those who have communicated, with the formula: *Benedictio Dei omnipotentis Patris*, etc. Thus from the Roman Ritual, and from the Response of the S. R. C., September 24, 1842.²³³

1542. Questions. Q. 1. What sin is it to OMIT the ceremonies prescribed in ministering Communion?

Resp. "To minister the Eucharist without light and the usual confession is commonly reputed only venial. But to minister without stole and surplice, authors commonly judge to be mortal from its kind; yet, only the stole having been omitted, it seems to several to be only venial. But to carry the Eucharist to another altar without sacred vestments, they commonly say, does not exceed venial sin."²³⁴

Q. 2. Whether Holy Communion can be given WITH BLACK VESTMENTS or in Masses of the dead?

Resp. There was formerly a great controversy concerning this matter; but at present the case is finished; for on June 27, 1868, a general Decree was issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and confirmed by Pius IX on July 23, by which it was declared: "That in Masses of the dead, with black vestments, sacred Communion can be ministered to the faithful, even from preconsecrated particles, by drawing the pyx from the tabernacle. Likewise, Communion can be ministered in black vestments immediately after a Mass of the dead; and, a reasonable cause having been given, immediately also before the same Mass; yet in each case the blessing is to be omitted. But Masses of the dead are altogether to be celebrated in black vestments; so that violet ones cannot be employed, except in the case in which, on November 2, the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist is publicly exposed to the adoration of the faithful for the solemn Prayer of Forty Hours, as was provided in the Decree of this Sacred Congregation on September 16, 1801."²³⁵

Q. 3. What is to be done if SACRED PARTICLES for the Communion of the people are not found in sufficient number?

Resp. Let the custom be observed of dividing consecrated particles into smaller parts;²³⁶ yet not so small that they cannot

²²⁷Book VI, 244.

²²⁸H. A., XV, n. 88, end.

²²⁹Gardellini, n. 5252, ad 19.

²³⁰Ibid., n. 1907.

²³¹H. A., XV, 14.

²³²Cf. *Analecta*, series 7, p. 829.

²³³Gardellini, n. 4947; cf. Schober, p. 119.

²³⁴Book VI, 241.

²³⁵Gardellini, n. 5403; *ibid.*, n. 4477.

²³⁶S. R. C., March 16, 1833, in Veronen. (Gardellini, n. 4707).

be given honorably.²³⁷

Q. 4. What is to be done in the case in which a host FALLS?

Resp. "First the place is to be covered, and afterwards washed, as the Rubrics prescribe; yet these do not oblige under grave obligation, and thus ordinarily the washing of a garment or beard can be omitted, to avoid disturbance of the people. But the place where the species of wine fall must always be washed, since they are imbibed, even if there is no need to burn them. If the host falls upon the breasts of a woman, the priest himself must not remove it, but the woman herself should draw it away with the hand and replace it in the ciborium."²³⁸ Likewise, if it falls within the cloister of Nuns. But the fingers of the woman should be washed, and the ablution thrown into the sacrarium. If the woman cannot easily take the host there, let her withdraw separately, for example into some chapel, or into the sacristy, etc.²³⁹

Q. 5. What is to be done if FRAGMENTS of hosts are found?

Resp. The Rubric of the Missal responds to this question in this manner: "If he notices after the consumption of the Body and Blood, or even after the ablution, that some consecrated relics have been left, let him consume them, whether they are small or large, because they pertain to the same Sacrifice." And this not only immediately after Mass, as is common, but also if the priest is in the sacristy, yet still clothed in the sacred vestments. It was said, still clothed; for if the priest has now taken off the sacred vestments, then the relics either are to be replaced in the tabernacle, if it is present, or are to be reserved for another priest about to celebrate on the same morning; otherwise, they are to be consumed by the same one who celebrated.²⁴⁰

But if those fragments are relics of another Sacrifice, it is not licit to consume them, unless danger of irreverence is present; because the Rubric permits a priest who is not fasting only to consume relics which pertain to the same Sacrifice, since they complete it.²⁴¹

Q. 6. What if an entire PARTICLE is found?

Resp. "But if an entire consecrated host has been left, he [the priest] should replace it in the tabernacle with the others; if this cannot be done, he should leave it, decently covered on the altar upon the corporal, for the following priest about to celebrate there, to be consumed together with the other which he is about to consecrate; or if neither of these things can be done, he should preserve it decently in the chalice itself or on the paten, until either it is replaced in the tabernacle, or consumed by another; but if he has no way in which it can be preserved honorably, he himself can consume it."²⁴² Particles found outside the corporal, in doubt whether they are consecrated, are to be consumed after the ablution, and better with the same ablution.²⁴³

Note. If a layman finds a particle or fragment of a host, let him warn a priest as soon as possible, who will act according to the things said above. But if a priest cannot be had, let the fragment be reverently collected by the layman himself in paper or a clean linen cloth, by means of a small pin, and be placed within a corporal or in a decent vessel, until a priest arrives.²⁴⁴

§ 2. On the Order to Be Observed in Administering Sacred Viaticum 1543. From the ROMAN RITUAL we note the following:

1. With respect to the obligation of ministering. "1. Viaticum of the most sacred Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ is to be procured for the sick at the opportune time with the highest zeal and diligence, lest perhaps it happen that they die deprived of so great a good by the negligence of the pastor... 2. Let the pastor exhort the sick person that he receive Holy Communion, even if he is not gravely sick, or danger of death is not imminent, especially if the solemnity of some feast suggests this, nor will he himself refuse to minister it... 3. But he will minister it as Viaticum when it is probable that he will not be able to receive it any more... 4. But let it not be carried to someone only for adoration, or for showing it, under the pretext of devotion or of any matter." Thus the Ritual.

²³⁷Book VI, 245.

²³⁸Ibid., 250.

²³⁹Gury, II, 296, end.

²⁴⁰Book VI, 251.

²⁴¹Ibid.

²⁴²Rubric, *De defect.*, VII, 3.

²⁴³Book VI, 251, end; and *H. A.*, XV, 18.

²⁴⁴Gury, II, 312.

2. With respect to the manner of carrying it. Let the pastor warn beforehand that in the room of the sick person all things be rightly arranged according to the prescriptions of the Ritual. Let lights be prepared, and a small vessel with water, with which the fingers are to be washed. Besides, let a clean linen cloth be placed before the breast of the one communicating, and other things for the adornment of the place, according to the ability of each.

Moreover, the Most Holy Eucharist is to be carried from the church to the private houses of the sick, in decent habit, with a clean veil laid over it, manifestly and honorably before the breast, with all reverence and fear, always with a light preceding. But the priest, clothed in surplice and stole of white color, and having first placed a decent oblong veil from each shoulder, should take the vessel with the Sacrament with both hands, and then go beneath the baldachin or umbrella, if it can be had, and proceed with uncovered head. Going, he says the *Miserere*, and other Psalms and Canticles; returning, *Laudate Dominum de coelis*, and other Psalms and Hymns; but these are only by way of counsel.

3. With respect to the rite of ministering. Let the prayers be recited, and let the rest be observed, as is prescribed in the Roman Ritual. According to the diversity of circumstances, let the return be solemn or private.

1544. Questions. Q. 1. Whether sometimes the Eucharist can be carried SECRETLY to the sick?

Resp. With the license of the Bishop this is licit in places of heretics, and also of Catholics, if it cannot be carried otherwise without proximate danger of irreverence.²⁴⁵ Concerning the manner of carrying the Eucharist secretly, these things are had in the Supplement to the Roman Ritual: "Where the force and wickedness of the Turks prevails, let the priest always have the stole covered by his own garments; let him hide the pyx in a small sack or burse, which, hung from his neck by little cords, he should place in his bosom; and let him never proceed alone, but let him be accompanied by at least one faithful person, in defect of a cleric." - From the Constitution of Benedict XIV, *Inter omnigenas*, § 25.

Q. 2. Whether it is licit for a priest carrying the Eucharist, in a case of NECESSITY, to run, ride, or proceed with covered head?

Resp. 1. To run in necessity probably is not against the reverence due; whence, when necessity urges, it will be licit.²⁴⁶ 2. It is licit to ride on a gentle horse, so that there is no danger of falling, if indeed a longer or more difficult journey must be undertaken; but it is never licit to give the pyx to be carried to a layman, however tired the priest may be, in which case the burse should rather be suspended from the neck.²⁴⁷ 3. It is licit sometimes, from Apostolic Indult, to go with covered head, nor is this conceded with great difficulty, on account of weather or infirmity; wherefore, when necessity urges, it could even be presumed. The Bishop can also probably dispense that Viaticum be carried with a hat on the head, when one must proceed for a long time through villas and villages.²⁴⁸

Q. 3. Whether it is licit, in a case of necessity, to minister Viaticum without LIGHT and SACRED VESTMENTS?

Resp. Affirmatively, according to the more common and sufficiently probable opinion. "The reason is that it is not reasonably presumed that Christ, who instituted this Sacrament for the help of souls, and the Church, which is a kindly mother, wished the dying to be deprived of so great a good, lest the prescribed ceremonies be omitted."²⁴⁹

Q. 4. Whether it is licit, in time of plague, to offer the Eucharist with some INSTRUMENT?

Resp. Affirmatively and probably, for example with the particle placed in a spoon, as far as can be done, of silver, with wine or water; for necessity seems a sufficient cause why it is licit to depart from the usual rite of the Church. And similarly it can be offered with a spoon to a sick person who, because of dryness of mouth, would be unable to swallow the host.²⁵⁰

Q. 5. Whether a priest ministering Viaticum can sometimes omit those words prescribed in the Ritual, RECEIVE VIATICUM, etc., substituting the common formula: THE BODY OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, etc.?

Resp. Affirmatively and probably, in the case in which the sick person is judged likely to receive Viaticum with great sadness of soul; for the precept of pronouncing those words induces only a light obligation, from which any just cause well excuses, such as excessive disturbance of the sick person.²⁵¹

Q. 6. What is to be done if the sick person VOMITS the host received?

²⁴⁵Gousset, *De Euch.*, 210.

²⁴⁶Book VI, 242.

²⁴⁷Book VI, 243.

²⁴⁸*Ibid.*, 241, end; *H. A.*, XV, 12.

²⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 241.

²⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 244; *H. A.*, XV, 12.

²⁵¹*H. A.*, XV, 50; Book VI, 285, doubt 4.

Resp. If the sacred species appear, they must be carefully collected in a clean vessel, carried to the church, and kept in a safe and well-closed place, until they are altogether corrupted, so that they can be cast into the sacrarium without irreverence. - If they cannot be discerned, as being altogether mixed with filth, the mouth of the sick person is indeed to be wiped; but whatever was rejected should be collected with tow; then, the tow having been burned, the ashes are to be cast into the sacrarium.²⁵²

Chapter III

On the Subject of the Eucharist

In this chapter four things come to be weighed: 1. Who can receive the Most Holy Eucharist? 2. What dispositions are required for this? 3. What and how great is the obligation of receiving the Eucharist? 4. What is to be thought concerning frequent Communion?

Article I

On Those Who Can Receive the Most Holy Eucharist

1545. Principles. I. The CAPABLE subject of receiving the Eucharist with fruit is every baptized human being, provided that through mortal sin he does not place an obstacle to grace. - For it was instituted for all Christians; therefore it can profit all rightly disposed persons, according to the words of Christ (John 6:55): "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life."

II. From the present discipline of the Church, the Eucharist OUGHT NOT to be conceded to those who cannot discern this heavenly food from profane food. This is universal practice, and it is clear from the Roman Ritual.

Hence: 1. Baptized children, still lacking the use of reason, although in the reception of the Sacrament they would truly receive an increase of grace, nevertheless, on account of greater reverence, are prohibited from its reception, even at the article of death.²⁵³

2. It is likewise altogether to be denied to those perpetually insane. But to other insane persons, who have not always lacked the use of reason and have lived piously, it is to be given IN THE ARTICLE OF DEATH, unless danger of vomiting or spitting out is present. Thus St. Thomas and the Roman Catechism with the Council of Carthage.²⁵⁴ "The reason is that, on the one hand, such a one is presumed interpretatively to ask Communion; on the other, the Eucharist can still be necessary for him, namely if he fell into insanity while existing in mortal sin, concerning which he had only attrition. Yet the Doctors except if it is certainly presumed that such a one fell into insanity altogether impenitent." - To these same persons, OUTSIDE THE ARTICLE OF DEATH, it is not licit to give Communion. "Yet it will be licit to do so, likewise to the frenzied, if at some time they have lucid intervals and show devotion, while they remain in that state, if no danger of indignity is present." Thus the Roman Ritual.²⁵⁵

1546. Questions. Q. 1. Whether the Eucharist is to be conceded to the half-witted, deaf-mutes, epileptics, and those possessed?

Resp. 1. To the HALF-WITTED, provided they are able to discern this heavenly food from profane food, Communion is to be given, in the article of death and at the time of precept; indeed even more frequently, if they possess greater discretion. - The same applies to OLD PEOPLE who, as is said, become children again.

2. To DEAF-MUTES from birth, according to the same norm, Communion is to be given, provided it is clear from signs that they have discretion. But from present-day experiments it is clear that deaf-mutes not instructed according to more recent methods can scarcely have knowledge of religion and of the mysteries. - But those who have been instructed in present-day institutes can communicate no otherwise than other faithful. - On the contrary, to those mute, deaf, and at the same time blind from birth, Communion is altogether to be denied.

3. To EPILEPTICS Communion is to be denied only during the paroxysm.

²⁵²Gousset, II, 232; cf. Haine, t. II, q. 42, concerning sacrilegious persons.

²⁵³Book VI, 301.

²⁵⁴Ibid., 302; H. A., XII, 44.

²⁵⁵*De Euch.*, cap. I, n. 10, typical edition.

4. To those POSSESSED BY A DEMON it is likewise to be denied when they are not masters of themselves. - For the rest, authors rightly say that it is to be conceded to them several times in the year, according to the prudence of the confessor, since the Eucharist is a special remedy for driving away demons.²⁵⁶

Q. 2. Whether Holy Communion is to be conceded to those CONDEMNED TO DEATH?

Resp. Affirmatively, provided through sacramental confession they are disposed for it; for, from the prescription of the Council of Nicaea, the Eucharist is to be given to all who have come to the end of life. Indeed, the guilty person can communicate, not fasting, after the manner of Viaticum, because then he is truly in the article of death. And St. Alphonsus adds: he can laudably communicate on the very day of death, provided Communion precedes the execution by an hour²⁵⁷ (cf. n. 731).

NB. Who are to be kept from Holy Communion as unworthy, see n. 1426 and 1427 seq.

Article II

On the Dispositions Required for Receiving the Most Holy Eucharist

For receiving the Eucharist, certain dispositions are required, both on the part of the soul and on the part of the body.

§ 1. On the Dispositions Required on the Part of the Soul 1547. A) In one receiving the Most Holy Eucharist, besides faith and immunity from censures, there is required first of all the STATE OF GRACE; both because the Eucharist is a Sacrament of the living, which presupposes first grace in the subject, and because it is spiritual food, which cannot profit one spiritually dead.

The TRIDENTINE SYNOD speaks aptly to the matter:²⁵⁸ "If it is not fitting," it says, "for anyone to approach any sacred functions unless holily, certainly the more the holiness and divinity of this heavenly Sacrament is known to a Christian man, the more diligently he ought to beware lest he approach to receive it without great reverence and holiness, especially since we read those words full of fear in the Apostle: He who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord. Wherefore, to one wishing to communicate, that precept must be recalled into memory: Let a man prove himself. But ecclesiastical custom declares that this proving is necessary, so that no one conscious to himself of mortal sin, however contrite he may seem to himself, ought to approach the Holy Eucharist without previous sacramental confession; and this holy Synod has decreed that this is perpetually to be observed by all Christians, even by priests upon whom it has fallen by office to celebrate, provided they do not lack the opportunity of a confessor: but if, necessity urging, a priest has celebrated without previous confession, let him confess as soon as possible."

But indeed these prescriptions of Trent ask for a fuller explanation for themselves. Whence let there be the following:

1548. Principles. I. No one conscious to himself of mortal sin, however contrite he may seem to himself, can approach the Holy Eucharist WITHOUT PREVIOUS SACRAMENTAL CONFESSION. For the Apostle says: "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread." But it is clear, from ecclesiastical custom, that confession itself is that necessary proving.²⁵⁹

There are indeed some, but these are few, who say that this precept is only ecclesiastical; but "the common and true opinion teaches that this PRECEPT is DIVINE. The reason is that, on the one hand, it is clear that from the precept of Christ proving must be premised, since the Apostle testifies that he received it from the Lord; on the other hand, from Trent it is clearly evident that this required proving is confession...; for the Council did not say that this precept of confession had been introduced by ecclesiastical custom, but that by it such a precept had been declared; whence confession is commanded from divine precept. - Nor is it opposed to this that it is called a precept of the Apostle, because in reality it is a precept of Christ promulgated through the Apostle."²⁶⁰

It is said 1. of mortal sin, because venial sins, however many they are, just as they do not deprive one of divine grace, so neither do they prohibit someone from approaching the sacred Table.²⁶¹

²⁵⁶Book VI, 303.

²⁵⁷Ibid., 247; Book III, 379; cf. *Collect. S. Sedis*, n. 363.

²⁵⁸Sess. 13, cap. 7 and can. 11.

²⁵⁹H. A., XV, 22.

²⁶⁰Book VI, 256.

²⁶¹H. A., XV, 23.

It is said 2. conscious to himself, that is, morally certain concerning a grave sin committed, which has not been remitted through the Sacrament of Penance. - But in doubt whether it has been committed, St. Alphonsus teaches that the following distinction must be made: "If someone doubts whether he has sinned gravely or not, then he can licitly approach Communion without previous confession, whether the doubt is negative or positive, it sufficing for him, that he may more safely receive the fruit of the Sacrament, to premise contrition...; because the precept of prohibition does not begin to possess, except after the man is conscious of his sin. On the contrary, if someone is certain concerning a sin committed, then he cannot communicate unless he is certain that he has been proved through confession; because then the precept of prohibition certainly possesses in him."²⁶²

1549. It is asked: Whether if someone after confession REMEMBERS some mortal sin inculpably forgotten, he is held to confess it before Communion?

Resp. It is controverted. The first opinion, most common among authors, affirms, because this seems more conformable to the words of Trent. "But the second opinion denies.... and, the intrinsic foundation having been considered, it seems altogether consonant with reason, and it seems very probable to others. The reason is that he who premised confession to Communion has already fulfilled the precept of confession, by force of which the forgotten sin has already been indirectly remitted, and the penitent already exists as proved.... For in Trent only this is prescribed, that the penitent approach Communion justified not by contrition alone, but also through confession; but here he has already been justified also through confession, and therefore is not held at once before Communion to confess again. But the practice of the faithful which is opposed is not to be held as a certain rule of obligation, but rather as a pious and laudable usage, which, for the rest, is to be counseled to all as often as some cause in opposition does not suggest something else."²⁶³

But neither is such a faithful person, according to the common opinion, held to elicit an act of contrition. For since he has been justified, no foundation appears from which contrition is required; not from precept, because this is nowhere found prescribed; not for deleting the sin, because this has already been deleted through the confession previously made.²⁶⁴

1550. II. It is licit to receive the Eucharist, with contrition alone premised without confession, when there is present a NECESSITY of celebrating or communicating, and OPPORTUNITY OF A CONFESSOR is lacking. Thus Trent, and the reason is that a positive precept does not oblige with so great an inconvenience.

It is said 1. WHEN NECESSITY IS PRESENT; but by necessity is not understood great devotion, nor the poverty of the priest, unless the poverty were very grave; but urgent necessity is understood. Hence:

1. Danger of death excuses, namely when a host is to be consecrated for one dying; likewise, danger of infamy or scandal, for example if someone were already found at the rail of those communicating, and could not depart without being noticed by others. The same must be said if, Viaticum having been brought to the sick person, confession, because of shortness of time, could not be completed without danger of death or infamy. In which case the priest, having heard some sin, ought to absolve the dying person and offer him Communion, with the obligation imposed on him of completing confession if he recovers. Yet here it must be carefully noticed that scandal is then said to occur when occasion is given for detracting or rashly judging, but not when only occasion for wonder is given.
2. The obligation from office of celebrating excuses, so that the people may hear Mass, provided there is not another who may celebrate. - But one who is not held from office to provide that the people be present at Mass cannot celebrate, even if he himself or the people, on a feast day, would have to lack Mass. For the precept of confessing, which is divine, is to be preferred to the ecclesiastical precept of hearing Mass. But whether, opportunity of a confessor being lacking, someone can communicate with contrition alone, so that he may satisfy the Paschal precept, is controverted: very commonly they affirm, from the fact that the Paschal precept is also divine; yet others deny, and say that the precept of Paschal Communion can be deferred until opportunity of a confessor is had. Each opinion is probable.
3. The necessity of completing a Sacrifice already begun excuses, for example if a priest, while celebrating, remembers a mortal sin. Yet here a distinction must be made. If he remembers the sin after consecration, the Mass is not to be interrupted so that he may confess, as St. Thomas teaches, and as is expressly had in the Rubric. But if he remembers before consecration, and especially before the Canon, he ought to confess if a confessor is present, and if he can effect this without note of infamy, for example in a solemn Mass, during the chant or during the sacred sermon. But if he cannot confess, and no danger of infamy is to be feared, he is more probably held to desist from Mass. Thus many, and this seems to be clear from the Rubric saying: "If before consecration the priest remembers that he is in

²⁶² *H. A.*, XV, 34.

²⁶³ *Book VI*, 257; *H. A.*, XV, 23.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 257, end.

mortal sin..., if scandal is not feared, he ought to abandon the Mass begun.” We have said more probably, because it is not certain whether the Rubric by the word ought imposes a grave precept. For the rest, the Doctors well notice that in such a case it can scarcely happen that the note of infamy be avoided.²⁶⁵

It is said 2. AND OPPORTUNITY OF A CONFESSOR IS LACKING; but it is judged to be lacking, not, as some wish, if that one is absent to whom he is accustomed and would desire to confess, or to whom he would confess more devoutly or usefully; but if no suitable one is present, and one absent cannot be approached without great difficulty. - Moreover, this difficulty is to be estimated by considering both the weakness, age, and occupations of the person, and other circumstances, such as weather, shortness of time, distance, etc. Regularly, a distance of two hours excuses; and a much smaller distance, if the priest would be about to celebrate shortly.²⁶⁶

1551. It is asked: Whether one who has a RESERVED sin, in defect of a confessor endowed with faculty, is held to confess to a simple confessor, that he may communicate?

Resp. 1. If he has no other sin than the reserved one, from the common opinion, he is not held; so that, necessity urging, he can communicate with contrition. - Nevertheless, if he has only attrition, he is held to confess the venial sins which he has, or a mortal sin already confessed on another occasion, so that thus, at least indirectly, he may be absolved from the reserved one. And he can do this same thing, although he has contrition, so that he may receive the Eucharist more safely (cf. n. 1283, 3).

Resp. 2. If he has reserved and non-reserved sins, we say with the most common and more probable opinion that he is held to confession. The reason is that, since the divine precept of premising confession to Communion urges, confession ought to be made at least formally entire, if it cannot be made materially entire. But, in this second case, from an opinion truly probable, by itself it suffices for the penitent that he declare the non-reserved sins. We say by itself; because by accident he is sometimes held also to declare the reserved sins, so that the confessor can rightly judge concerning the disposition, for example if he is relapsed in reserved sins, or in a proximate occasion of sinning (cf. n. 1778).

1552. III. A priest who, necessity urging, has celebrated without previous confession, is held to confess AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. It is an ecclesiastical law openly expressed in Trent.

It is said 1. A priest; for, from the most common and more probable opinion, this precept of confessing as soon as possible does not oblige laymen. The reason is both that the Council names priests alone, and that the same reason does not run for laymen as for priests. For in priests the necessity of communicating without confession occurs more easily, and therefore they themselves would more easily, under the pretext of this necessity, celebrate with confession omitted.²⁶⁷

It is said 2. is held; because Trent does not express counsel, but precept. This is evident from proposition 38 condemned by Alexander VII, which sounds thus: “The mandate of Trent made to a priest sacrificing from necessity with mortal sin, of confessing as soon as possible, is counsel, not precept.” - But whether this precept obliges a priest who remembers the sin after consecration is controverted. Others deny, because the Rubric, speaking of him, says only: let him be contrite with the purpose of confessing. “This opinion does not seem improbable, but the contrary is more common and perhaps more probable, because then the case supposed by the Council is already verified, namely that he now celebrates in sin and without confession; so much the more because in that phrase of the Rubric, of confessing, the word as soon as possible is easily understood, already expressed by the Rubric a little before.”²⁶⁸

It is said 3. as soon as possible, that is, within three days, according to the common interpretation of authors. For in ecclesiastical laws that phrase as soon as possible, or another similar word, must be understood morally, and therefore, as they commonly teach, it is extended to the space of three days. “Yet the authors notice that it can happen that a priest, by accident, is held from this precept to confess on the same day, and perhaps in the same hour, for example if he then had a confessor, whom he will afterwards lack for several days, or if tomorrow the same necessity of celebrating would urge, and he could not confess.”²⁶⁹

1553. It is asked: Whether a priest is held to confess as soon as possible if, confession having been omitted, he celebrated SACRILEGIOUSLY?

Resp. Distinguish. 1. If without necessity, or with opportunity of a confessor given, he celebrated, the most common and truer opinion denies that he is held. The reason is that the precept of Trent is ordained toward instilling fear in those who,

²⁶⁵Book VI, 259-263; *H. A.*, XV, 24, 25.

²⁶⁶Book VI, 264; *H. A.*, XV, 26.

²⁶⁷Book VI, 268; *H. A.*, XV, 33.

²⁶⁸*H. A.*, XV, 31.

²⁶⁹Book VI, 266, q. 4, end.

under the pretext of necessity, defer confession; but not in those celebrating sacrilegiously, for whom this precept would very rarely be profitable. For those who, with the divine precept contemned, dare knowingly to celebrate in sin, will more easily condemn an ecclesiastical precept.

2. But if, necessity urging and opportunity of a confessor lacking, he celebrated not contrite, he is indeed held to confess as soon as possible; because the precept of Trent does not distinguish between a priest having or not having contrition, but speaks of any priest whatever celebrating from necessity.²⁷⁰

1554. B) Besides the state of grace, which is altogether necessary, there is required in one receiving the Holy Eucharist IMMUNITY FROM VENIAL SINS, and ACTUAL DEVOTION, namely so that a richer harvest of graces may be gathered from the reception of the Sacrament. - For the purer the soul is, the more closely it is joined with the Lord, who is Purity itself; and the greater devotion with which it is borne toward Him, the more lovingly it is treated by the Lover of souls and heaped with richer graces.

Moreover, that actual devotion is best promoted through acts of living faith, sincere humility, ardent desire, and burning charity.

And this is why the people are often to be admonished “with what PREPARATION, and with how great religion and piety of soul, and also humble bearing of body, they ought to approach so divine a Sacrament. Moreover, those communicating are to be warned that, the Sacrament having been received, they should not immediately depart from the church, or converse, or at once look around with wandering eyes...; but, with the devotion that is fitting, they should remain for some time in prayer, GIVING THANKS TO GOD for so singular a benefit, and also for the most holy Passion of the Lord, in memory of which this mystery is celebrated and received.”²⁷¹

1555. Questions. Q. 1. Whether to approach the Eucharist WITH VENIAL SIN is a new venial sin?

Resp. 1. To approach with habitual venial sin probably is not a new sin. “The reason is both that it would rather be a defect of perfect reverence than a positive irreverence; and because the very will of receiving the Eucharist and its effect is a certain virtual detestation of venial sins, by which faults are removed, so that they by no means impede the fruit of the Sacrament.”²⁷²

Resp. 2. To approach with an actual concomitant venial sin, for example because of vainglory, or with a purpose of lying afterwards, is a sin; because such a communicating person inflicts a positive injury on the Sacrament. Thus commonly and more truly, against some.²⁷³

Q. 2. Whether an actual venial sin IMPEDES the fruit of the Sacrament?

Resp. From the far more common opinion, it does not impede the principal effect, namely an increase of habitual grace; although it impedes some fruits, for example fervor of charity, and from this it is why several priests are observed who celebrate daily in grace, and nevertheless profit nothing. The reason is that venial sin does not fight with habitual grace, nor with any increase whatever of it, and therefore does not impede it (cf. n. 1548).

Q. 3. When does the Eucharist produce its effects in one receiving it who is rightly disposed?

Resp. 1. Grace is given in the very act of eating, namely when passage is made from the mouth into the stomach. Whence “the species are not to be retained in the mouth so long until they entirely perish; because then Christ would not be eaten, nor would the grace of the Sacrament be conferred”; just as it is not conferred if someone dies while he retains the host in his mouth.²⁷⁴

Resp. 2. It is very probable that, if the disposition of the subject becomes better, grace is always increased as long as the sacramental species endure in the stomach. “The reason is that this Sacrament was instituted after the manner of food; whence, just as food nourishes the body during the whole time in which it remains in the stomach, so likewise, whenever the Eucharist remains in the body, it nourishes the soul by increasing grace.”²⁷⁵

Q. 4. What if a PRIEST should dispose himself during the consumption?

²⁷⁰Ibid., 266, q. 5.

²⁷¹Roman Ritual, *De SS. Euch.*, c. I, n. 3, 4.

²⁷²Book VI, 270, q. 1.

²⁷³Ibid., q. 2.

²⁷⁴Ibid., 226.

²⁷⁵Book VI, 228; *H. A.*, XV, 6.

Resp. "If someone had consumed part of the wine or host while indisposed, and then disposed himself, he would still receive grace in the consumption of the other part; because even then the Eucharist has the power of conferring grace *ex opere operato*. Some also probably say that this would happen if he disposed himself before the species are consumed in the stomach."²⁷⁶

§ 2. On the Dispositions on the Part of the Body On the part of the body, two things are required: 1. fasting; 2. cleanliness and decent habit.

1. Fasting First we shall speak concerning the obligation of fasting, then concerning the causes excusing from it.

I. On the Obligation of Fasting 1556. Principles. I. For the licit consumption of the Eucharist NATURAL FASTING is required, namely that the one about to communicate has consumed nothing of food or drink from midnight. - This is clear both from universal custom, which has constantly flourished from the time of the Apostles to the present, and from various Councils, especially from Constance.²⁷⁷ But this precept was sanctioned on account of the reverence due to the Sacrament, and on account of its signification, "namely that it may be given to be understood that Christ, who is the reality of this Sacrament, and His charity ought first to be founded in our hearts."²⁷⁸

But although this precept is not of divine law, but only of ecclesiastical law, nevertheless it does not admit smallness of matter: "because the precept is not now of approaching the Eucharist fasting, but of not approaching after food or drink; but he who communicates after any very small part whatever already communicates after food or drink. Thus all."²⁷⁹

1557. II. For breaking the natural fast THREE things are required: 1. that what is consumed come from outside; 2. that it have the nature of food or drink; 3. that it be consumed after the manner of eating or drinking. - Thus authors commonly.²⁸⁰

It is required 1. That what is consumed come from outside; for, as St. Thomas observes, what comes from within is not eaten, and therefore does not harm the natural fast. - Hence, he can communicate who has swallowed saliva, or phlegm, or blood flowing from the interior head or gums, even if he has swallowed it purposely. - But indeed he cannot communicate who at night placed sugar in his mouth, and after midnight swallowed some; nor he who swallowed blood flowing from the fingers, or tears flowing from the eyes; nor he who, having fallen or been thrown into a river, swallowed water.²⁸¹

It is required 2. That it have the nature of food or drink; for according to the more common and more probable opinion, only digestible things break the fast, but not indigestible things. Hence: hair, metals, crystal, nails, silk or woolen threads, little fruit-stones altogether cleaned, because they are not digested, do not have the nature of food. - The contrary must be said of paper, straw, linen threads, medicinal powder, wax, earth or chalk, etc., which, altered in the stomach, can be converted into the substance of a human being.²⁸²

It is required 3. That it be consumed after the manner of eating or drinking. Therefore every digestible thing which is deliberately transmitted into the stomach breaks the fast, although it is transmitted in an unaccustomed manner, for example through the nostrils; because such an action is morally equivalent to drinking or eating. But that which is drawn in unintentionally, after the manner of breathing or saliva, does not break the fast. - Hence, the fast is not broken if someone, breathing, accidentally draws in flies, water, snow, etc.; but it is broken if someone draws in such things purposely. Likewise, it is not broken by tobacco taken through the nostrils, nor by the smoke of tobacco, or by juice of camphor, nor by tobacco rubbed with the teeth; provided the juice is spat out, and if anything is swallowed beyond intention, it is mixed with saliva and passes as such, not as food. But although chewing of this kind does not impede Communion, nevertheless it is indecent, nor is it easily excused from venial sin.²⁸³

1558. Questions. Q. 1. Whether to swallow REMAINS OF FOOD left in the mouth, or DROPS OF WATER mixed with saliva, breaks the fast?

²⁷⁶Ibid., 227.

²⁷⁷Sess. 13, § *In nomine sanctae*, etc.; Book VI, 278.

²⁷⁸St. Thomas, 3 p., q. 80, a. 8.

²⁷⁹Book VI, 278.

²⁸⁰Book VI, 278.

²⁸¹Ibid., 279; *H. A.*, XV, 35-37.

²⁸²Ibid., 281; *ibid.*, 42, 43.

²⁸³Ibid., 280; *H. A.*, *ibid.*, 38-41.

Resp. The first opinion, not improbable, denies simply, whether this happens accidentally or purposely. The reason is both that the passing down of such remains is not to be regarded as a new eating, but as part of the preceding eating; and because they are consumed not after the manner of food, but after the manner of saliva. And the Rubric of the Missal indeed seems to favor this opinion. But the second opinion, more common and more probable, says that the fast is broken if they are swallowed purposely, but not if accidentally. The reason is that the passing down of remains of this kind, when it happens by design, seems to be a new eating. Yet no obligation is given of applying diligence to extracting those remains from the teeth; “for otherwise this obligation would be liable to innumerable scruples and perplexities, to which certainly the Church is not presumed to have wished to oblige.”²⁸⁴ Hence also the fast is not broken, according to the Rubric, “if, in washing the mouth, a drop of water is swallowed beyond intention”; provided it does not pass down in a great quantity, but mixed with saliva, which cannot be avoided. And the same must be said of the remains of wine, or of broth, which someone has tasted.²⁸⁵

Q. 2. Whether it is licit, immediately after the Eucharist has been received, to consume an ABLUTION, by which the particle may be swallowed more easily?

Resp. Affirmatively, where such a custom flourishes, or necessity requires it, for example if someone suffers extreme dryness of mouth. But in this case, “although the ablution is swallowed before the host or fragments of the host, nevertheless this does not obstruct the fast. The reason is that the violation is not judged morally to have preceded Communion; for the precept of the fast is that nothing be consumed before the reception of the Eucharist; but when the Eucharist is consumed together at the same time with the ablution, then that whole thing from the ablution and particles is consumed by one single consumption; whence it is well verified that the violation of the fast did not precede Communion.”²⁸⁶

Q. 3. Whether one who dined before midnight can communicate A LITTLE AFTER, and while the food has not yet been digested?

Resp. This is not prohibited by reason of the fast, since this is truly observed; wherefore, a just cause being present, it can be done.²⁸⁷

Q. 4. How is the time of MIDNIGHT to be computed?

Resp. It is to be computed physically, not morally. Now, at the first stroke of the hour, midnight is completed; wherefore he cannot communicate who swallows food after the first stroke, but before the last.²⁸⁸ But the time is rightly determined from public clocks; for, in designating time, the Church follows that rule which publicly directs all human business in individual places.²⁸⁹ Yet it is licit, at one’s choice, to follow true or mean time; indeed the time of another meridian, for example of the metropolis, if the public clocks of the place mark it.²⁹⁰

Q. 5. Whether IN DOUBT whether he has broken the fast, someone can communicate?

Resp. Affirmatively. For the law of fasting is prohibitive, namely forbidding that someone communicate after food has been consumed; wherefore the fact of the broken fast must be proved, that someone may be prohibited from communicating. And as long as the breaking is not established, liberty of communicating possesses. This reason applies both for the case in which you doubt whether you consumed something of food or drink, and for the case in which, certain of the consumption, you doubt whether you consumed it after midnight (cf. n. 49, 2).

Hence the Doctors very commonly affirm that, among several discordant clocks, it is licit to follow the last, for receiving Communion; provided the error is not established, or the clock is not one of those which for the most part err, because these are presumed always to err.²⁹¹ The reason is that individual good clocks generate a probable opinion, and therefore a positive doubt.

Q. 6. Whether it is licit to eat or drink IMMEDIATELY after Communion?

Resp. Formerly fasting after Communion until Sext was prescribed; but this precept has now long since been abrogated. Nevertheless, to eat and drink without cause, while the sacred species still endure in the stomach, where they are judged

²⁸⁴Book VI, 279, doubt 1.

²⁸⁵Ibid., doubt 2.

²⁸⁶Book VI, 288, near the end.

²⁸⁷Ibid., 289, end.

²⁸⁸Ibid., 282.

²⁸⁹*Acta S. Sedis*, VII, 390; S. R. Congr., August 7, 1875 (Gardellini, n. 5622, ad IX).

²⁹⁰*Acta S. Sedis*, t. VII, p. 399; XV, p. 445.

²⁹¹Book I, 38, 39, from the sixth edition.

to endure for a quarter of an hour in priests, is not excused from venial sin. Thus commonly. It was said without cause; because any just cause excuses, for example if the sign for table were given for a Religious.²⁹²

Q. 7. Whether it is licit to SPIT OUT immediately after Communion?

Resp. "All agree that it is indeed fitting that those communicating abstain from spitting out for some interval of time, and the Ritual agrees. - Yet authors say there is no sin in spitting out after Communion, if no fragment of the host has remained in the mouth."²⁹³

II. On the Causes Excusing from the Fast 1559. The law of the Eucharistic fast, since it is positive and ecclesiastical, sometimes admits an exception, but on account of most grave causes, which can stand either on the part of the Sacrament or on the part of man. The CASES in which the Eucharist can be received by one not fasting are numbered as FOUR:

I. When the Sacrifice must be completed. This can happen in many ways, namely: 1. If the priest notices that he took water for wine, etc.; in which case he ought again to consecrate either each species, or at least the wine, as was said above (n. 1528, II).

2. If it happens that the priest fails after consecration; in which case another priest, even one not fasting, is held to complete the Sacrifice. 3. If the priest, after the consecration even of one species, remembers that he is not fasting, he is held to finish the Mass. It was said after consecration; for if he remembers before it, he is held to desist, as often as this can be done without scandal or infamy. - 4. If the priest, after the ablution has been consumed, notices some relics of the same Sacrifice, he ought to consume them, as we have said (n. 1542, q. 4).²⁹⁴

II. When grave irreverence against the Sacrament is to be avoided; for example if there is danger that the sacred Host may perish, or be corrupted, or be badly handled by infidels or heretics; because the precept of preventing such irreverence prevails over the precept of fasting, as they commonly teach. - Whence, if a priest is then absent, a layman can consume the sacred Host; indeed, in such a case, a priest can offer sacred particles to laymen who are not fasting.²⁹⁵

III. When danger of infamy or scandal is to be avoided, which would arise from the omission of Mass or Communion; for in this case the natural precept urges, which prevails over the ecclesiastical precept. Now, the case would be if a priest celebrating in public remembered before consecration that he was not fasting, and could not depart without scandal. - Similarly, if on a Sunday or feast day Mass had to be celebrated for the people, and the pastor, not fasting, had no other fasting priest to celebrate. Yet it is supposed in this last case that no one knows the pastor is not fasting; otherwise a greater scandal would arise, at least among the simple, from the celebration than from the omission of Mass.²⁹⁶

IV. When the article or danger of death is imminent, from whatever cause the danger proceeds, whether from natural illness, or from the sentence of a judge (cf. n. 1565). - It is also licit for one not fasting to celebrate in order to avoid danger of death, provided this is not demanded in contempt of the Church.²⁹⁷

And here a fifth case can be added, from a response given by the S. C. de Prop. Fide to the Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Tonkin (February 13, 1806), which has itself thus: "Salt having been tasted beforehand by catechumens in the conferral of Baptism, although the fast seems to be broken, still there is no doubt that, Baptism having been received, they can be admitted to Holy Communion, indeed must be."²⁹⁸

1560. Questions. Q. 1. Whether and HOW OFTEN in the same infirmity it is licit for a sick person not fasting to REPEAT Communion after the manner of Viaticum?

Resp. 1. "It is not doubted by the Doctors that Viaticum can be received several times, even during the same infirmity, since this Sacrament ought to be received not only for satisfaction of the precept, but also for strength against temptations, which in death are stronger and more dangerous. And this not only if a new danger supervenes, but also if the same danger

²⁹²Book VI, 283; *H. A.*, XV, 45.

²⁹³*Ibid.*, 283.

²⁹⁴Book VI, 287, 288; *H. A.*, XV, 54.

²⁹⁵*H. A.*, XV, 52.

²⁹⁶*Ibid.*, 53; Book VI, 287; cf. Croix, book VI, n. 572, where there are other similar cases.

²⁹⁷*H. A.*, XV, 55.

²⁹⁸*Collect. S. Sedis*, n. 282.

endures. Thus commonly.”²⁹⁹ And Benedict XIV³⁰⁰ exhorts Bishops that they even “decree a penalty against pastors who, when the sick devoutly ask, refuse to carry the Eucharist again and a third time on false pretexts.”

Resp. 2. The common opinion is that an interval of eight days, or even six, must be interposed between Communions. Nevertheless, others not improbably teach that Viaticum can already be repeated on the following day, in the case in which the sick person had been accustomed to frequent Communion and danger of death was imminent. Indeed several authors universally admit that Communion can be offered on any day if circumstances suggest it.³⁰¹ Thus in monasteries, and where less apparatus is required, it can more easily be conceded. - Particular statutes in this matter are also to be attended to.

Q. 2. Whether a priest can CELEBRATE not fasting, in order to minister Viaticum?

Resp. 1. Affirmatively, if the priest himself, near death, ought to celebrate in order to give himself Viaticum; for then in the same person an ecclesiastical and a divine precept concur, but the latter is to be preferred. Thus commonly.

Resp. 2. If Viaticum is to be given to another, it is controverted. The first probable opinion affirms, because the divine precept of giving and receiving Viaticum is to be preferred to the ecclesiastical precept of observing the fast. - But the second opinion, common and perhaps more probable, denies; because the precept of not celebrating after the consumption of food is also divine as to its substance, namely by reason of the reverence which is due to the Sacrament. But the precept of ministering Viaticum ceases when it cannot be ministered rightly. - Yet otherwise, if the dying person could not be fortified by the Sacrament of Penance or Extreme Unction; for the Eucharist, in this case, will be able to be a Sacrament of necessity, so that he may become contrite from attrite.³⁰²

Q. 3. Whether sometimes, OUTSIDE DANGER OF DEATH, it is licit to give Communion to a sick person not fasting, who cannot observe the fast, if indeed the illness is going to be long-lasting?

Resp. The common opinion denies, which common practice also confirms, since the Pontiff alone has power to dispense in this most grave law.³⁰³ - Hence, if such a case occurs, the Eucharist, with license of the Bishop, is to be carried at night, so that thus the sick person, immediately after midnight, can communicate fasting. But if this cannot be done, recourse must be had to the Supreme Pontiff for dispensation³⁰⁴ (cf. n. 1881, end).

2. Cleanliness and Decent Habit 1561. Principles. I. “No stain of the body BY ITSELF impedes the reception of the Eucharist, since it does little toward moral goodness or malice; yet sometimes BY ACCIDENT it can impede, on account of the effects which follow.”³⁰⁵ - For before all else it is required that one about to receive the Eucharist be immune from every venereal filth. Concerning this matter the following things are to be noted:

1. On account of voluntary pollution which occurred on the same day, even if it has been expiated through the Sacrament of Penance, one must abstain from Communion under venial sin, just as also from celebration, unless a just cause excuses, “as will seem to the prudent confessor,” as the Rubric of the Missal speaks.³⁰⁶ But on account of involuntary pollution one is not to abstain, unless perhaps from the commotion of the body disturbance of the mind still endures; for to approach with disturbance of this kind is commonly not excused from venial sin, unless some just cause is present, or unless the person strives, as much as he can, to quiet the disturbed mind, and applies diligence that he may approach devoutly, as all reasonably teach.³⁰⁷
2. The conjugal act, by itself, does not impede worthy Communion, if the debt was asked or rendered from a good end, for example for obtaining offspring, or for avoiding incontinence. But if it was rendered or asked for the sake of pleasure alone, or if disturbance remains in the mind from it, etc., one must abstain on that day under venial sin, on account of decency. Yet any reasonable cause excuses.³⁰⁸ - To a spouse asking whether he is held to render on the day of Communion, St. Alphonsus proposes this RULE: If he communicates frequently, he ought to render, lest by his devotion he burden his consort, and lest justice or charity be injured; but if he communicates only on

²⁹⁹H. A., XV, 46; Book VI, 285.

³⁰⁰*De Synodo*, book 7, c. 12, n. 5, near the end.

³⁰¹H. A., XV, 47; Book VI, 285; *Conf. dir.*, XIV, 9.

³⁰²Book VI, 286; H. A., XV, 51.

³⁰³Benedict XIV in the letter *Quadam de more*, March 24, 1756, § 4.

³⁰⁴Cf. Lugo, *De Euch.*, Disp. 15, n. 35, 64.

³⁰⁵Book VI, 271.

³⁰⁶*De defect.*, IX, 5.

³⁰⁷H. A., XV, 56.

³⁰⁸Book VI, 273.

the principal feasts, let him invite the spouse to continence, in honor of the Sacrament; if the other resists, let him render, and nevertheless communicate, provided he is otherwise disposed.³⁰⁹

3. Those having notable external uncleanness, which can easily be removed, should deservedly abstain until they have been cleaned. Yet if it is hidden, or perpetual and involuntary, as leprosy, flow of blood, scabies, it does not impede Communion. - But to a priest who is leprous, or laboring under a horrible disease, it is permitted to celebrate privately, since in the Law it is prohibited only "on account of the scandal and abomination of the people."³¹⁰

1562. II. By natural law, an EXTERIOR HABIT and COMPOSITION of the body are required, which exhibit internal reverence and devotion of the soul. - The reason is evident; for to this most august Sacrament not only internal but also external veneration is due, since Christ Himself, by means of the species, exists and is handled in it in a certain sensible manner.³¹¹

Hence: 1. Women ought to approach Holy Communion in holy adornment, redolent of modesty. If any should present themselves very indecently at the sacred Table, for example with the breast uncovered, Communion would have to be denied to them, yet with due precautions, so far as can be done, to prevent scandals.³¹² 2. It is fitting that armed persons approach with weapons laid aside. The soldiers of St. John are excepted, who bear arms as a sign of Religion to be defended.³¹³ 3. Priests communicating in the manner of laymen should communicate with a stole. Thus the Rubric, which seems to prescribe this under venial sin.³¹⁴

Article III

On the Obligation of Receiving the Eucharist

1563. Principles. I. The real reception of the Eucharist is not necessary for salvation by NECESSITY OF MEANS. - The proposition is of faith, if it concerns children; but if it concerns adults, it is common and certain. The reason is that the Eucharist by itself does not confer, but supposes first grace; but this gives a right to heavenly glory; whence one who dies with it, even without the Eucharist having been received, certainly obtains eternal salvation.

It is said real reception; because reception in desire, according to the more probable opinion, is necessary for salvation by necessity of means, both for adults and for little children. It is proved: 1. From the words of the Lord (John 6:54): "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, you will not have life in you." 2. From reason, "because the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance, which are certainly necessary by necessity of means, at least in desire, for obtaining first grace, do not confer grace except with regard to the Eucharist, as to the end of all the Sacraments.... But adults have such a desire when they receive the Sacraments of Baptism or Penance; for their will of fulfilling all precepts includes at least implicitly this precept also of the Eucharist. But little children have the desire, not from their own will, but from the implicit will of the Church, which is applied to children, just as the will of receiving Baptism is applied."³¹⁵

It is asked: Whether the Eucharist, in reality or in desire, is a necessary means FOR ADULTS for preserving spiritual life?

Resp. Some deny, "saying that other means are present for this. But more commonly and more truly others affirm with St. Thomas.³¹⁶ The reason is that just as the life of the body cannot be preserved for long without material food, so neither can the life of the soul without this spiritual food, at least in desire, and indeed explicit desire, in one who notices the necessity of this Sacrament."³¹⁷

1564. II. The consumption of the Eucharist is necessary for adult faithful by necessity of PRECEPT, both divine and ecclesiastical. The divine precept is proved from the words of Christ: "Unless you eat," etc.; but the ecclesiastical precept from the Fourth Lateran Council, whose words we shall relate below (n. 1568).

Moreover, from the DIVINE precept, we are held to receive the Eucharist not only in danger of death, but also several times in life. But how often we are held to this has not been declared by Christ the Lord, but He Himself left the matter to be

³⁰⁹Ibid., 274.

³¹⁰Book VI, 275; *H. A.*, XV, 58.

³¹¹Gury, II, 336.

³¹²*H. A.*, XV, 58.

³¹³Book VI, 275, end.

³¹⁴Ibid., 276; *H. A.*, *ibid.*, 58.

³¹⁵Ibid., 192.

³¹⁶3, q. 80, a. 11, ad 2.

³¹⁷Book VI, 193.

determined by His Church; whence each one, speaking by itself, satisfies the divine precept by satisfying the ecclesiastical precept. - We say speaking by itself; for "sometimes, by accident, a man is held from the divine precept to communicate perhaps even several times in the year, if he judged this necessary for overcoming some grave temptation. Yet Suarez says this can happen very rarely, since other remedies can suffice for this, prayers, penances, etc. But in that case in which Communion were necessary, a man, by omitting it, would not sin against its precept, but against the virtue against which he suffers temptation"³¹⁸ (cf. n. 1579, Rule I, It is said 2).

These things having been said concerning the necessity of the Eucharist in general, it remains that we treat separately of the twofold Communion which each one is held to receive, that is, concerning Communion in the article of death or Viaticum, and concerning Paschal Communion.

§ 1. On Viaticum 1565. Principles. I. The DIVINE precept of receiving the Eucharist obliges especially in the ARTICLE or in the DANGER of death. It is clear from the Council of Nicaea, can. 13, in which it is established that with those who are thought to be departing from life the ancient law is to be observed, namely that they not be deprived of the last and necessary Viaticum.³¹⁹ The reason *a priori* can easily be given, because from the institution of this Sacrament as nourishment is gathered the obligation of consuming it when it is judged necessary; but never can the necessity of this food be greater than in that article upon which eternity ultimately depends, and in which the last struggle with the enemy is imminent, for deciding the whole matter.³²⁰

"It was said in danger; because for receiving Viaticum it is not necessary nor laudable to wait for the time when no further hope of life remains; but it suffices that probable danger of death be present."³²¹

Hence: 1. "Each faithful person, in danger of life, which he foresees or deservedly fears, for example in a grave illness, before battle, or childbirth, especially a first one, before navigation, etc., is held under mortal sin to communicate."³²² Thus commonly.

2. One who did not communicate in danger of death is not afterwards held to supply. Similarly, one who after Viaticum has been consumed sinned mortally is not held to communicate again; confession alone then suffices.³²³

1566. II. Sick persons who CANNOT receive it with due reverence are excepted from the law of Viaticum. The Ritual also admonishes: "It must diligently be cared for that Viaticum not be given to those from whom, whether on account of frenzy, or on account of continual cough, and another similar illness, some indecency with injury to so great a Sacrament can be feared." The reason is that it does not concern a Sacrament of every sort of necessity, and therefore provision must be made rather for reverence toward the Sacrament than for the utility of the sick person.³²⁴

Therefore: 1. In danger of vomiting, Viaticum is not to be given. Whence, if the sick person labors under continual vomiting, he cannot communicate unless he has been free from it at least for six hours. But if the vomiting proceeds from the food itself, an unconsecrated particle can be given to him for the sake of experiment; and then, if he retains this, a consecrated particle. In doubt, it is better to abstain.³²⁵

2. A cough, unless it is continual or so frequent that the sick person cannot pass down the particle, does not impede Communion; because there is one way, namely the throat, by which food is passed down, and another, namely the windpipe, from which phlegm and breaths are ejected.³²⁶
3. To the delirious who were duly prepared before the failing of the mind, Viaticum can and ought to be given, if they are able to communicate, danger of irreverence having been excluded. But the best practice is that also to sick persons of this kind there first be given an unconsecrated particle, for testing whether from this they can decently consume the Eucharist.³²⁷ (See n. 1546.)

³¹⁸Ibid., 295.

³¹⁹Cf. Lugo, *De Euch.*, Disp. 16, n. 34.

³²⁰Lugo, Disp. 16, n. 35.

³²¹H. A., XV, 46.

³²²Book VI, 291.

³²³Ibid., 293.

³²⁴H. A., XV, 20.

³²⁵Ibid., 20, 21.

³²⁶Book VI, 292.

³²⁷Ibid.

1567. Questions. Q. 1. Whether one who A FEW DAYS BEFORE communicated from devotion is HELD, danger of death supervening, to receive Viaticum?

Resp. It is controverted. - "The more common opinion denies, even if he communicated eight days before, because he has already satisfied the end of the precept. This opinion is sufficiently probable, at least if the danger of death occurs naturally, because then, at the time of the Communion received, danger had already begun morally to be imminent. But the second and more probable opinion affirms, because this precept, which is divine, obliges precisely when the danger of death actually urges; and just as a debt cannot be satisfied before it is contracted, so neither can a precept be fulfilled before it begins to oblige. Nor is it valid to say that through that Communion the end of the precept has already been satisfied; because if this sufficed, it would also suffice for fulfilling the Paschal precept that someone communicate on the day preceding Palm Sunday; but this cannot be said."³²⁸

Q. 2. Whether one who communicated IN THE MORNING from devotion OUGHT or CAN receive Viaticum, danger of death supervening?

Resp. Three opinions are present. The first says that he is held, that he may satisfy the precept. - The second says he is not held, but can. - The third says he is neither held nor can, since the practice of the Church is that no one communicate twice on the same day. Benedict XIV says that the pastor can embrace whichever of these opinions he prefers; whence he holds all three as probable. For the rest, among these, the more probable seems to be the opinion which distinguishes thus: in a violent illness, for example if someone has been struck by a wound, or has fallen from a height, he can communicate, indeed he is held according to the things said in the preceding question; because here he truly did not receive Viaticum while constituted in the article of death. But otherwise, in a natural illness, when someone, already placed in sickness, has communicated in the morning; because then the danger of death was already present, although unknown. And the same must be said if the illness was sudden, say apoplexy, or something similar; for illnesses of this kind are judged already to have previously existed disposed in their causes, although they are unknown.³²⁹

Note. "To a sick person unto death, who has been judged worthy of absolution from sins, the Most Holy Viaticum also is to be conceded." Thus the S. C. DE PROP. FIDE to the Vicar Apostolic of Pondicherry, July 26, 1845.³³⁰

§ 2. On Paschal Communion 1568. From the DIVINE precept, as we have said (n. 1564), we are held to receive the Eucharist several times in life. "The reason is that just as it is necessary to take earthly food several times for preserving bodily life, so heavenly food for preserving spiritual life."³³¹ But from the ECCLESIASTICAL precept the time and manner of this obligation are more closely determined, as is had in the Constitution of the Fourth Lateran Council, which sounds thus: "Every faithful of either sex, after he has arrived at the years of discretion, shall faithfully confess all his sins at least once in the year to his own priest... receiving reverently, at least at Easter, the Sacrament of the Eucharist; unless perhaps, by the counsel of his own priest, for some reasonable cause, he should judge that for a time one must abstain from reception of this kind; otherwise, living, let him be kept from entering the church, and dying, let him lack Christian burial." It is confirmed from Trent, sess. 13, can. 9.

In these words of the Council are contained three obligations, and these grave: the first regards the frequency of receiving the Sacrament; the second the time of reception, and the third the place of reception. Wherefore let there be the following:

1569. Principles. I. Each faithful person is held AT LEAST ONCE IN THE YEAR to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist. - But he who communicates sacrilegiously does not satisfy the precept, as is clear from proposition 55 condemned by Innocent XI: "The precept of annual Communion is satisfied by sacrilegious eating of the Lord." Therefore one who communicated unworthily is afterwards held to satisfy, no otherwise than one who omitted Communion altogether.³³²

It is asked: How is the year of the obligation of this annual Communion to be computed?

Resp. "Some judge that it is to be computed from January to December. But from the common opinion of the Doctors, and from custom received everywhere, the time is computed from Easter to Easter, because this is judged to be the ecclesiastical year. But the Paschal time begins from Palm Sunday, and ends on Low Sunday, from the declaration of Eugene IV in the Bull *Fidei digna*, in the year 1440. Yet from custom, necessity, or privilege, more time is conceded."³³³

³²⁸H. A., XV, 48; Book VI, 285, doubt 2; cf. 1 *El. qq. ref.*, n. 66.

³²⁹H. A., XV, 49; Book VI, 285, doubt 3; 1 *El. qq. ref.*, n. 66.

³³⁰*Collect. S. Sedis*, n. 365.

³³¹Book VI, 295.

³³²Book VI, 294.

³³³*Ibid.*, 296.

1570. II. The annual Communion prescribed to Christ's faithful is to be performed IN PASCHAL TIME. This time, according to the more common and more probable opinion, is assigned by the Church not for ending, but for urging on the obligation of the divine precept; wherefore one who omitted Communion at Easter is held to communicate as soon as possible, from both the ecclesiastical and the divine precept.³³⁴

But Paschal time is to be computed strictly, so that any delay, even of one day, by itself is judged grave.³³⁵ Yet this obligation by no means urges the confessor to absolve the indisposed more quickly than is just. But the faithful are held to remove impediments. Hence "the excommunicated and those detained in prisons, when they can, are held to procure absolution or liberty, by which they can satisfy the Paschal precept"³³⁶ (cf. n. 225).

It is asked: Whether one who cannot communicate in Paschal time is held to ANTICIPATE?

Resp. 1. "It is certain that, Paschal time having begun, if someone foresees himself about to be impeded from Communion, he is held to receive it immediately, as they commonly teach."³³⁷ 2. Before Paschal time has begun, he is not held to anticipate, because, according to the common opinion, "before that time the obligation has not yet been contracted; and if someone anticipates, he does not satisfy the precept; and this is so much so that if someone, on account of a foreseen impediment, anticipated, and afterwards the impediment ceased, he would still be held to communicate at Easter."³³⁸

1571. III. "Anyone is held to receive Paschal Communion IN HIS OWN PARISH from his pastor, or his delegate, unless he is exempted by his license, custom, or privilege." This is clear from various Constitutions of the Supreme Pontiffs and declarations of the Roman Congregations,³³⁹ and from the practice of the universal Church. The reason of the law is that the pastor may know the sheep committed to his care.

It is said 1. in his own parish, that is, in the parish of his domicile or quasi-domicile (cf. n. 203). - Hence, he does not satisfy who communicates in the cathedral church, since this cannot despoil parochial churches of their rights. - But he satisfies who anywhere receives Communion from the hand of his own pastor, because the pastor is judged to know his sheep everywhere. Similarly, one who has received Viaticum in Paschal time from the hand of his own pastor has satisfied each precept.

It is said 2. unless he is exempted by license of the pastor; "because, with the consent of the Supreme Pontiff, or of the Bishop or Ordinary, or his Vicar General, or the pastor, for all these are understood under the name of pastor, the Doctors concede that by communicating outside the parish, the precept is satisfied." Yet PRESUMED or interpretative license suffices, provided consent can morally certainly be supposed. And if the pastor is, or is presumed to be, unwilling unreasonably, the consent of the Bishop or Pontiff can licitly be presumed. But it is not licit for a pastor to concede to his parishioners a general license that they satisfy the Paschal precept in another church, since he cannot dispense universally in the law of the Church. Thus the S. C. Conc., September 7, 1615.

It is said 3. by custom: by this reason priests satisfy wherever they celebrate. Understand, if they celebrate; for otherwise they are held to communicate in the parish, as laymen. Likewise, pilgrims and vagi are exempted, who either do not have a parish, or are so absent from it that they cannot conveniently return to it. Therefore they can communicate in any church whatever, unless, as the Ritual bears, in some place a custom flourishes of remitting them to the cathedral church.³⁴⁰ - And the same must be said of soldiers, if they are not at station, nor have domicile or quasi-domicile in the city.

It is said 4. or by privilege: for to Regulars privilege has been conceded, that their familiars can satisfy in their churches; provided they actually serve, reside within the enclosures of the monastery, and live under the obedience of the Prelates, as is had in Trent (cf. n. 2186).³⁴¹

It was asked: "Whether male and female secular servants of Nuns, living in dwellings situated in the courts of monasteries surrounded by a wall, and which are contiguous to the monasteries and have a gate which is closed, are held to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Paschal time from the pastors in whose parishes the monastery and dwellings are situated? - And the S. C. C., September 19, 1722, responded: Affirmatively and no more... by which word no more, it is declared that

³³⁴Ibid., 297, first opinion.

³³⁵Gury, I, 482, q. 4.

³³⁶H. A., XII, 41; Book VI, 299.

³³⁷Book VI, 298, end.

³³⁸H. A., XII, 40.

³³⁹Cf. Benedict XIV, *Encycl. Magno*, § 21, and *Instit.* 18.

³⁴⁰Book VI, 240.

³⁴¹Sess. 24, cap. 11.

all the Cardinals were unanimous, and that no question about the same matter, clear enough, is to be had in the future.” Thus Benedict XIV.³⁴²

1572. It is asked: To what is he held who DID NOT SATISFY the Paschal precept in his own parish?

Resp. 1. One who communicated in his own parish, but, on account of unworthy reception, did not satisfy, is indeed held to communicate as soon as possible, but can do this in any church; because he is already sufficiently recognized by the pastor.³⁴³ 2. One who in good faith communicated in another church does not seem to be obligated under grave sin to repeat Communion in his own parish church; because the pastor is reasonably presumed not to urge his right in this way, at least toward those who receive the Sacraments more rarely. 3. One who omitted Communion, or in bad faith communicated in another church, is held to communicate as soon as possible in his own church; because his own dishonesty excuses no one from the law. Yet, Paschal time having now elapsed, the consent of the pastor can more easily be presumed, so that satisfaction be made in another church.³⁴⁴

It must be noted that the penalty decreed against transgressors of the law is not incurred except after the sentence of a judge³⁴⁵ (cf. n. 1387, 4).

1573. IV. Every faithful of either sex is held by the Paschal precept, after he has arrived AT THE YEARS OF DISCRETION. - But at what age children are judged to have this discretion must be weighed in this place. Hence the following:

Questions. Q. 1. Whether CHILDREN, as soon as they have the use of reason, are held to communicate?

Resp. Negatively, from the most common and more probable opinion. “The reason is that the common usage of the Church thus interprets the obligation of this precept, both that children may receive the Eucharist with greater reverence and fruit, and lest they themselves be easily exposed to danger of transgression. And although they are obligated to confession, nevertheless they are not for that reason held to receive the Eucharist, which is of greater excellence and not of so great necessity. Nor does the canon of the Lateran Council obstruct, where it is said that every faithful, after he has reached the years of discretion, is held not only to confession but also to Communion; for the years of discretion are to be understood respectively according to the reason of the matter, namely when someone has reached the years of discretion for confession, let him confess; when he has reached the years of discretion for Communion, let him communicate.”³⁴⁶

But to children constituted in DANGER OF DEATH, provided they are able in some way to discern between profane and heavenly food, Communion not only can be given, but also ought to be, as authors very commonly teach.³⁴⁷ “The reason is that, on the one hand, children constituted in such danger are held from the divine precept to communicate; on the other, the utility of the Eucharist then does not demand a greater disposition.”³⁴⁸

Q. 2. When are children judged OBLIGATED to communicate?

Resp. “The Doctors commonly say that, REGULARLY speaking, children are not obligated to Communion before the ninth or tenth year”; the Council of Albi in the year 1850 thinks the same³⁴⁹; “nor is Communion to be deferred for them beyond the twelfth or at least beyond the fourteenth year.... It was said REGULARLY; for, as authors notice, children who before such an age are seen to be more perspicacious can be obligated sooner. Whence Roncaglia rightly reprehends pastors who indiscriminately do not admit to Communion except children constituted in a certain age. - But it must be noted that, although children in the tenth year can be admitted to Communion, nevertheless they themselves are not held to it, but only then when they have been warned by the pastor or parents.”³⁵⁰

Q. 3. To WHOM does it pertain to institute an examination and bring judgment concerning the capacity of the child?

Resp. “1. With respect to AGE and DISPOSITION OF SOUL, it pertains to parents and the confessor to decide the matter. For thus the Roman Catechism:³⁵¹ ‘At what age the sacred mysteries are to be given to children, no one will be able to

³⁴²Instit. 55, n. 8.

³⁴³Croix, book VI, n. 630.

³⁴⁴Suarez, *De Euch.*, Disp. 72, sect. 2, n. 10, 11.

³⁴⁵Book VI, 674; cf. Togni, p. 251.

³⁴⁶Book VI, 301, second opinion.

³⁴⁷*Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 366.

³⁴⁸Book VI, 301, doubt 2.

³⁴⁹Tit. 5, decret. 5, apud *Collect. Lucen.*, tom. IV, p. 433.

³⁵⁰Book VI, 301, doubt 1.

³⁵¹P. 2, c. 4, n. 63.

determine better than the father and the priest to whom they confess their sins; for it pertains to them to explore and ask from the children whether they have received some knowledge of this admirable Sacrament and have a taste for it.'

"2. With respect to EXAMINATION concerning Christian doctrine, nothing particular is established by common law. Therefore it pertains to the confessor to attend whether the child has sufficient doctrine. But by particular law, established by Bishops in many places, children to be admitted to first Communion must be examined by the pastor himself, or his delegates, concerning doctrine and maturity of judgment."³⁵²

1574. Concerning the FIRST COMMUNION of children it is useful to add the following things from the Council of Bordeaux, celebrated in the year 1850:³⁵³

"Since on the first approach to the sacred Synaxis the course of the whole life, and therefore eternal salvation itself, often depends, we beseech in the Lord every rector of souls, that they expend the greatest possible diligence in disposing little ones for first Communion.... Let them demand, as far as can be done, that the children be present assiduously at catechism for two years; let them instruct them with particular diligence, question them frequently, and not admit them unless it is altogether clear concerning their sufficient knowledge.

Then: "Let them stir them up in every way to prepare a dwelling for God, which is a great work; and, for the sake of discerning who are preparing themselves with a great heart and willing soul, let them diligently inquire concerning the manner of acting of each one, and let them themselves watch over them attentively; at least once in the month, let them receive them at the sacred tribunal, or care that they be received, and the more frequently as the time of Communion becomes more imminent.

"Before Communion, let them receive a general confession of the whole life, taking care lest, through fear of repulsion, some sin be concealed. But three days before Communion, let them proximately prepare them by pious exercises, and on the day itself let them take care that the greatest solemnity be applied, and that the baptismal vows be renewed."

FROM THE SYNOD OF TURIN we add: "But if an adolescent, already having attained the thirteenth year, cannot approach his proper pastor, the confessor will perform an excellent work of charity if he teaches him in catechesis and promotes him to Communion; but let him exhort him that he make his pastor more certain concerning this matter."³⁵⁴

Article IV

On Frequent Communion

1575. The pious mother Church, by strict precept, obliges only to Paschal Communion. "And yet let not the faithful have it as enough that they, obeying the authority of this decree, receive the Body of the Lord only once each year; but let them judge that Communion of the Eucharist is to be repeated more often. But whether it is more expedient to do this each month, or each week, or each day, a certain rule cannot be prescribed for all";³⁵⁵ but a varied NORM must be established according to the variety of persons. - But how one must proceed in this will be taught by the following:

1576. Principles. I. The frequency of Communion is so to be defined that provision is made both for the REVERENCE due to so great a Sacrament and for the UTILITY of the one receiving. The reason of the FIRST is that, on account of the excellence of the Sacrament, "it is required that the one receiving approach with great devotion and reverence...; but because many impediments of this devotion often occur in many human beings, because of indisposition of body or of soul, it is not useful for all men to approach this Sacrament daily, but as often as a man has found himself prepared for it."³⁵⁶ Whence proposition 5, which said: "Frequent confession and Communion, even in those who live like Gentiles, is a mark of predestination," was deservedly condemned by Innocent XI. They ought rather to have said, St. Alphonsus observes,³⁵⁷ "it is a mark of reprobation." The reason of the SECOND is that the Sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted primarily by Our Lord for the spiritual refreshment of souls; nor is there doubt that the most loving Redeemer wishes this food to be offered to all His sheep: to the well, that they may have life more abundantly; and to the languid, that they may recover.

Wherefore the TRIDENTINE SYNOD desires that Christ's faithful so live³⁵⁸ "that they can frequently receive that super-

³⁵²Gury, Case XI, *De Euch.*, where also the Constitution of Benedict XIV *Etsi minime* is rightly interpreted.

³⁵³Tit. 3, cap. 4, n. 2, apud *Collect. Lacen.*, tom. IV, p. 569.

³⁵⁴Apud cl. Del Vecchio, I, n. 497, note.

³⁵⁵*Catech. Rom.*, p. 2, c. 4, n. 60.

³⁵⁶St. Thomas, 3, q. 80, a. 10.

³⁵⁷Book VI, 254.

³⁵⁸Sess. 13, cap. 8.

substantial bread, and that it may truly be for them the life of the soul and the perpetual health of the mind.” And this 23rd proposition of Baius was condemned by Alexander VIII: “Similarly, those are to be kept from Communion in whom the most pure love of God, free from every mixture, is not yet present.”

1577. II. The richer the fruit that comes from Communion for the one receiving, the MORE FREQUENTLY it is to be conceded; and, to whatever degree the fruit decreases, to that degree the frequency is to be LESSENED, not so that Communion is altogether omitted, but so that preparation and devotion may increase. Concerning this matter Innocent XI speaks thus:³⁵⁹ “Frequent access to receiving the sacred nourishment is to be left to the judgment of confessors..., who, from purity of consciences, and from the fruit of frequency, and from progress toward piety, ought to prescribe to them, namely penitents, what they foresee will be profitable for their salvation.” St. Thomas teaches the same,³⁶⁰ writing: “If someone knew by experience that from daily communion the fervor of love was increased, and reverence was not diminished, such a one ought to communicate daily.”

But one must beware lest, under the pretext of reverence, the Sacrament be deserted; for “although to abstain from Communion on some day is also a virtue, nevertheless, says Fr. Granada in his Treatise on Communion, it is the common opinion of the Doctors that it is better to approach Communion daily on account of love, than to abstain on account of reverence.”³⁶¹

1578. But it must be noticed that that richer FRUIT which is attended to in Communion is of a twofold kind, so namely that it is found either in hope, or in act. 1. It is found in hope with respect to that communicating person who is held by a true and right desire of Communion, and who therefore receives it not that he may be seen by men, but that he may profit in the love of God and in union with Christ. 2. But it is found in act with respect to that one who shines with great purity of conscience, who advances continually in piety and in charity, who strongly resists temptations, and who always has a will prompt to execute the divine commands.

Whence St. Alphonsus:³⁶² “It must be noted,” he says, “that which St. Francis de Sales says in his *Philothea*: If they ask you why you communicate so frequently, answer them that two kinds of persons ought to communicate more often, namely the perfect and the imperfect: the perfect, that they may preserve themselves in perfection; the imperfect, that they may be able to arrive at perfection; the strong, lest they become weak; the weak, that they may become strong; the sick, that they may be cured; the well, lest they become sick. And as for you, as being imperfect, sick, weak, you need frequent Communion. - Tell them that those who are not entangled in worldly affairs ought to communicate more often, because they have opportunity; but those who are detained by such affairs, because they need Communion.”

For the rest, as the Holy Doctor notices with St. Lawrence Justinian, it is not necessary that the soul feel, or openly discern in itself, an increase of fervor; since not rarely this Sacrament works without our noticing its operation. - Therefore it suffices for the confessor to detect in the depth of the will of his penitent a certain ALACRITY for executing whatever things have pleased God.³⁶³

1579. According to the preceding principles, St. Alphonsus establishes certain SPECIAL RULES, which it is now useful to explain.

Preliminary note. A threefold degree of frequency is distinguished: 1. weekly Communion, which ordinarily is received once in the week; 2. frequent Communion, which is received several times in the week; 3. daily Communion, which is customarily received daily, perhaps with one day removed. - Wherefore the three following rules are given:

RULE I. WEEKLY Communion is regularly to be conceded and counseled to all who are accustomed to avoid mortal sins. It is said 1. to all who are accustomed to avoid mortal sins, that is, who are solicitous about avoiding them, even if they place no care in acquiring greater perfection.

But if they sometimes fall into mortal sin, Communion is not on that account to be denied to them, provided they detest their sins and propose amendment of life for themselves. It is said 2. to be conceded and counseled; for on the one hand, more cannot be conceded to souls of this kind, St. Alphonsus bearing witness, who writes thus:³⁶⁴ “There is no doubt that it is an error, as Benedict XIV notices, to concede frequent Communion, that is, more than once in the week, to those who approach with an affection toward deliberate venial sins, without any desire of freeing themselves from them”; but

³⁵⁹Decree of the S. C. C. *Etsi frequens*, February 12, 1679.

³⁶⁰In 4, dist. 12, q. 3, a. 1, ad 2.

³⁶¹*Praxis*, n. 151.

³⁶²*Ibid.*, n. 153.

³⁶³*Ibid.*, 155.

³⁶⁴*Ibid.*, n. 149.

neither, on the other hand, is less to be counseled to them, lest namely they fall into mortal sin. “There are many,” says St. Alphonsus,³⁶⁵ “who by communicating every eight days will remain free from mortal sin, but not by communicating every month.” And elsewhere:³⁶⁶ “For those who lead a tepid life, so that at least they can preserve themselves in the grace of God, it is good that they consume the Body of Christ every Sunday, or at least twice in the month.” It is said 3. regularly; for sometimes these also will be able to communicate during the week: for example when some special feast occurs, or if they were in danger of falling into mortal sin, so that thus they may receive strength to resist; but sometimes it will be expedient for those who are not placed in such danger to be interdicted from Communion for an entire week, that they may conceive a greater horror for their defects and greater reverence toward the Sacrament.³⁶⁷

1580. RULE II. FREQUENT Communion can be permitted and advised to the faithful who are accustomed to avoid fully deliberate venial sins, and assume the means of attaining perfection. Behold, concerning this matter, the words of St. Alphonsus: “When a soul is now held by no affection toward a thing prohibited under venial sin, abstains from fully voluntary venial sins, and moreover applies itself to prayer and to mortification of the passions and senses, then the confessor can concede to it that it communicate three, four, indeed even five times in the week.”³⁶⁸ But the Holy Doctor notices:³⁶⁹ “But if afterwards it is recognized that, notwithstanding frequency of Communion, the soul profits nothing in the way of perfection, nor amends itself from deliberate faults, although venial, as if it adhered even to pleasures of the senses in seeing, hearing, eating, dressing with some vanity: then certainly the use of Communion will by counsel have to be restricted, also so that it may begin seriously to think of its amendment, and to provide for its spiritual perfection.”

And speaking of persons consecrated to God: “Indeed, I would permit frequent Communion only with difficulty,” he says, “to that Nun who was not willing to amend herself concerning some defect, although not evidently sinful, yet certainly contrary to perfection, especially if it concerns a defect against humility or against obedience.”³⁷⁰

1581. RULE III. DAILY Communion is to be conceded to souls which, immune from affection toward any venial sin whatever, apply themselves much to the exercise of prayer and mortification, and are held by a great desire of Communion. - For these fulfill the condition which St. Thomas requires, writing: “If someone knew by experience that from daily consumption the fervor of love was increased, and reverence was not diminished, such a one ought to communicate daily.” “Except, ordinarily speaking, one day in any week, as some prudent directors are accustomed to do; and except that time in which they may wish to deprive penitents of Communion, for testing their obedience or humility, or on account of some other just cause.”³⁷¹ - Nevertheless, in Novenas of the Holy Spirit, of the Nativity of the Lord, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of one’s holy Patrons, such a person can communicate daily.³⁷²

And these things are confirmed by the Decree of Innocent XI, where it is had thus: “Nuns asking daily for Holy Communion are to be admonished that they communicate on the days determined by the Institute of their Order: but if any shine with purity of mind and have grown warm with fervor of spirit, so that they can seem worthy of more frequent or daily reception of the most holy Sacrament, let this be permitted to them by the Superiors.”

It was requested: “Whether, and with whose license, Nuns ought to receive the Holy Eucharist, who wish to receive it beyond the days established by the Constitutions or by the custom of the monastery, so that on those days all the Nuns communicate?”

And the S. C. CONC., April 14, 1725, responded: “With the license of the ordinary confessor, and not of Directors, with previous communication to the ordinary Prelate.”³⁷³

1582. Admonitions. 1. Let the confessor not immediately concede frequent Communion in perpetuity, but, each time, only a certain number of Communions, until he has taken experience concerning the progress and fervor of the penitent. For many begin with fervor, who little by little fall away, and nevertheless withdraw with difficulty from the rule fixed for themselves.

2. Frequent Communion would be imprudently advised or conceded to persons otherwise disposed, who cannot approach it without some detriment to family affairs, the education of children, the care of the sick, etc. Yet prudent

³⁶⁵ *Risposta apolog.*, ed. Turin, tom. IX, p. 890.

³⁶⁶ *Inst. catech.*, p. 2, c. 4, n. 9, end.

³⁶⁷ *Praxis*, n. 149.

³⁶⁸ *Vera Sposa*, cap. 18, § 3, n. 7.

³⁶⁹ *Praxis*, n. 155.

³⁷⁰ *Vera Sposa*, loc. cit., n. 7.

³⁷¹ *Praxis*, 152.

³⁷² *Ibid.*, 158.

³⁷³ *Collect. S. Sedis*, n. 368.

persons generally know how to join each, namely devotion and the duties of their state, so that these by no means harm each other.³⁷⁴

3. The fruit of Communion depends not on the disposition of those communicating alone, but also, and indeed very much, on THANKSGIVING. Hence St. Alphonsus admonishes the confessor thus:³⁷⁵ “Let him also take care to insinuate that each one remain after Communion in thanksgiving for that time for which he can. Very few are the directors who diligently do this...; and the reason is that very few are the priests who, after the Sacrifice of the Mass, remain with Jesus Christ in thanksgiving; and therefore they are ashamed to insinuate to others what they themselves do not do. - Thanksgiving ordinarily ought to last for a whole hour; let it be made at least for a half hour, in which the soul exercises itself in loving and asking” (cf. n. 1554, end, and n. 1555, q. 3).
4. Let the confessor also insinuate to penitents that they communicate SPIRITUALLY more often. For this is very useful to pious faithful and is commended by the holy Council of Trent, when it says that those communicate spiritually “who, eating in desire that heavenly bread set before them, by living faith which works through love, perceive its fruit and utility.”³⁷⁶ (cf. n. 1563, question.)

St. Alphonsus proposes the METHOD of communicating spiritually thus: “Therefore elicit an act of FAITH, by which you firmly believe that Jesus Christ is present in the Sacrament; an act of LOVE, to which is joined contrition for your sins; then an act of DESIRE, by which you invite Jesus Christ to come into your soul, and to render it His own; finally give thanks to Him, as if you had already truly received Him.”³⁷⁷

Chapter IV

On Reserving the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist

1583. “The custom of reserving the holy Eucharist in the sacrarium is so ancient that even the age of the Nicene Council recognized it.”³⁷⁸ But lest so great a Sacrament be treated irreverently, many things have been prescribed by the Church concerning the manner of reserving it, all of which can be read among authors of liturgical Institutions. Here we shall hand down only a few things, and those which are of greater moment, excerpted from the Roman Ritual.³⁷⁹

1. “He,” the pastor, “ought to care that perpetually some consecrated particles be preserved, in that number which can be sufficient for the use of the sick and of the Communion of other faithful.” Yet the Most Holy Sacrament cannot be kept in any church whatever, but only in cathedrals, parochial or quasi-parochial churches, for example those which are had in hospitals and exempt colleges. From privilege it can also be kept in churches of Regulars, and of Nuns living under enclosure. But in other churches, even collegiate ones, it cannot be reserved without pontifical Indult, which regularly is not customarily conceded for private Oratories, nor for rural chapels, unless there is a concourse of the people and distance from the parish.³⁸⁰
2. The Most Holy Eucharist is to be reserved “in a pyx of solid and decent material, and clean, well closed with its own cover, covered with a white veil.” The pyx, as far as can be done, should be of gold or silver; yet in very poor churches one of tin is permitted, provided it is gilded within. Under it, while it contains the Most Holy Sacrament, there should always be a clean corporal or at least a pall.
3. Let the pyx with the Most Holy Sacrament be placed, “as far as the matter allows, in an adorned tabernacle locked with a key. But this tabernacle should be covered with a conopaeum, and empty of every other thing”; within it should be covered with gold or silver, or at least with silk cloths of white color.³⁸¹

It ought to serve only for reserving the Eucharist: whence neither Relics, nor Holy Chrism, nor Oil of the infirm can be placed in it.³⁸² The key is to be kept only by the pastor or another priest; among Religious by the Sacristan, and among

³⁷⁴Cf. *Risp. apolog.*, near the end, ed. Turin, vol. IX, p. 891.

³⁷⁵*Praxis*, n. 155, near the end.

³⁷⁶Sess. 13, cap. 8.

³⁷⁷*Vera Sposa*, c. 18, § 3.

³⁷⁸Trent, sess. 13, cap. 6.

³⁷⁹*De Euchar.*, cap. 1, n. 5 seqq.

³⁸⁰Book VI, 424, see *Hic ultimo*.

³⁸¹S. C. EP. and REG., October 26, 1575; cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 329.

³⁸²S. C. EP. and REG., May 3, 1693; cf. Crispino, *Visita pastoral.*, p. II, § II, n. 9.

Nuns by the Chaplain.³⁸³ The conopaeum should be of white color, or suitable to the Office of the day.³⁸⁴ It is not licit, for the sake of devotion or ornament, to place anything on top of the tabernacle besides the cross,³⁸⁵ or to place anything before its little door.³⁸⁶

4. The tabernacle, where the Most Holy Eucharist is reserved, “should be placed on the high altar or on another which seems more convenient and decent for the veneration and worship of so great a Sacrament; so that no impediment is brought to other sacred functions or ecclesiastical offices.” The Most Holy Eucharist can be reserved on only one altar,³⁸⁷ and regularly ought to be on the high altar as being more worthy.³⁸⁸ In cathedrals let an altar be designated which is not in view of the choir, on account of pontifical functions, which are performed with the back turned toward the altar.³⁸⁹
5. “Let several lamps before it, or at least one, shine continually day and night.” Faculty of reserving the Most Holy Eucharist without a light can be had only from Apostolic Indult.³⁹⁰ - Moreover, the S. R. C. on July 9, 1864,³⁹¹ declared: “that generally olive oil is to be used; but where it cannot be had, it is to be remitted to the prudence of Bishops that the lamps be nourished from other oils, as far as can be done, vegetable ones.”³⁹² But if, because of gravely culpable negligence of the pastor, or of him to whom that care has been committed, for an entire day, or several entire nights, the light does not burn before the venerable Sacrament, it is a mortal sin, as authors commonly teach; otherwise if it does not burn for only one hour.³⁹³
6. The pastor “will also care that all things ordained for the worship of the Sacrament itself be whole and clean, and be preserved.”
7. He will renew “the particles of the Most Holy Eucharist frequently,” namely once a week, or at least every other week.³⁹⁴

“But the hosts or particles to be consecrated should be fresh” (cf. n. 1540); “and when he has consecrated them, let him first distribute or consume the old ones.” Therefore let him beware lest particles recently consecrated be mixed with the old; but when all these have been distributed or consumed by himself, let him not omit to purify the pyx.³⁹⁵ - If a larger host for the exposition of the Most Holy Sacrament is to be renewed, the priest himself must consume the old one; for it is not licit to break it and distribute it to the faithful.³⁹⁶

1584. It is asked: What is to be noted concerning the EXPOSITION of the Most Holy Eucharist?

Resp. A twofold exposition is distinguished, namely private and public. It is private when the pyx, covered with its own veil, is left in the open tabernacle. But it is called public when the Most Holy Eucharist is drawn out of the tabernacle and exposed uncovered to public veneration.³⁹⁷

I. PRIVATE exposition is permitted on account of a private cause, nor is license of the Ordinary needed.³⁹⁸ What things are to be observed in it will be evident from the following decree:

“Whenever, from a private cause, the Most Holy Eucharist seems to be exposed, let it never be drawn out from the tabernacle, but, with the pyx veiled, let it be placed in the open little door of the same tabernacle, with the assistance of some priest, clothed in stole and surplice, and with at least six wax lights. We command the same to be observed in churches of

³⁸³ Cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 334 and 335; cf. Lucidi, cap. 1, n. 100 and 101, where various decrees are had.

³⁸⁴ Ibid., n. 332, and apud Gardellini, n. 5221, ad 12; S. C. R., July 21, 1855, in Briocen.

³⁸⁵ *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 330; and Gardellini, n. 4578 and 4777.

³⁸⁶ *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 331; Gardellini, n. 5033, September 6, 1845.

³⁸⁷ Gardellini, n. 3392, ad 3, July 21, 1696.

³⁸⁸ Cf. Lucidi, cap. 1, n. 91.

³⁸⁹ Gardellini, n. 5023, June 14, 1845; and Lucidi, ibid., n. 91.

³⁹⁰ Cf. Konings, I, p. LXXII, n. 24.

³⁹¹ Gardellini, n. 5331, July 14, 1864.

³⁹² In Supplement to the Roman Ritual, p. 16.

³⁹³ Book VI, 248; cf. *Analecta J. P.*, series 1, p. 1306, where there are more things.

³⁹⁴ Gardellini, n. 4623, December 16, 1826; cf. Schober, *S. Alph. de Caerem. Missae*, cap. 11, n. 6, note 10.

³⁹⁵ Gardellini, n. 2602, 3, September 3, 1672.

³⁹⁶ Schober, loc. cit., n. 6; Gardellini, n. 2602, 3, September 3, 1672.

³⁹⁷ Cf. Gardellini, Proem. to the Clement XI Instruction for the Oration of Forty Hours, n. 13, and § XXXVI, n. 2.

³⁹⁸ Benedict XIV, Instit. 30, n. 16.

seculars.”³⁹⁹ Yet if an old custom flourishes of drawing out the sacred pyx for blessing the people, it can be preserved.⁴⁰⁰ - In certain regions, exposition is sometimes made by drawing the pyx out of the tabernacle and placing it in the throne in place of the monstrance: this manner, says Gardellini,⁴⁰¹ is opposed to the customs of the Roman Church, and therefore is not to be permitted. - But if the usage has now prevailed, it can be permitted by the Bishop.⁴⁰² Such an exposition, however, is to be held not as private, but as public, even if less solemn.

- II. PUBLIC exposition is not permitted, unless on account of a public cause (a)⁴⁰³ and with the license of the Ordinary, to whom it pertains to judge concerning the cause.⁴⁰⁴ - Moreover, “if some private person procures this exposition to be made for promoting public devotion, then that seems to be a public rather than a private cause.”⁴⁰⁵

That public exposition be made licitly, besides the consent of the Bishop, decency is required; wherefore we note these things:

1. The Most Holy Sacrament ought not to remain exposed unless at least six wax candles burn on the altar, from the Decree of the S. R. C., March 15, 1698,⁴⁰⁶ and unless some adorers themselves stand by without interruption.
2. During exposition, according to the Clementine Instruction for the exposition of Forty Hours, there ought to be neither relics nor images of Saints on the altar, except of adoring Angels; but the cross can be left or removed, according to the custom of places, according to the S. R. C., September 2, 1741.⁴⁰⁷ Moreover, it must be noted what the S. Rit. C. responded on June 4, 1874, in Lisbon, namely: “that the Clementine Instruction does not oblige outside the City, yet those who strive to conform themselves to it are to be praised, unless something else is established by the Ordinaries of places.”⁴⁰⁸
3. At the altar on which the Sacrament is exposed, it is not licit, unless necessity urges or even custom, to celebrate Masses or sing them except for repositioning it. Thus from several decrees of the S. R. C.⁴⁰⁹ Yet contrary custom ought not to be removed if the faithful would be affected with sadness from this, or if it concerns immemorial custom.⁴¹⁰
4. To one asking whether the Most Holy Sacrament should frequently be exposed for public adoration, Gardellini responded:⁴¹¹ “Provided every danger of irreverence is absent, and the Ordinaries of places diligently watch, and do not permit the Sacrament to be exposed to public veneration unless this is done with due homage and sign of reverence; the present discipline of the Church does not seem alien from granting frequent exposition.” - Yet exposition “should not be too frequent; for excessive frequency could become a cause why something would be diminished from reverence toward so great a Sacrament.”⁴¹²

But that pastors and confessors may promote public worship of the Most Holy Eucharist as much as possible, the Council of Bordeaux⁴¹³ piously and gravely exhorts them thus: “Since that most loving Savior wished to be present in His tabernacle not only in use, but permanently, let them very much commend and confirm by example the pious practice of VISITS TO THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT, by which those approaching with confidence to the throne of grace may obtain mercy, and find grace in opportune help.”⁴¹⁴

³⁹⁹S. C. EP. and REG., December 6, 1602, apud Benedict XIV, loc. cit., n. 21.

⁴⁰⁰Benedict XIV, loc. cit., n. 23.

⁴⁰¹Clementine Instruction, § 36, n. 26, 6m, and n. 4748, ad 4.

⁴⁰²Cf. Gardellini, n. 4181, ad 9, May 7, 1746, and n. 4237, ad 13, December 22, 1753, and Clementine Instruction, § 12, n. 6.

⁴⁰³“Today, however, general practice in the City permits, on account of a private cause, as for obtaining health, that a triduan devotion with exposition of the Most Holy Sacrament be instituted.” Thus Haringer in the second edition of the moral theology of St. Alphonsus, ad VI, n. 424, 16.

⁴⁰⁴Gardellini, *ibid.*, § 36, n. 3.

⁴⁰⁵St. Alphonsus, Book VI, 424, 16.

⁴⁰⁶Gardellini, n. 3464.

⁴⁰⁷Gardellini, n. 4119, ad 5; cf. Schober, c. 2, n. 18, note 32.

⁴⁰⁸Gardellini, n. 5585.

⁴⁰⁹Cf. Gardellini, n. 2508, August 9, 1670, and n. 2542, ad 6, June 13, 1671.

⁴¹⁰Cf. Gardellini in Clementine Instruction, § 12, n. 6.

⁴¹¹*Ibid.*, § 36, n. 6.

⁴¹²Book VI, 424, 16.

⁴¹³Year 1850, tit. II, c. 8, n. 2, apud *Collect. Lacen.*, tom. IV, 564.

⁴¹⁴Cf. St. Alphonsus, pamphlet *Visite al SS. Sacramento*.

Dissertation II

On the Most Holy Eucharist insofar as It Is a Sacrifice

1585. Those things having been set forth which regard the Most Holy Eucharist insofar as it is a Sacrament ordained to our sanctification, it remains that we speak of this most august mystery insofar as it is a SACRIFICE, by which we worthily exhibit to the divine Majesty that supreme worship which befits It. The oblation of this Sacrifice is called Mass, drawing its origin from the word Mission, either because through this Sacrifice Christ is sent to us, or because an oblation is sent by us to God; or because formerly, when the part which precedes the Offertory had been completed, the catechumens were dismissed; or finally, because, the Sacrifice now completed, the people are dismissed with these words: *Ite, Missa est*.⁴¹⁵

Those things which come to be said concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass we divide into two chapters: in the first we shall speak concerning this holy Sacrifice considered in itself; in the second concerning those things which regard its celebration.

Chapter I

On the Sacrifice of the Most Holy Mass Considered in Itself

Three things are to be investigated here: 1. what the true notion of the Sacrifice of the Mass is; 2. what its value and fruit are; 3. how its application is made.

Article I

On the Notion of the Sacrifice of the Mass

1586. DEFINITION. Sacrifice, taken in the broad sense, is every action which redounds to the glory of God, as prayer, almsgiving, etc., according to that Ps. 6: "Offer to God the sacrifice of praise"; and Ps. 50: "A sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit." But strictly it is defined: An oblation made to God through the alteration of some thing as a sign of supreme dominion, from legitimate institution. Thus commonly with Suarez, etc.⁴¹⁶

"It is said 1. Oblation for the genus, in which it agrees with other oblations. 2. Made to God, because sacrifice is offered to God alone, not to the Saints. 3. Through the alteration of some thing; for alteration distinguishes sacrifice from other oblations. 4. As a sign of supreme dominion; for by such a sign we signify that we and ours can be destroyed by God as by the supreme lord, just as the thing offered is altered. 5. From legitimate institution; but this institution requires three things: that the sacrifice be made by public authority, that it be made in the name of the whole people, and that it be made by a priest as legitimate minister."⁴¹⁷

DIVISION. "On the part of the end, sacrifice is distinguished into latreutic, which is offered merely in homage to God; eucharistic, in thanksgiving; propitiatory or expiatory, unto remission of fault or punishment; impetratory, for obtaining goods from God."⁴¹⁸

1587. Principles. I. The Mass is a true and properly so-called SACRIFICE, by which the BODY AND BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST is offered to the divine Majesty, under the species of bread and wine. - This is clear 1. from Trent, which, sess. 22, can. 1, defined thus: "If anyone has said that in the Mass there is not offered to God a true and proper Sacrifice, or that to be offered is nothing other than Christ being given to us to eat, let him be anathema." - It is clear 2. from reason; for all the conditions of a true sacrifice are verified; for the Mass is: 1. an oblation made to God, since Christ Himself is offered to God the Father; 2. this oblation is made through the alteration of some thing; for through consecration and through consumption, as will be said below n. 1589, q. 1, 4th opinion, Christ is mystically slain, and thus there is had the alteration required for sacrifice;⁴¹⁹ 3. it is made besides as a sign of supreme dominion; for the Sacrifice of the altar is principally

⁴¹⁵Cf. Aversa, *De Sacrif. Missae*, at the beginning.

⁴¹⁶P. 3, disp. 74.

⁴¹⁷Book VI, 304, note 1; cf. Lugo, *De Euch.*, Disp. 19, sect. 1-8.

⁴¹⁸Book VI, 304, note 2.

⁴¹⁹Book VI, 304, note 3.

ordained to this end; 4. it is made from legitimate institution; for it was instituted by Christ with respect to that which pertains to the essence of the Sacrifice.⁴²⁰

“But the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, instituted in the law of grace, by which all ancient sacrifices ceased, perfectly contains the meanings of all of them: for it is latreutic in recognition of divine excellence; it is eucharistic in thanksgiving; it is impetratory of graces through the merits of Christ; it is expiatory of sins, because through it God is moved to mercy.”⁴²¹ See a fuller proof and exposition of this doctrine among the Dogmaticians.

1588. II. The unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass is THE SAME IN SPECIES as the bloody Sacrifice OF THE CROSS, both because the same victim is offered by the same highest and eternal Priest, and “because the formal reason of sacrifice is the same, since it is offered in protestation of the supreme dominion which God has over life and death. Therefore the Sacrifice of the altar, as Trent says, does not indeed differ essentially from the Sacrifice of the cross, but only accidentally, with respect to the manner of offering, namely because: 1. In that of the cross real death intervened; in this mystical death intervenes. 2. That was offered by the Redeemer Himself on the altar of the cross; this is offered by the ministry of priests. 3. That was meritorious, because there the price of our redemption was paid; but this is not meritorious, since here only the merits of Christ are applied.”⁴²²

1589. Questions. Q. 1. In what does the ESSENCE of the Sacrifice of the Mass consist?

Resp. Several opinions are present. The FIRST says that it consists in consumption alone, because in that alone is found destruction or alteration of the victim. The SECOND says that it consists in the oblation which follows the consecration, with these words: “Whence also mindful,” etc., since sacrifice is nothing other than oblation. These two opinions do not seem probable. - The THIRD teaches that it consists in consecration alone, because in consecration all things required for sacrifice are present, namely the oblation, which is already made in exercised act, and the destruction or alteration of the victim, while by force of the words the Body is now separated from the Blood of Christ. But the consumption pertains to the integrity of the sacrifice, and therefore is prescribed by divine law. “This opinion,” says St. Alphonsus, “is indeed very probable and more common, but the FOURTH opinion seems to me more probable, although in Tome I I adhered to the third, which Bellarmine, Tournely, etc., hold. This opinion says that the essence of the Sacrifice consists partially in consecration and partially in consumption; for in the consecration the victim is placed, and in the consumption it is consumed.” The principal reason is “because true and real sacrifice requires the true and real destruction of the thing offered, which is not had except through the consumption of the priest, by which the sacramental existence of Christ is destroyed.”⁴²³

Q. 2. Whether for the essence of the Sacrifice the consecration OF EACH species is required?

Resp. It is controverted. - The first opinion denies, because through the consecration of one species whole Christ is placed and offered, and at the same time the death of Christ is already represented, and there is had the oblation and slaying of the victim. But the second opinion, more common and more probable, affirms; and the reason is that, from Trent, sess. 22, cap. 1, the Sacrifice of the Mass ought to be commemorative of the bloody Sacrifice of the cross, according to that saying of Christ the Lord: “Do this in commemoration of me.” Now, if only one species were consecrated, although by force of the words the bloodless body would be placed, or although by consumption the slaying would be had, nevertheless the shedding of blood would not be expressed, which happens only through the consecration of each species, through which the separation of blood from body is properly signified, according to the saying of St. Cyril: “By the sword of the words the blood is separated from the body.” - By this very reason, each species ought to coexist at the same time upon the altar: wherefore, from the Rubric, if each cannot be had, the Mass is to be interrupted, unless one species has now been consecrated.⁴²⁴

Q. 3. Who is the OFFERER of the Sacrifice of the Mass?

Resp. 1. The principal and primary minister is Christ, since, as Trent teaches in the cited place, cap. 2, it is the same one offering through the ministry of priests who offered Himself on the cross; nor otherwise could Christ be called a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedech.

2. The secondary minister and one subject to Christ, who nevertheless truly and properly offers, is every and only

⁴²⁰Ibid.

⁴²¹Ibid., note 2.

⁴²²Ibid.

⁴²³Book VI, 305, from the second edition; whence it is to be corrected in Tome I, Book III, n. 310; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 96; cf. Panzuti, Book VI, n. 184.

⁴²⁴Book VI, 306; cf. Benedict XIV, *De Sacrif. Missae*, L. 3, c. 10, n. 18 and 19.

validly ordained priest, although a heretic, excommunicated, degraded, etc.⁴²⁵

3. But the Church and the faithful concur in the Sacrifice either generally or specially; whence they can be said morally to offer it.

And indeed the Church offers generally through priests, as her delegates; whence in the Canon it is said: "This therefore the oblation of our service, and also of Thy whole family," that is, of the Christian people. - But the faithful concur specially in the Sacrifice when they promote it in a special manner, for example by ministering, or assisting, and most of all by giving a stipend.⁴²⁶

Article II

On the Value and Fruit of the Sacrifice of the Mass

1590. "VALUE is that efficacy which the Mass has from the dignity of the one offering and of the thing offered, for conferring goods on the one offering and on those for whom it is offered. But the FRUITS are the goods themselves which, in view of the Sacrifice, God confers. Whence value differs from fruit as cause from effect."⁴²⁷

The fruits or effects of the Mass are distinguished from a threefold head: 1. on the part of the thing; 2. on the part of the cause; 3. on the part of those participating.⁴²⁸

1591. I. On the part of the THING, the EFFECT of the Mass is fourfold: namely adoration and thanksgiving in relation to God; remission both of sins and of punishments, and impetration of goods in relation to men. It is clear from the definition of the Church in Trent, sess. 22, can. 3, where it is said thus: "If anyone has said that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice accomplished on the cross, and not propitiatory; or that it profits only the one consuming, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema" (cf. n. 1599).

Moreover, concerning the effects of the Mass, or concerning the fruits in relation to men, let the following be noted: 1. Remission of sins, whether mortal or venial, is not made immediately through the Sacrifice of the Mass, but only mediately, insofar namely as "God is immediately placated in view of this Sacrifice, and then is moved to conceding the gift of penance, through which sins are immediately deleted."⁴²⁹ 2. Remission of punishments is conceded immediately to just men for whom the Sacrifice is offered. For the Tridentine Synod teaches that "the souls detained in Purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, and especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the altar." But the dead cannot be helped in another way than by immediate remission of punishments.⁴³⁰ 3. The impetration of goods regards especially spiritual goods: actual graces are immediately obtained for performing acts by which habitual grace increases. Secondly temporal goods are obtained, insofar as these profit the soul.⁴³¹

It is asked: Whether the Sacrifice of the Mass produces its effects INFALLIBLY?

Resp. Affirmatively, unless there is an obstacle in the subject. But it works according to the measure of the good disposition which is in the man; or, if it concerns a Mass for the dead, according to an ordination of divine Wisdom unknown to us.

1592. II. On the part of the CAUSE, a twofold FRUIT is distinguished: namely *ex opere operato*, and *ex opere operantis*. The fruit *ex opere OPERATO* is that which is conferred in view of the merits of Christ: it is the principal fruit, independent of the probity of the celebrant, and it is conceded equally whether the Mass is celebrated by a good or by a bad priest. And the same must be held concerning the prayers which are said in the Mass: they avail, although they are said by a priest who is a sinner; for he prays in the name of the Church, which is always pleasing to God. The fruit *ex opere OPERANTIS* is that which is conferred in view of the merit and devotion of the celebrant: it is an accidental fruit, and is greater or lesser according to the holiness of the celebrant. Hence Pope Alexander says: "The more worthy priests have been, the more easily they are heard for those for whom they cry out."⁴³²

⁴²⁵Cf. Trent, sess. 23, c. 1.

⁴²⁶Book VI, 307; *Op. in Trid.*, sess. 22, n. 18; cf. Lacroix, L. VI, p. 2, n. 23.

⁴²⁷Book VI, 312, note 1; cf. Lancicius, opusc. 13, L. 2, c. 9 and 10; Lugo, Disp. 19, sect. 9.

⁴²⁸Book VI, 312, note 2.

⁴²⁹Ibid., 311, 1.

⁴³⁰Ibid., 2.

⁴³¹Book VI, 311, 3, 4.

⁴³²Ibid., 312, note 2, and near the end.

1593. III. On the part of those PARTICIPATING, a fourfold FRUIT is had, namely: most general, general, special, and most special.

1. The most general fruit, called general by others, is that of which all the faithful, both living and dead, somehow become participants. For since the minister, in any Sacrifice whatever, acts in the name of the Church, the Sacrifice profits the whole Church.
2. The general fruit, included by others under the special, is that which falls to the faithful who assist at the Sacrifice, or concur in it by ministering vestments, lights, hosts, etc. This fruit does not depend on the intention of the celebrant, but on the devotion of the faithful, who by their own peculiar work become, in a certain way, offerers.
3. The special or ministerial fruit is that which falls to those to whom the Mass is applied. This is ordinarily intended where speech is made simply of the fruit of the Mass.
4. The most special fruit is that which falls to the priest alone celebrating, and it is altogether proper to him.⁴³³

1594. It is asked: Whether the Sacrifice of the Mass has INFINITE value?

Preliminary note. It is certain that the Sacrifice of the Mass in itself, and with respect to sufficiency, is of infinite value, by reason of the infinite dignity of Christ, who in this Sacrifice is victim and principal offerer.

But the question is whether the Mass, even from the institution of Christ, has infinite efficacy or virtue of working?

Resp. A twofold opinion is present. - The first, probable, denies, and teaches that the Sacrifice was instituted by Christ in such a way that it produces a determined effect, namely so that, applied for several, it profits each less than if it were applied for only one. It is proved from the prohibition of the Church, which forbids that satisfaction be made by one Sacrifice for several asking for Mass. But the second opinion, more probable, affirms, and holds that the VIRTUE of the Sacrifice of the Mass is infinite both intensively and extensively. It is called intensively infinite insofar as it can cause a greater and lesser fruit according to the measure of the disposition of the man; but extensively insofar as it can produce infinite effects, and profit one alone and infinite men in this way. But with respect to EFFECT, the Sacrifice of the Mass is said to be finite, not now from its institution, but from the finite capacity of men for whom it is offered. The reason of this opinion is that the Sacrifice of the Mass is the same, although offered in a diverse manner, as the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was of infinite value. Whence, according to this opinion, the Mass profits equally when applied for several as if it is applied for one. But the prayers of the Mass instituted by the Church profit someone more if they are applied to him singly than if by the priest to several: as is evident from the Council of Constance, where this article of Wyclif was condemned: "Special prayers applied to one person by prelates or religious do not profit the same more than general prayers, other things being equal."⁴³⁴

1595. Let it be noted for practice: 1. However much this second opinion seems true, nevertheless it is not licit by one Mass to satisfy several stipends; for the stipend is not given as the price of the fruit of the Mass, but for the support of the minister; whence, since he already has support from one stipend, the title fails why he should receive another. The same is evident from proposition 10 condemned by Alexander VII: "It is not against justice to accept a stipend for several Sacrifices, and to offer one Sacrifice."⁴³⁵

2. The probability of the first opinion standing, the priest cannot, for a certain stipend, apply an uncertain fruit of the Mass. Yet, the Mass having been applied for him who gave the stipend, he can apply it at the same time for himself, or from charity for others, not indeed absolutely, but under condition: namely with the right of him preserved for whom he is held to apply the Mass⁴³⁶ (cf. n. 1601, q. 10).

Article III

On the Application of the Sacrifice of the Mass

1596. APPLICATION is the intention of the mind by which the priest designates the person whom he wishes to become participant in the fruit of the Sacrifice. Concerning this application THREE things are asked: 1. whether it is required, so that the Sacrifice may profit the faithful; 2. what sort it ought to be; 3. for whom it can be made. Hence the following:

⁴³³Ibid., note 2; cf. Benedict XIV, *De Missae Sacrific.*, L. 3, c. 21.

⁴³⁴Book V, 312, *Hic autem*.

⁴³⁵Ibid., *Nec obstat*, 1.

⁴³⁶Ibid., n. 336, end.

1597. Principles. I. That the special fruit of the Mass fall to him for whom it is offered, the application of the celebrant is NECESSARY. - The reason is that this fruit, proceeding from the Sacrifice insofar as it is the action of Christ, is strictly owed to no one; therefore, unless it is specially applied, it comes to no one.⁴³⁷

It is said 1. that the special fruit of the Mass; for the most general and general fruit, as also the most special, does not require application, since the faithful and the priest, insofar as they are offerers, certainly always perceive it.⁴³⁸

It is said 2. the application of the celebrant is necessary. For application is altogether proper to the celebrant, because it is an act of the power of Order. "Whence, if a Religious applies a Mass against the will of the Superior, he indeed applies illicitly, but validly; because the subject, with respect to the power of Order which he then uses, does not lie under the Prelate."⁴³⁹

It is asked: Whether the priest can apply the MOST SPECIAL fruit to others?

Resp. It is controverted, but authors more commonly deny. Therefore, since the application of this fruit is very uncertain, the following proposition was deservedly condemned by Alexander VII: "A doubled stipend can licitly be accepted by a priest for the same Mass, by applying to the one asking a part even of the most special fruit corresponding to the celebrant himself, and this after the decree of Urban VIII."⁴⁴⁰

1598. II. That application of the Mass be valid, it ought to be made before consecration, through an INTENTION at least habitual, and in some way determined. Thus commonly. - Therefore THREE CONDITIONS are required, namely:

1. It ought to be made before consecration, at least of the second species, lest it be exposed to danger of nullity; because the Sacrifice produces its effect while it is being completed, nor is that effect suspended.⁴⁴¹ But it is probable that the Sacrifice is completed by consecration alone, as we said above (n. 1589, q. 1).
2. An intention at least habitual is required; for just as interpretative intention does not suffice, so neither is actual or virtual required, but habitual suffices, that is, had and not revoked. "The reason is that application of Mass has itself after the manner of a verbal donation, which, once made, is valid until it is expressly revoked."⁴⁴² Here it can be asked: what application is to be judged valid if the priest, unmindful of the prior intention, elicits a new one? Resp. That one which is recognized as predominant. Therefore if the prior application was more universal and revocatory of the later, it is valid. If each were equal, the later would prevail, as happens in a testament. In doubt, it suffices that the priest on another occasion apply the Sacrifice to him to whom it was not applied the first time. For it is certain that one or the other application was valid.⁴⁴³
3. A determined intention is required, at least implicitly; for otherwise there would not be a reason why the fruit would fall to one rather than to another. But implicit determination suffices, because this, by some general term, already reaches persons in particular.

1599. Hence: 1. The application is valid if you say: "I offer this Sacrifice for him who gave the stipend"; "for whom the Superior wishes the Mass to be made"; "for whom the foundation requires"; "for the greatest sinner"; "for the soul afflicted by the graver temptation"; "for the soul of Purgatory more deserted than the rest, or more pleasing to God"; "for all the souls of Purgatory"; "for him to whom I am held to apply"; "for the person, or intention written or determined in the mind, at the beginning of the week," etc. - On the contrary, that application is not valid: "I offer that God, or the Blessed Virgin Mary, may apply, or may wish to apply, this Mass"; the reason is that, from the institution of Christ, it belongs to the priest, not to God or the Blessed Virgin Mary, to apply or determine the Sacrifice.⁴⁴⁴

2. If someone accepts a stipend from ten persons for as many Masses, he does not seem to satisfy by applying individual Sacrifices for individuals indeterminately. But if he intended to apply each Mass to all those ten persons, by applying to each one the tenth part of each Mass, he satisfies well; because the fruit is divisible.⁴⁴⁵
3. If stipends have been received confusedly from diverse persons, the application is sufficiently determined if it is made according to the order in which the stipends were accepted, according to the axiom: "he who is prior in time

⁴³⁷Cf. Const. *Auctorem Fidei*, where proposition 30 of the Synod of Pistoia, which denies this doctrine, is condemned.

⁴³⁸Cf. Lugo, *De Euch.*, Disp. 19, n. 230.

⁴³⁹H. A., XV, 79; Book VI, 334.

⁴⁴⁰Book VI, 318, *Hic autem*.

⁴⁴¹Book VI, 335.

⁴⁴²*Ibid.*, q. 1.

⁴⁴³Lugo, *De Sacram. i. g.*, disp. 8, n. 124.

⁴⁴⁴Cf. Sporer, pars 2, c. 4, n. 279.

⁴⁴⁵Book VI, 335, q. 2.

is stronger in right.” Whence, if you have accepted twenty stipends in this way, no other care is incumbent upon you, except that you make Mass twenty times, to the intention of the giver. Yet interruption can intervene, provided the Masses are celebrated within the due time.

4. Application under a condition already fulfilled is valid, for example: if Peter is dead, I apply for his soul; but not under a future contingent condition, for example: I apply to him for whom Titius, when asked, shall have wished.⁴⁴⁶

It is asked: Whether application to the intention of him who is going to offer the first stipend is valid?

Resp. Such application is certainly illicit, from the prohibition of Clement VIII, which Paul V promulgated on November 15, 1605, forbidding this custom “as dangerous under several names, liable to scandals of the faithful, and excessively aberrant from the ancient custom of the Church.” Indeed, not rarely it would be invalid, for example if afterwards a stipend were offered for liberation from an illness, etc., which did not yet exist while the Mass was being applied; for, that this application be valid, the fruit of the Sacrifice would have to remain suspended until the existence of the illness, which does not seem credible. Nevertheless, if the priest foresees that shortly Masses are going to be requested from him for a deceased person, he can apply them meanwhile, and afterwards receive the stipends; because in this case they are already offered for a determined person.⁴⁴⁷

1600. III. The Sacrifice of the Mass can be offered both for the faithful LIVING, whether just or sinners, and for the DEAD in Christ and not yet fully purged. Thus Trent.⁴⁴⁸ - It is said: for the dead in Christ not yet fully purged; for it can be offered neither licitly nor validly for the damned, who are irrevocably separated from the Body of Christ. And the same must be said of children dead without Baptism, because these also have been constituted in an immutable state.⁴⁴⁹ But neither can it be offered for the Blessed, since they have already attained the end to which the fruits of the Mass are ordained. Yet it is licit to celebrate Masses in their honor, namely to this end, that thanks may be paid for the benefits which have been conferred on them by God, and that their patronage may be implored, or in other words, that they may deign to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we keep on earth.⁴⁵⁰

As regards the living, Mass, by reason of itself and with respect to valid application, can be offered for all human beings, no otherwise than the Sacrifice of the Cross was offered for all. But if it ought not to be applied for some, this must be referred solely to the prohibition of the Church. Wherefore let there be the following:

1601. Questions. Q. 1. Whether it is licit to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass for the EXCOMMUNICATED?

Resp. Distinguish. 1. It is not licit for excommunicated persons to be avoided. Yet licitly “a priest can offer the action of sacrificing, insofar as it depends on the private merit of the one operating, for such an excommunicated person, or remember him in particular in the Memento.”⁴⁵¹

2. It is licit for tolerated excommunicated persons, according to the more probable opinion. “The reason is that favorable laws are to be understood with every breadth. Therefore when it was conceded to the faithful to communicate with the tolerated, it was also conceded to offer public prayers for them; for to communicate imports this also, as is had from cap. 28 and cap. 38, *de sent. excomm.*”⁴⁵² - And these things are valid both for the living and for the dead.

Q. 2. Whether the Sacrifice of the Mass can be offered for INFIDELS, HERETICS, and SCHISMATICS?

Resp. 1. For these LIVING persons, especially for their conversion, it can be offered; for they are capable of at least impetratory fruits, and the certain prohibition of the Church extends itself only to excommunicated persons to be avoided, among whom the aforesaid are not to be numbered. It was requested: “Whether it is licit for priests to celebrate Mass for the intention of Turks and other Infidels, and to accept alms from them for the application of the Mass? - And the S. C. S. OFF. responded, July 12, 1865:” Affirmatively, provided scandal is not present, and nothing is specially added in the Mass, and, with respect to the intention, it is clear that nothing evil, or of error, or of superstition underlies in the Infidels bringing the alms.”⁴⁵³

Resp. 2. But indeed it is not licit publicly or solemnly to celebrate Mass for these same DEAD persons, even if the condition were added: if perhaps they died in good faith in only material heresy. “For these more secret mysteries of divine grace by

⁴⁴⁶Book VI, 337.

⁴⁴⁷Ibid., 337.

⁴⁴⁸Sess. 22, c. 2.

⁴⁴⁹Cf. *Collectan. S. Sed.*, n. 374.

⁴⁵⁰Salmant., tract. 5, c. 2, n. 25; Trent, sess. 22, c. 3.

⁴⁵¹Book VII, 162; VI, 308.

⁴⁵²Book VII, 164; VI, 309.

⁴⁵³*Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 371.

no means pertain to the external judgment of the Church.”⁴⁵⁴ And the general rule is that to those to whom ecclesiastical burial has had to be denied, other public suffrages of the Church are also denied. But it is licit privately to pray for them under the Memento of the dead in solemn Mass, or even secretly to apply the Mass of the day, not of Requiem, provided scandal is avoided. Thus, for example, a priest to whom a stipend for some heretic in particular is offered will be able to respond that he can apply the Mass of Requiem for all the faithful departed, with the intention of helping also the soul of that deceased person, if this is accepted before God.

Q. 3. Whether it is licit to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass for the FAITHFUL who died in the act of sin?

Resp. Affirmatively; nevertheless, if ecclesiastical burial is to be denied to someone, Mass ought not to be celebrated publicly, that is, with the people knowing, for him. - Recall the things said at n. 1387.

Q. 4. Whether the Mass profits the DEAD from the infallible promise of Christ?

Resp. Some deny; but others more truly and more commonly affirm. The reason is that, since it is of faith from Trent that Mass is usefully offered for the dead, this cannot happen except *ex opere operato*, that is, from the promise of Christ, which indeed is had in those words: “This is my Blood of the new Testament, which will be poured out for many unto remission of sins.”⁴⁵⁵

Q. 5. Whether a Mass OF REQUIEM profits the dead more than a Mass of the Saints?

St. Thomas responds:⁴⁵⁶ “On the part of the Sacrifice offered, it profits the deceased equally, of whatever Mass it is said; but on the part of the prayers, that one profits more in which there are prayers determined for this; yet this defect can be recompensed through the greater devotion either of him who says the Mass, or of him who orders it to be said, or again through the intercession of the Saint whose suffrage is implored in the Mass.”

Q. 6. Whether, on the day of the Commemoration of all the faithful departed, Mass can be applied for SOME particular deceased person?

Resp. Affirmatively, from the decrees of the S. R. C. on August 4, 1663, and September 2, 1741,⁴⁵⁷ where it was said that on that day “Sacrifices can be applied at will by priests celebrating, namely either for all the faithful departed, or for some only.” Wherefore nothing prevents a stipend from being accepted for that Mass.⁴⁵⁸

Q. 7. Whether one celebrating satisfies by a Mass OF REQUIEM to the intention of the giver, if what this is is wholly unknown?

Resp. Affirmatively, according to the declaration of the S. R. C. on November 29, 1856.⁴⁵⁹ Hence it is concluded that a Mass of Requiem is validly applied for a living person; which also will be done licitly if a sufficient reason accedes, for example if other vestments are not had.

Q. 8. Whether a priest satisfies if, thinking him for whom he ought to celebrate as dead to be now dead, he celebrates for him while still living?

Resp. Negatively; because the error is essential. For each person, while he lives, can provide for his soul in various ways, for example by gaining indulgences, etc.; not likewise after death.⁴⁶⁰

Q. 9. Whether the fruits of the Mass can be DIVIDED, so that the impetratory fruit is applied to one, the satisfactory fruit to another?

Resp. Affirmatively, according to the common opinion of the Doctors. Therefore in gratuitous Masses, the priest can divide the fruits at will. In Masses owed from obedience or fidelity, he can do this for that part of the fruit which he is not held to apply. Hence, for example, if a Mass is to be celebrated for thanksgiving, he can apply the satisfactory and impetratory fruit at will. But in Masses owed from stipend, this is not licit, since the whole applicable fruit is owed to the one giving the alms.⁴⁶¹

Q. 10. What if the application is made TO NO ONE, or to one INCAPABLE?

⁴⁵⁴Gregory XVI, in Letter to the Abbot in Scheyern in Bavaria, February 16, 1842.

⁴⁵⁵Book VI, 310, request 1.

⁴⁵⁶Suppl., q. 71, a. 9, ad 5.

⁴⁵⁷Gardellini, n. 2241, ad 9, and n. 4119, ad 4.

⁴⁵⁸Book VI, 338.

⁴⁵⁹Cf. Schober, p. 288, n. 6, where the text of the decree is had.

⁴⁶⁰Book VI, 337, 5.

⁴⁶¹Sporer, p. 2, c. 4, n. 292 seqq.

Resp. The fruit, in this case, remains in the treasury of the Church. "But in practice, when it is doubted whether he for whom we offer is capable of the fruit or not, in gratuitous Masses it is advised to apply them either to ourselves, or to another under condition: if the person to whom they are applied is not capable. But in Masses owed from stipend, because probably the fruit falls to the benefit of the relatives of the one offering, from his implicit will, therefore then we cannot apply the fruit to whomever we wish, except under condition, lest prejudice be done to him to whom the obligation of applying is present."⁴⁶²

NB. Concerning Mass celebrated ON A PRIVILEGED ALTAR, see below, n. 1743.

Chapter II

On the Celebration of the Sacrifice of the Mass

We shall deal, in a twofold article, with the celebration of Mass, and we shall treat: 1. concerning the obligation of celebrating; 2. concerning the things required for celebrating rightly.

Article I

On the Obligation of Celebrating

The obligation of celebrating can arise from various titles, of which three are commonly numbered, namely: 1. the priesthood itself; 2. the office committed to the priest; 3. the stipend accepted from the faithful. Now concerning each, several things.

§ 1. On the Obligation of Celebrating by Reason of the Priesthood 1602. Christ "commanded His Apostles and their successors in the priesthood that they should offer, by these words: Do this in commemoration of me, as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught."⁴⁶³ Therefore it is of faith that a precept of sometimes celebrating was imposed by Christ on the universal priestly Order.⁴⁶⁴ But whether this precept extends itself also to individual priests is disputed among the Doctors. Wherefore let there be the following:

1603. Questions. Q. 1. Whether individual priests, by reason of the Order received, and independently of any other title whatever, are held UNDER GRAVE obligation sometimes to celebrate?

Resp. 1. Some deny, scandal being excluded, which nevertheless they say is easily had if a priest abstains from celebrating for a long time, say for six or eight months. Wherefore, at least by reason of this danger, that opinion must scarcely be called practically probable.

Resp. 2. The far more common and more probable opinion affirms that individuals are held both by divine law and by ecclesiastical law. - The DIVINE precept is gathered from the words of Christ: Do this, etc., since no probable reason is present for restricting the precept to the priestly Order in general. Likewise from the words of the Apostle: "For every Pontiff... is appointed... that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." But the ECCLESIASTICAL precept is proved from cap. *Dolentes* 9, *de celebr. Miss.*, where Innocent III vehemently reprehends priests "who scarcely celebrate the solemnities of Masses four times in the year."⁴⁶⁵ St. Thomas gives the reason of this opinion, saying:⁴⁶⁶ "Each one is held to use the grace given to him, when it has been opportune, according to that (2 Cor. 6): We exhort you that you not receive the grace of God in vain. But the opportunity of offering Sacrifice is attended not only by comparison to the faithful of Christ, to whom it is necessary to minister the Sacraments, but principally by comparison to God, to whom, by the consecration of this Sacrament, Sacrifice is offered. Whence to a priest, even if he does not have care of souls, it is not licit altogether to cease from celebration."

Q. 2. How often IN THE YEAR is each priest held to celebrate?

Resp. 1. Under grave obligation each one is held to celebrate only three or four times in the year, namely on the more solemn Feasts, as the far more common opinion affirms. - Indeed, many say that it suffices if the priest celebrates three or four times in the year, on any days whatever, provided due distance is observed, so that he does not abstain beyond six

⁴⁶²Book VI, 336.

⁴⁶³Trent, sess. 22, c. 1.

⁴⁶⁴Ibid., can. 2.

⁴⁶⁵Book VI, 313, doubt 1.

⁴⁶⁶3 p., q. 82, a. 10.

or eight months. And this opinion is conformable to the decree of the S. C. Conc., issued in the month of November 1696, where it is said: "One who, without a just cause, has not celebrated three or four times in the year, sins mortally, and can be punished by the Bishop."⁴⁶⁷

Yet others require more, and say that all priests are obligated to celebrating on individual Sundays and Feasts, especially the more solemn. But on account of the mere probability of this opinion, a strict precept cannot be asserted.

Resp. 2. Under light obligation priests are held to celebrate MORE OFTEN; as is gathered from these words of Trent: "Let Bishops care that these, that is, priests, celebrate Mass at least on Sundays and the more solemn feasts." Wherefore, says St. Alphonsus, "I would not know how to excuse from light fault that priest who could celebrate daily, with one day of the week excepted on account of reverence, and without any just cause, but only on account of sloth, abstained from celebrating. For the priest celebrates not only for himself, but also for the good of the whole Church and of the Christian people, whose minister and intercessor he has been constituted, according to that of the Apostle: Every Pontiff, etc."⁴⁶⁸

Let the words of the Seraphic Doctor be carefully weighed by the priest, especially by the scrupulous one: "The priest who DOES NOT CELEBRATE," he says, "as much as is in him, deprives the Trinity of praise and glory, Angels of joy, sinners of pardon, the just of help and grace, those existing in Purgatory of refreshment, the Church of Christ of spiritual benefit, and himself of medicine and remedy against daily sins and infirmities."⁴⁶⁹

§ 2. On the Obligation of Celebrating by Reason of Office By reason of the office which they have undertaken, all Pastors of souls are held not only to celebrate Mass, but also sometimes to apply it for the people. - That this twofold obligation may become better known, let there be the following:

1604. Principles. I. All pastors of souls are held, and indeed under grave obligation, to CELEBRATE Mass on individual Sundays and feasts of precept. - For the obligations of the people and of the pastor are correlative; whence on those days on which the people are held to hear Mass, on the same days the pastor also is held to celebrate it, as is had from Trent, saying: "But if they have care of souls, let them celebrate Masses as frequently as they may satisfy their office."⁴⁷⁰ But if someone is legitimately impeded, he is held to supply through another, lest the people lack Mass.⁴⁷¹ By accident, the pastor is held to celebrate also on days other than the aforesaid, for example if the necessity of consecrating urges for ministering Viaticum; likewise if, on the occasion of the nuptial blessing or of funerals, the faithful reasonably ask. For the Ritual itself insinuates that these be performed with Mass accompanying. Nor, however, is he held to apply the fruit of the Sacrifice, unless he accepts a stipend. Thus the Holy Office, September 1, 1841.

1605. II. All pastors of souls, similarly, under grave obligation, are held to APPLY Mass FOR the people on individual Sundays and feasts of precept. - This is clear from Trent,⁴⁷² saying: "Since by divine precept it has been commanded to all to whom care of souls has been committed, to know their sheep, to offer Sacrifice for them, etc." Therefore the obligation of celebrating for the people is OF DIVINE LAW, according to that John 21:17, Feed my sheep; but the Church has defined more accurately to whom this obligation extends itself, on what days it urges, and how it is to be fulfilled. These things must now be investigated singly.

1606. Questions. Q. 1. WHO are the PASTORS of souls upon whom the obligation of applying for the people is incumbent?

Resp. 1. They are: 1. Bishops, after possession of the See has been obtained,⁴⁷³ administrators, or others marked by whatever title, who actually preside over a canonically erected diocese. Nor indeed are Capitular Vicars, the See being vacant,⁴⁷⁴ or Vicars General held to this. - 2. Abbots having quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over clergy and over people with a separate territory.⁴⁷⁵ - 3. Pastors, whether secular or regular; whether removable or irremovable; whether they have suitable support or do not have it; although immemorial custom to the contrary were present, as Benedict XIV declared.⁴⁷⁶ 4. All those functioning in place of a pastor, such as both vicars-curate, to whom care of souls is so committed that habitual care remains with another, for example at Rome in St. Mary Major with the Chapter; and vice-pastors, or vicars, who, the

⁴⁶⁷Book VI, 313, doubt 2.

⁴⁶⁸Book VI, 359, *Dub. deinde*.

⁴⁶⁹Opusc. *De praeeparat. ad Missam*, cap. 5.

⁴⁷⁰Sess. 23, cap. 14, *de Ref*.

⁴⁷¹Book VI, 326.

⁴⁷²Sess. 23, cap. 1, *de Ref*.

⁴⁷³S. R. C., November 12, 1831, *Marsorum*; cf. Gardellini, n. 4669, ad 22.

⁴⁷⁴Gardellini, *ibid.*, ad 23.

⁴⁷⁵S. C. de Prop. Fid., February 5, 1803, apud Lucidi, vol. I, p. 454, cap. 3, n. 367; cf. Leo XIII, *Encycl. In suprema*, June 10, 1882, *Acta S. Sed.*, XIV, 529.

⁴⁷⁶Bull *Cum semper*, August 19, 1744.

parish being vacant, are deputed to preside over it.⁴⁷⁷ But if someone has two distinct parishes,⁴⁷⁸ or if a Bishop exercises the office of pastor, he is held to apply a twofold Mass.⁴⁷⁹ Otherwise, however, if a Bishop rules two dioceses.

Resp. 2. Immune from this burden are priests who have only secondary or subsidiary care, as chaplains or cooperators of the pastor,⁴⁸⁰ chaplains of Nuns,⁴⁸¹ chaplains of hospitals, colleges, and other places of this kind.⁴⁸² Likewise, titular Bishops are not bound by this law; nor Apostolic Vicars or missionaries, “provided it does not concern places in which episcopal Sees and parishes have already been canonically erected, and to which the Apostolic Vicar and missionaries have been sent to perform the functions of legitimate pastors.” Thus the S. C. de Prop. Fide, March 23, 1863.⁴⁸³

Q. 2. Which are the FEAST DAYS on which pastors of souls are held to apply for the people?

Resp. They are all those which are numbered in the list of Urban VIII (cf. n. 654, q. 3),⁴⁸⁴ as is clear from the Constitution *Amantissimi Redemptoris*,⁴⁸⁵ in which Pius IX brings forward these things: “By these letters we declare, establish, and decree that pastors and all others actually exercising care of souls ought to celebrate and apply the sacrosanct Sacrifice of the Mass for the people committed to them, both on all Sundays and other days which are still observed from precept, and also on those which, from the indulgence of this Apostolic See, have been removed and transferred from the number of feast days of precept, just as the curators of souls themselves were bound when the mentioned Constitution of Urban VIII flourished in its full vigor, before feast days of precept were diminished and transferred.... This one thing we except, namely that when the divine Office has been transferred together with the solemnity to Sunday, only one Mass for the people is to be applied by the pastor.”⁴⁸⁶ Likewise, satisfaction is made by one Mass if the feast falls on a Sunday.

It is said Office together with the solemnity; for, if the solemnity alone is transferred, for example according to the privilege conceded to France and Belgium with respect to the feasts of Epiphany, Corpus Christi, Saints Peter and Paul, and the Patron of the place, and in several dioceses also with respect to the feasts of the Purification, Annunciation, Nativity, and Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mass for the people ought to be applied on the very day on which the Offices of the aforesaid Feasts are commonly recited in the Church, as is clear from various decisions of the S. C. of the Council.⁴⁸⁷

Q. 3. HOW must the obligation of celebrating for the people be satisfied?

Resp. Pastors of souls are held to fulfill this obligation:

1. On the established days, unless legitimate dispensation has intervened. In the Bull *Cum semper*, Benedict XIV conceded to Bishops the faculty of dispensing with pastors laboring under grave poverty, that on feast days they can apply for those giving a stipend to them, yet with the burden of celebrating on another day for the people. - But for a broader Indult, if grave reasons are present, recourse must be had to the S. Congregation OF THE COUNCIL.⁴⁸⁸
2. In the established place, namely in the parochial church, as is clear from various declarations of the S. C. of the Council.⁴⁸⁹ Nevertheless it has been declared:⁴⁹⁰ “A pastor legitimately absent on a feast day satisfies his obligation by applying Mass for his people in the place where he is staying; provided that another priest celebrates in the parochial church for the necessary convenience of the people, and explains the word of God.” Nor indeed is it required that a solemn Mass be applied; a private Mass suffices.⁴⁹¹
3. Through themselves; because it is a personal obligation, as the S. C. C. declared on September 25, 1847, in Mechlinien., doubt 4.⁴⁹² Therefore contrary custom cannot, but only a canonical cause can, furnish a sufficient reason that they may be able to celebrate through another. But a canonical cause is judged to be: 1. grave infirmity; 2.

⁴⁷⁷Cf. Schober, appendix 2, cap. 2.

⁴⁷⁸Ibid., cap. 5; S. C. C., May 9, 1874; cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, VIII, 33.

⁴⁷⁹S. C. de Prop. Fide, March 23, 1863, apud Lucidi, vol. I, p. 453, cap. 3, n. 364, ad 8.

⁴⁸⁰S. R. C., June 14, 1845, ad 3, 1; Gardellini, n. 5014.

⁴⁸¹S. R. C., December 7, 1844, ad 4, n. 4988.

⁴⁸²S. C. C., June 2, 1860, apud Lucidi, vol. I, p. 450, cap. 3, n. 361.

⁴⁸³Cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 375, and Lucidi, vol. I, p. 451, cap. 3, n. 363.

⁴⁸⁴Benedict XIV, Const. *Cum semper*.

⁴⁸⁵May 3, 1858.

⁴⁸⁶Thus in several dioceses of Germany the feasts of the Assumption and Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary are transferred.

⁴⁸⁷Cf. Gury, II, n. 365-366.

⁴⁸⁸Cf. Muller, III, § 21.

⁴⁸⁹March 12, 1774, apud Lucidi, I, p. 449, n. 357.

⁴⁹⁰December 14, 1872; *Thesaur. Resol.*, tom. 131, Num. I; cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, VII, 191.

⁴⁹¹S. R. C., February 27, 1847; Gardellini, n. 5079, ad 4.

⁴⁹²Cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. XIV, 335; cf. Book VI, 326, *Postquam*.

legitimate absence; 3. obligation of singing the conventual Mass;⁴⁹³ 4. dispensation of the Superior. - But the celebration of a funeral Mass, although the corpse is present, is not a sufficient cause which can exempt from the personal burden.⁴⁹⁴ Yet for suppressed feasts, of which no solemnity remains among the people, particular Indults are sometimes conceded, by force of which it is licit to remit the parochial Mass to the following day, if obsequies occur with the body present, or buried the day before, the blessing of spouses, etc.⁴⁹⁵

4. Those legitimately impeded are held to celebrate through others, because the obligation is not only personal, but at the same time real.⁴⁹⁶ Wherefore the S. C. C. declared: "A pastor in any way legitimately impeded from celebrating Mass is held to have it celebrated on a feast day through another, and applied for the people, in the parochial church; but if this has not been done, as soon as he can, he ought to apply Mass for the people."⁴⁹⁷

§ 3. On the Obligation of Celebrating by Reason of Stipend 1607. The STIPEND of a Mass is called the alms which the faithful bestow on priests, that the Sacrifice may be offered to God for them or to their intention.

By reason of stipend, Masses are distinguished into adventitious and founded. ADVENTITIOUS or manual Masses are called those which, by reason of an offered stipend, are to be celebrated in a determined number. FOUNDED Masses are called those which, in perpetuity or at least for a long time, daily or on certain days, are to be celebrated and applied, by reason of a foundation, that is, of a good left to some ecclesiastical Institute with the burden that Masses be celebrated. Therefore the fruit of the foundation has the nature of a stipend.

These things having been premised, we shall speak: 1. concerning the liceity of a stipend; 2. concerning the office of one accepting a stipend; 3. concerning reduction and condonation of Masses.

I. On the Liceity of a Stipend 1608. Principle. It is licit for any priest, even a rich one, to accept a JUST STIPEND for celebrating Mass. - St. Thomas brings forward the reason, saying: "The priest does not accept money as the price of consecration, but as the stipend of his support."⁴⁹⁸ And because even the rich are worthy of reward when they place some work worthy of price, it follows also that rich priests licitly exact a stipend.⁴⁹⁹

Hence, more probably, a priest who intends to offer principally on account of the stipend is not infected with the stain of simony, although he is not easily excused from venial sin, because the temporal thing is then accepted not as the price of the thing, but for the stipend of support.⁵⁰⁰

1609. Questions. Q. 1. What stipend is to be had as JUST?

Resp. "The just stipend of a Mass is not indeed the sustenance of one day, as some have said; for the priest, besides the action of sacrificing, can occupy himself in the rest of the day in preaching, teaching, and similar exercises, so that he may gain entire support; but it is that which has been fixed by the Bishop, or by custom, or at least by a prudent man, if a tax made by custom or by the Bishop is lacking."⁵⁰¹ And this opinion is common and to be held from the declaration of the S. C. of the Council.⁵⁰² - "Wherefore Roncaglia rightly says that if a testator left Masses to be celebrated, without the alms having been fixed, they are to be celebrated according to the common tax, or are to be taxed according to the custom of the place, as the S. C. C. also declared,⁵⁰³ with account taken of a rich or small inheritance."⁵⁰⁴

Q. 2. Whether REGULARS are held under grave obligation to stand by the Bishop's tax?

Resp. Affirmatively, according to the common opinion and from the decree of the S. C. of the Council,⁵⁰⁵ by which it was sanctioned thus: "The alms for any Mass whatever to be celebrated by Regulars in their churches is to be taxed by the judgment of the Ordinary, according to the custom of the region."⁵⁰⁶

⁴⁹³Benedict XIV, Const. *Cum semper*, § 27.

⁴⁹⁴S. C. C., January 26, 1771, in Fesulana; cf. *Thesaur. Resolut.*, tom. 40, p. 1.

⁴⁹⁵Cf. Schober, appendix 2, c. 3, n. 10.

⁴⁹⁶Book VI, 326.

⁴⁹⁷December 14, 1872.

⁴⁹⁸2.2, q. 100, a. 2, ad 2.

⁴⁹⁹H. A., XV, 59.

⁵⁰⁰Book III, 55, end.

⁵⁰¹Book VI, 319.

⁵⁰²November 25, 1698, apud Benedict XIV, Notif. 56, n. 10.

⁵⁰³November 23, 1697, ad 5, in Bull of Innocent XII *Nuper*.

⁵⁰⁴H. A., XV, 61; Book VI, 320.

⁵⁰⁵January 15, 1639, apud Benedict XIV, loc. cit., n. 10, end.

⁵⁰⁶Book VI, 320.

Q. 3. Whether it is licit for a priest to accept a stipend BELOW or ABOVE the tax?

Resp. 1. If only the law is considered, it is licit for a priest to obligate himself to celebrating Mass for a smaller alms, or below the tax; for anyone can yield his own right, and also celebrate without any stipend. But because remission of the customary alms can become damaging to other priests and in some way detract from the dignity of the Sacrifice itself, more probably it is licit for the Bishop to prohibit that an alms less than just be accepted, from the declaration of the S. C. of the Council.⁵⁰⁷ “Wherefore, in the case in which the Bishop prohibits it, priests are altogether held to obey him.” - Nevertheless, if someone knowingly has accepted smaller stipends, he ought to celebrate as many Masses as he promised, as the S. C. of the Council declared by order of Urban VIII in the year 1625;⁵⁰⁸ nor can he licitly diminish their number, unless he acted ignorantly, as authors rightly concede.⁵⁰⁹

Resp. 2. It is not licit for a priest to exact a stipend above the tax; for the Council of Trent commands Bishops that they altogether prohibit “importunate and ungenerous exactions of alms, rather than requests, and other things of this kind, which are not far from the simoniacal stain, or certainly from base gain.”⁵¹⁰ Yet he can receive more, both from the spontaneous liberality of the giver, and the Bishop has no power to prohibit this, as was decided by the S. C. of the Council;⁵¹¹ and from justice for extraordinary labor, for example for Mass to be celebrated at such an hour, or in such an inconvenient place. Whence requests are not illicit, indeed neither are agreements, provided they are just and moderate, and provided they are made without scandal.⁵¹²

Q. 4. Whether it is licit for one having faculty of celebrating twice in the day to accept a stipend for the second Mass?

Resp. Negatively, unless the Supreme Pontiff has indulged it.⁵¹³ It is clear from the Constitution *Quod expensis* of Benedict XIV, issued on August 26, 1748, and from various declarations of the S. C. of the Council.⁵¹⁴ But neither is it licit to accept anything for the celebration alone, with the application remaining free. But for peculiar labor, for example by reason of a journey to a distant church, it is permitted, from the prudent judgment of the Bishop, to perceive something.⁵¹⁵ - But under the aforesaid prohibition are not comprehended the three Masses which it is licit to celebrate on the solemnity of the Nativity of the Lord; for that repetition is conceded not from Indult, but from immemorial custom; whence it is licit to accept three stipends for three Masses.

But there are comprehended the two Masses which, from the concession of Benedict XIV, are permitted to be added in the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal on the day of the Commemoration of all the dead; unless somewhere another ancient privilege already existed.⁵¹⁶

II. On the Office of One Accepting a Stipend 1610. Principles. I. From acceptance of a stipend there arises an obligation OF STRICT JUSTICE to celebrate as many Masses as, by reason of the alms accepted, have been promised. - For, says Suarez, “there intervenes the true nature of justice, founded on mutual consent burdensome on both sides, which is explained by these words: I give that you may do; but this is a title of justice.”⁵¹⁷

It is said to celebrate as many Masses, etc., since this 10th proposition was condemned by Alexander VII: “It is not against justice to accept a stipend for several Sacrifices, and to offer one Sacrifice.” Moreover, the reason of the condemnation is both because the opinion which says that the Sacrifice is of finite value, both intensively and extensively, does not lack all probability; and because a stipend can be accepted only by the title of support; whence, one stipend having been accepted, the title for accepting another fails.

It is asked: Whether a priest OMITTING to celebrate a Mass owed either from stipend or from gratuitous promise sins gravely?

Resp. 1. He certainly sins gravely if the alms given is grave matter; and this is the unanimous opinion of authors. But according to the more probable opinion, he sins gravely also if the alms is only light matter. “The reason is that gravity

⁵⁰⁷January 16, 1649, apud Benedict XIV, loc. cit., n. 11, end.

⁵⁰⁸June 21, 1625; cf. *Bullar.*, tom. IX, p. 464.

⁵⁰⁹Book VI, 320, doubt 3; 1 *El. qq. ref.*, n. 67.

⁵¹⁰Sess. 22, decree *de observandis*...

⁵¹¹January 16, 1649, apud Benedict XIV, loc. cit., n. 11.

⁵¹²Book VI, 320, doubt 2 and 4.

⁵¹³Cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 382.

⁵¹⁴Cf. *Bullar. Bened. XIV*, tom. 2, n. LXI; and *Thesaur. resol.*, t. 117, p. 408; t. 121, p. 71.

⁵¹⁵In Treviren., S. C. C., March 23, 1861, apud *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. I, 13.

⁵¹⁶Cf. Benedict XIV, cited place, and *De Sacrif. Missae*, L. 3, c. 4, n. 11.

⁵¹⁷*De Sacrif. Missae*, disp. 86, sect. 1, n. 1.

of matter here is more probably to be measured not in order to the stipend, but to the fruit of the Mass, of which the one handing over the alms is deprived, to whom from privation of this kind grave damage certainly is brought.”⁵¹⁸

Resp. 2. If he omits a Mass promised gratis, it is disputed. Others say that he sins gravely, on account of the reason just brought forward. “But others probably deny, because simple promise does not oblige under grave sin unless the one promising expressly obligates himself under grave sin.... But all agree that he sins gravely who omits a Mass owed from vow, or from the precept of a Prelate: because no one can doubt that this is grave matter in a vow or precept”⁵¹⁹ (cf. n. 628 and 1062).

1611. II. The obligation of celebrating from the acceptance of a stipend can, a peculiar stipulation being excluded, be fulfilled THROUGH ANOTHER; yet under this law, that the WHOLE STIPEND be handed over to him. The reason of the first is that, such stipulation being excluded, the obligation is only real, whence it suffices that the thing owed be furnished. - The reason of the second is that the priest “although he acquires ownership of the alms, nevertheless acquires it according to the will of those who give the alms; and he who furnishes the alms asks not only for a Mass, but also wishes that it be celebrated for such an alms; for a greater stipend makes him perceive richer fruit from the Sacrifice; and therefore this intention enters into the substance of the contract; therefore if the priest retains part of the stipend, he unjustly retains it against the will of the giver.”⁵²⁰ - And hence it is why the Church strictly prohibits that a priest who has undertaken a Mass to be celebrated with a certain stipend commit the same Mass to another to be celebrated, with part of the stipend retained for himself. Thus from the Decree of the S. C. C. approved by Urban VIII and confirmed by Innocent XII. And this 9th proposition was condemned by Alexander VII: “After the decree of Urban, a priest to whom Masses to be celebrated are handed over can satisfy through another, with a smaller stipend conferred on him, another part of the stipend retained for himself.”⁵²¹

Hence: 1. A procurator or executor of a testament is to be condemned for shameful gain, who causes Masses committed to himself to be celebrated where there is a smaller tax, so that thus he may retain the excess for himself.⁵²² But an heir who, on account of an inheritance accepted, is held concerning Masses to be celebrated, can, if the place of celebration and the stipend have not been determined, commit them to any priests whatever to be celebrated.

2. He who, against the prohibition of the Church, retains part of a stipend for himself, not only sins, but is held to restitution. But this, according to the more common and more probable opinion, is to be made to the celebrant, “because, the burden having been transferred to him, the right also to the whole stipend is transferred according to the will of the lord.”⁵²³

1612. From the aforesaid prohibition, namely that nothing be subtracted from the stipend, a threefold CAUSE can excuse: namely the will of the one bestowing the alms, the spontaneous yielding of the one undertaking the burden of celebrating, and concession of the Holy See.

1. The will of the one bestowing the alms excuses: for he can at will exceed the customary tax, either with the intention that the whole stipend fall to the celebrant, or with the intention that the excess fall to the one receiving. Nor, however, is it required that the one giving the stipend expressly manifest this intention of his. It suffices that from circumstances his will be morally clear. Hence, if for adventitious Masses a greater stipend is given, not so much in view of the Mass as of friendship, poverty, gratitude, kinship, etc., the priest can retain the excess for himself and commit the celebration of the Mass to another.⁵²⁴

As regards founded Masses, one must distinguish: if the intention of the founders was only that Masses be celebrated, the whole stipend is to be handed over to the celebrant. Thus from a recent decree of the S. C. C., in the Cologne case, July 18, 1868.⁵²⁵ But if by their mind they also intended to render better the incomes of the pastor or chaplain, the excess can be retained. And the same must be said, as is evident, if besides the celebration of Mass, other offices are to be fulfilled.

With respect to beneficiaries,⁵²⁶ it has been declared in the Bull *Nuper* of Innocent XII: “it is enough that the rector of a benefice, who can celebrate Mass through another, give to the priest celebrating a suitable alms, according to the custom

⁵¹⁸Book VI, 317, q. 3; 1 *Elench. qq. ref.*, n. 67.

⁵¹⁹*Ibid.*, q. 4.

⁵²⁰*H. A.*, XV, 65.

⁵²¹Book VI, 321.

⁵²²*Ibid.*, 322, doubt 2.

⁵²³*Ibid.*, 322, doubt 1.

⁵²⁴Book VI, 321, see *Ab hac tamen*.

⁵²⁵*Apud Acta S. Sed.*, vol. IV, 39.

⁵²⁶Book VI, 321, see *Excip.*, 3.

of the city or province, unless something else has been provided in the foundation of the benefice.”⁵²⁷ - The same must be said of a removable chaplain, “provided certain revenues for the chaplaincy have been established annually, and assigned perpetually to the chaplain; otherwise, however, if a certain alms is given to a chaplain of this kind for each Mass to be celebrated.”⁵²⁸

2. The spontaneous and liberal yielding of the priest to whom the celebration is committed excuses; for just as he can remit the whole, so also a part. “Nevertheless, this is by no means to be admitted if you indicate the greater price accepted and ask the priest to remit it; or ask from him whether he consents that you retain a part; for then you cannot retain it, even if he agrees; for this in the Bull *Quanta cura* of Benedict XIV is asserted as an execrable abuse forbidden by several Pontiffs.”⁵²⁹
3. Concession of the Holy See excuses. For the Roman Pontiff, by the supreme authority in which he has power in the Church, can concede that some part of the alms, the circumstances of things suggesting it, be retained. A concession of this kind in favor of poor churches was made through the Decree of the S. C. of the Council confirmed by Innocent XII. But in this Decree⁵³⁰ it is read: “It is not to be permitted that churches and pious places, or their administrators, retain from the alms of Masses to be celebrated any portion, however minimal, by reason of the expenses which they undergo in the celebration of Masses, unless the churches and pious places have no other revenues which they can licitly expend for the use of the same expenses; and then what portion they will retain ought by no means to exceed the value of the expenses which necessarily must be undergone only for the very Sacrifice of the Mass; and nevertheless, even in that case, it must be cared for that from the monies which remain, expenses as above having been deducted, absolutely as many Masses be celebrated as had been prescribed by those offering the alms.”⁵³¹ See also the Decree of the S. C. C., April 24, 1875.⁵³²

It is asked: Whether it is licit to EXCHANGE Masses, without unequal stipends being exchanged?

Resp. Such an exchange, principally if it is made by reason of retaining the greater stipend, seems to involve shameful gain, and therefore seems also to be disapproved: yet not under grave sin, especially if poverty excuses.⁵³³

1613. III. To make gain from stipends of Masses which are transmitted to others is most severely prohibited. For such a manner of acting very greatly dishonors the dignity of the Holy Sacrifice, and is a cause why this most august Sacrifice is held as of less account among the faithful. Concerning this matter these things are to be noted:

1. They are subject to excommunication *latae sententiae* reserved to the Roman Pontiff who “collect alms of greater price for Masses, and seek profit from them by causing them to be celebrated in places where Mass stipends are customarily of lesser price.”⁵³⁴ These things have been more fully explained elsewhere (n. 1339).
2. The manner of acting of those booksellers or merchants savors of shameful trade, and therefore is to be disapproved and, if there is need, restrained even by ecclesiastical penalties by Bishops, who, public invitations and rewards being employed, or in any other way whatever, collect alms for Masses, and to priests to whom they commit them to be celebrated, pay not money, but books or other merchandise. Nor can this manner of acting be made honorable because the Masses are celebrated in the due number, or because in this way help is given to poor priests lacking alms of Masses, or because the gain which is drawn from the exchange of merchandise with alms is expended not for the proper advantage of those collecting, but for the use and increase of pious institutions and good works. - Wherefore it is not licit to cooperate in a manner of acting of this kind, whether by handing over alms for Masses to those collecting, or by accepting the burden of celebrating Masses.⁵³⁵
3. Priests do not act illicitly who for Masses celebrated receive books or other merchandise in place of a stipend, any species of negotiation or shameful profit being excluded.⁵³⁶

⁵²⁷The Bull *Nuper* can be seen apud Croix, L. VI, p. 2, n. 63; likewise apud Scavini, tom. IV, p. 348.

⁵²⁸Book VI, 321, see *Idem licet*; S. C. C., March 15, 1745.

⁵²⁹Book VI, 321, *Excip.*, 2.

⁵³⁰November 23, 1697, ad 7; *Bullar.*, tom. IX, 468.

⁵³¹Book VI, 322, doubt 5.

⁵³²Cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. VIII, 659.

⁵³³Book VI, 322, doubt 4; cf. also *Vindic. Alphons.*, p. 4, q. 2.

⁵³⁴Const. *Apostolicae Sedis*, sect. II, 12.

⁵³⁵S. C. C., September 9, 1874; cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 383.

⁵³⁶*Ibid.*, n. 383, ad 6.

But whether the moderators or administrators of religious newspapers are to be disapproved, who commit Masses to be celebrated to priests, retaining from their alms the price corresponding in the case to those same newspapers? To this question the S. C. OF THE COUNCIL responded:⁵³⁷ “Negatively, provided nothing is subtracted from the will of the founders concerning the quantity of the stipend, the place and time of the celebration of Masses, every studied collection of Masses being excluded, and the one to whom it belongs by law being informed concerning the completed celebration of the Masses, the matter having been mentioned to the Most Holy.”

1614. IV. All CIRCUMSTANCES of celebration which the one giving the alms stipulated are to be observed religiously. - The reason is that a true contract, I give that you may do, intervened, which induces obligation.

It remains that certain particular things, both concerning adventitious Masses and concerning founded Masses, be weighed in this place.

A. On Adventitious Masses 1615. I. TIME OF CELEBRATION. Adventitious Masses must, under grave obligation, be celebrated either at the established time, or within a moderate time, unless the one offering the stipend consents to delay.

It is said 1. at the established time, if indeed it has been expressly determined. Yet delay to the following day seems able to be excused, unless the one asking for the Mass fixed this day on account of a grave cause, or also offered a greater stipend to this end.⁵³⁸

It is said 2. or within a moderate time, if indeed none has been fixed beforehand. But the moderation of time must be taken altogether relatively.

And indeed: 1. any delay is to be judged grave by which the one asking for the Mass would be frustrated in the intended end. Wherefore a priest sins gravely “if he omits, within a time suitable for celebration, a Mass asked for the obtaining of some urgent grace, say for a happy childbirth, for escaping danger, for winning a lawsuit, etc. The reason is that the circumstance of time then pertains to the substance of the thing asked; whence, that time having passed, the priest is held to restore the stipend, and to warn the giver concerning the Masses omitted at the suitable time.”⁵³⁹ 2. “In Masses for the dead, many theologians deservedly regard a delay of one month as grave.”⁵⁴⁰ 3. In other Masses, a delay of two months is to be judged grave; wherefore satisfaction must be made within two months, with this exception: unless the Holy See has conceded a delay; cf. n. 1620.

It is said 3. unless the one offering consents to delay. For to one knowing and willing, no injury is done. Thus also the S. C. C. defined.⁵⁴¹ - Now, such consent is presumed by the fact itself if someone offers many Masses, for example 200, to a priest to be celebrated by the priest himself. Not likewise “when Masses are handed over to a community of several priests to be celebrated; because then he who gives the alms for many Masses is presumed to wish them to be celebrated sooner. Yet this is not to be understood as though all the priests of that community ought to occupy themselves in satisfying Masses of this kind, but that they ought not to defer as long as would be necessary if those Masses were committed to one person. Hence, I say then the whole number can be distributed among the individuals of the community, or at least among the greater part of it, if it is more numerous; and this distribution having been made, the whole community will be able to satisfy within only as much time as would be conceded to each member of the community for satisfying his own proportion. For Holzmann well says that those committing these numerous Masses can easily foresee that the community has other obligations.”⁵⁴²

1616. II. PLACE OF CELEBRATION AND KIND OF MASS. The celebrant who does not observe the condition of PLACE sins more or less gravely, according to the greater or lesser repugnance of him who gave the alms. - Indeed, if the place was intended equally principally, for example the Holy House of Loreto, he is held to restore the stipend.

One obligated to celebrate at a privileged altar satisfies by using a personal privilege;⁵⁴³ and he who celebrated without satisfying the obligation undertaken is not now held to restitution of the stipend, but only to gaining a plenary indulgence applicable for the dead.⁵⁴⁴ Thus the S. IND. C., February 22, 1847. But before the fact, it is not licit so to establish with

⁵³⁷ April 24, 1875; cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. VIII, p. 650, 659, or more fully apud *Thesaur. Resol.*, tom. 134, Num. II, in Tarbien., etc.

⁵³⁸ Book VI, 317, *Sed hic dubium*.

⁵³⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁴¹ November 23, 1697, ad 11; and April 24, 1875.

⁵⁴² Book VI, 317, q. 2, near the end.

⁵⁴³ S. C. Indulg., March 15, 1852; *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 351, p. 301.

⁵⁴⁴ Book VI, 329.

oneself. The same Congregation, July 24, 1885.⁵⁴⁵

Not to observe the KIND of Mass, for example if you celebrate the Mass of the occurring feast for a votive Mass or of Requiem, even when this is conceded by the Rubrics, does not exceed venial sin, since the substance of the Mass is equally had; wherefore the celebrant can also retain the stipend. - But if for a just cause the priest has acted thus, for example for observing the Rubrics, he has sinned in no way.⁵⁴⁶

B. On Founded Masses 1617. Masses can be founded either for a time, or in perpetuity. Wherefore we note from the sacred Canons the following:

1. Perpetual burdens of Masses cannot be undertaken by secular priests without the written license of the Bishop or Vicar General. - But among Regulars, license of the Superior General or Provincial is required, as is clear from the decree *Cum saepe* of the S. C. of the Council, issued by the authority of Urban VIII and confirmed by Innocent XII through the Bull *Nuper* in the year 1697.
2. A beneficiary who has a benefice or chaplaincy with the burden of Masses ought, notwithstanding any custom whatever, to apply those Masses for the founders, or to their intention. - But indeed "when, in the foundation of a benefice or chapel, it has been expressly provided that the celebrant is not held to application of the Sacrifice, in that case the celebrant will be able to accept a new stipend, and by one Mass satisfy the obligation of the benefice or chapel, and likewise the one giving the new stipend." Decree of the S. C. C., July 13, 1630.⁵⁴⁷ - "But when it had been asked from the S. C. on March 18, 1668, whether Masses ought to be applied for the testator when in the testament nothing had been declared concerning application, the S. C. C. responded that they are to be applied for the testator. - And the same was declared, on February 6, 1627, concerning chaplains who celebrate so that confreres or Nuns may be present at the Mass; since it is said that they cannot receive a stipend."⁵⁴⁸ Moreover, "unless it is expressed in the institution of the chaplaincy that the chaplain celebrate by himself, he can always celebrate through another."⁵⁴⁹
3. Chaplains, Beneficiaries, etc., who from the law of foundation are held to apply Mass only on feast days, are still bound to apply on reduced feasts, as pastors are; for reduced feasts are always held in the Church as feasts of precept. Thus from the Letters *Paternae charitati* of Pius VII, April 10, 1818⁵⁵⁰ (cf. also n. 891, 1).
4. Canons, in cathedral and collegiate Churches, ought to celebrate daily the conventual Mass for their benefactors; although these, in their donations, had made absolutely no agreement for themselves, but had only declared that they offered their goods to God for the remission of their sins; and although contrary custom, even immemorial, flourished somewhere. - Indeed, where the custom flourishes of applying a second or even third Mass for them, the Bishop ought to command that this custom be kept holily; but where it does not flourish, at least in the Memento of the second and third conventual Mass, let a commemoration of them be made. Thus Benedict XIV, Const. *Cum semper*.⁵⁵¹
5. A priest who, on account of a benefice or chaplaincy, is held to celebrate daily can, from the common opinion, sometimes omit the celebration of Mass if a legitimate cause intervenes, for example devotion, reverence toward the Sacrifice, or infirmity not exceeding 15 days, indeed, Lugo says probably, even if the infirmity were prolonged for two months. He can also probably, provided he does not accept a stipend, celebrate four or six times in the year for himself or for a very dear friend; for this is reasonably presumed from the mind of the founder. Otherwise, however, if he had expressed the contrary; for example by saying: "I will that Mass be celebrated daily, by the chaplain or by another"; or also: "I will that, in such a church, Mass be celebrated daily," etc.⁵⁵²
6. It is not licit to celebrate founded Masses in another church, on another altar, or at another hour than those which were established by the founder. Nor is this obligation light if the founder stipulated circumstances of this kind on account of a grave cause, for example on account of the memory or convenience of his own family, or of the people. But if no special end gave occasion to the stipulation, or if the cause why it was made no longer exists, for example if the family is extinct, or if it dwells elsewhere: the aforesaid obligation will not be grave; indeed, it will

⁵⁴⁵Cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. XVIII, p. 94.

⁵⁴⁶Book VI, 327.

⁵⁴⁷Benedict XIV, Instit. 56, n. 8.

⁵⁴⁸Ibid., n. 8; *H. A.*, XV, 88, 7; Book VI, 324.

⁵⁴⁹Book VI, 330.

⁵⁵⁰The cited Constitution in the *Bullar.*, § 4.

⁵⁵¹Book VI, 326.

⁵⁵²Book VI, 332-333; *H. A.*, XV, 73.

be null if the priest compensates it by celebrating on a privileged altar.⁵⁵³ Otherwise, the obligation is so grave that the priest would sin mortally if he often, or without cause, or without dispensation, omitted or changed those circumstances. "I said often; for he will sin only venially if he does it rarely, say once or twice in the month; and he is more easily excused if he changes only the altar, and not the church. Likewise, I said without cause; for he will by no means sin if he celebrates elsewhere from a just cause, say if the altar is execrated, or because, having come out of the sacristy, he saw that it was occupied by another. - Likewise, I said without dispensation; for the BISHOP can well dispense that celebration be made in another place, from a reasonable cause, say on account of the utility of one's own church, etc."⁵⁵⁴ For this faculty belongs to Bishops, as Delegates of the Holy See, as is commonly drawn from Trent.⁵⁵⁵ But where the transfer is opposed to the express will of the testator, or to divine worship, or to the convenience of the people, it is not customarily conceded by the S. Congregation of the Council, and in that case Bishops cannot dispense.⁵⁵⁶

1618. It is asked: Whether PRESCRIPTION can be made against burdens of Masses?

Resp. Some affirm; "but, according to the truer opinion, such prescription is not admitted, since in Trent⁵⁵⁷ it is forbidden that derogation can be made from all burdens imposed, both in foundation and in any other pious disposition or conferral of benefices; and Pius IV in the Bull by which he confirmed the Council declared void whatever might be done in the future against it.... But an irritating clause binds even the ignorant, and in beneficial causes infects title and possession. At least we say, in practice the first opinion can be probable with difficulty, since good faith can with difficulty be presumed in beneficiaries, since it is rather presumed that they know the laws of the benefice."⁵⁵⁸

Note. - 1. Authors notice that it is most opportune that any priest note in a book the Masses accepted and the Masses celebrated by himself, so that thus, even in the case of unexpected death, all things become known to the heirs. 2. But this is altogether prescribed by Innocent XII to all rectors and ministers of churches, whether secular or regular, that each year they be able to render an account to their Superiors concerning Masses celebrated, whether they are perpetual, temporary, or even manual. - And moreover, the table of perpetual and temporary burdens must be exposed in a more visible and obvious place, to guard against burdens of Masses being undertaken beyond their strength, from the Bull *Nuper*.

III. On the Reduction and Condonation of Masses 1619. REDUCTION of Masses is properly called that by which burdens of Masses are constrained to a lesser number for future time, whether this is done in perpetuity or for an established time. - When reduction is referred to past time and imports the omitted celebration of Masses, then it is properly called remission, absolution, and CONDONATION.⁵⁵⁹

1620. Principles. I. Reduction of Masses, today, can be made only by the APOSTOLIC SEE, but not by the Bishop, nor by a regular prelate. - This is evident from the Constitution *Nuper* of Innocent XII, § 1, where it is said thus: "It is strictly prohibited that Bishops... in any way reduce any burdens of Masses to be celebrated, either imposed after the same Council or at the threshold of foundation; but for all these to be reduced, moderated, or commuted, recourse is to be had to the Apostolic See."⁵⁶⁰ The same applies both concerning condonation and concerning concession of a longer time for fulfilling burdens of Masses.⁵⁶¹ Only in a twofold case does the right of reducing Masses belong to Bishops: 1. if the testator himself has granted this faculty to the Bishop; 2. if the Holy See has conceded such privilege to Bishops, as frequently obtains.

1621. II. Reduction or condonation of Masses can be made only when a JUST CAUSE intervenes. This is evident of itself. - "But the CAUSES from which the Apostolic See is accustomed to reduce Masses are scarcity of priests, smallness of stipend, or increase of the current stipend, diminution of the revenues of a monastery, or greater expenses necessary for living, etc.; finally if necessity of the brethren, or of the fabric of the church or monastery, urges."⁵⁶²

Note. For obtaining reduction or condonation, recourse is made to the Holy See, through the S. C. of the Council, or through the Fabric of St. Peter. - But when the Holy See grants CONDONATION on account of just causes, it always imposes some salutary penance, and especially the penance of celebrating a certain number of Masses. - Moreover, it supplies from its spiritual treasury whatever has been sinned in fulfilling the burdens; and for the suffrage of souls for

⁵⁵³Book I, Appendix II, n. 60.

⁵⁵⁴Book VI, 329; cf. *De Priv.*, n. 60, where there are more things.

⁵⁵⁵Sess. 21, cap. 7, *de Ref.*, and Sess. 25, c. 5, *de Ref.*

⁵⁵⁶Book VI, 329; cf. Lucidi, cap. VII, n. 108 sqq.

⁵⁵⁷Sess. 25, cap. 5, *de Ref.*

⁵⁵⁸*H. A.*, XV, 74; cf. Decision of the S. C. C., December 20, 1879, apud *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. 13, p. 220.

⁵⁵⁹Lucidi, cap. VII, n. 80.

⁵⁶⁰Book VI, 331; *1 El. qq. ref.*, n. 68; cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 376.

⁵⁶¹Cf. Benedict XIV, *De Synodo*, L. 5, c. 10, n. 2.

⁵⁶²Book VI, 331; cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. XVIII, p. 147, where there is an example.

whom the omitted Sacrifices ought to have been offered, it commands that a suitable number of Masses be celebrated daily by the chaplains assigned to this office in the Vatican Basilica. But if someone, with the intention of obtaining a condonation of this kind, has presumed to omit the celebration of Masses, in this case, the grace in no way suffices, and hope of this kind, as irrational and illicit, is condemned and reprobated.⁵⁶³

If it concerns only the internal forum, that is, if someone omitted either founded or adventitious Masses without the omission being publicly established, and has become unable to satisfy: for condonation, recourse can be made to the S. Penitentiary, namely through the confessor, who ought to conceal the name of the penitent.

1622. III. To Bishops belongs the faculty of INTERPRETING, in doubt, the will of founders, and of reducing burdens of Masses undertaken by contract to equity. For in these things Bishops use their judicial power, which is proper to ordinary jurisdiction; wherefore, if they pronounce concerning an obligation constituted or not constituted, concerning a burden resolved or not resolved, etc., they do not exceed the limits prescribed to them by common law. Nor then is there place for reduction at the Holy See (cf. n. 1083 and 1087, q. 2).

It is asked: Whether sometimes a chaplain, or beneficiary, can by himself diminish the number of Masses?

Resp. "If the revenues fail in whole, without his fault, it is certain he is not held to celebrate Masses," as is commonly taught and as the S. C. C. defined.⁵⁶⁴ "But if the revenues fail in part, it also seems certain that the chaplain can diminish Masses, in the case in which the testator designated a suitable alms, for example three small coins for each Mass; because then, just as the number of Masses would have to be increased if the revenues were increased, so it is to be diminished if the revenues are diminished."⁵⁶⁵

NB. It is greatly to be desired that those who impose perpetual burdens of Masses, in the very act of foundation, grant to the beneficiary or Bishop the faculty of reducing their number, in the case in which the revenues are diminished.

Article II

On the Things to Be Observed in the Celebration of Mass

Those things which the celebration of Mass demands for itself comprise three things: 1. the circumstances of time and place; 2. things required for the celebration itself; 3. observance of the rubrics.

§ 1. On the Time and Place of Celebration

I. On the Time of Celebration 1623. Principles. I. TO CELEBRATE DAILY is licit and laudable, unless a special prohibition of the Church obstructs. - For "in the celebration of this mystery there is attended the representation of the Lord's Passion and the participation of its fruit; and according to each it was fitting to determine a time suitable for the celebration of this Sacrament. For because we need the fruit of the Lord's Passion daily, on account of daily defects, the Sacrament is offered daily in the Church regularly."⁵⁶⁶

It was said unless a special prohibition of the Church obstructs. Now, a prohibition of this kind obstructs on the last three days of Greater Week, namely:

1. On THURSDAY in the Supper of the Lord, private Masses are prohibited.⁵⁶⁷

We say private Masses, for in individual churches, the solemn Mass to be celebrated by the rector of the church, or by one performing his functions, is admitted. - And here one must remember what the S. R. C. established, saying: "the rule prescribed in the Ceremonial Book is to be observed, which is conformable to the custom of the universal Church: namely that on Thursday in the Supper of the Lord, in memory that Our Lord Jesus Christ communicated the Apostles by His own hand, all presbyters, both Dignitaries and Canons, and any others from the body of the church,⁵⁶⁸ receive Communion from the hand of the Bishop or of another celebrating."⁵⁶⁹

Let the following things be noted: 1. The prohibition of celebrating, on Thursday in the Supper of the Lord, other Masses besides the solemn one suffers the following exceptions: 1. In smaller churches where the sacred functions of Greater

⁵⁶³Cf. Lucidi, cap. VII, n. 86 sqq., where several things are accurately defined.

⁵⁶⁴June 7, 1686, and August 8, 1705.

⁵⁶⁵Book VI, 331, doubt 2.

⁵⁶⁶St. Thomas, III, q. 83, a. 2.

⁵⁶⁷Book VI, 350; *1 El. qq. ref.*, n. 69.

⁵⁶⁸Gardellini, n. 1734, September 19, 1654.

⁵⁶⁹*Ibid.*, n. 3597, ad 16, September 10, 1701; n. 4353, December 22, 1770; n. 4815, ad 1, September 23, 1837.

Week cannot be solemnly performed, let rectors of churches strive to perform them, with the form of the small Ritual issued by order of Benedict XIII observed; with respect to other parishes which are destitute of clerics, the Ordinaries of places are able to indulge, for the convenience of the people, that pastors, with permission sought yearly, can celebrate a read Mass.⁵⁷⁰ 2. For the convenience of the sick, the Bishop can concede that in the church, not in the private chapel of the hospital, one private Mass, besides the solemn one, be celebrated.⁵⁷¹ 3. A regular Superior can celebrate Mass privately in a private Oratory, for ministering Communion to Religious, and if the oratory is lacking, let this be done in the church, with the doors closed.⁵⁷²

2. If on this day a Feast of precept occurs, for example of St. Joseph or the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, provision is to be made by the Ordinaries of places that on that day, according to the number of Christ's faithful, several private Masses be celebrated before the solemn Mass.⁵⁷³ But the Masses to be said are of the solemnity of the day with *Gloria* and *Credo*, not of the feast, concerning which nothing is made.⁵⁷⁴
3. But if the feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary falls on Parasceve or on Holy Saturday, it ought, together with the precept of hearing Mass and abstaining from works, to be transferred in the universal Church to Monday after Low Sunday.⁵⁷⁵
2. On FRIDAY of Greater Week, namely the day of Parasceve, the prohibition of the Church is absolute. On this day all priests must abstain from celebrating, and indeed under grave obligation, even if celebration would have to be made for furnishing Viaticum to a dying person. It is clear from the Rubric of the Missal and from Can. *Sabbato* 13, Dist. 3, *de Consecr.* The reason is that on that day, the Passion of the Lord is recalled by the Church as really enacted,⁵⁷⁶ and therefore it is not represented mystically through the consecration of the Eucharist.
3. As regards HOLY SATURDAY, only the solemn Mass is permitted, and in smaller churches a read Mass, with the form of the small Ritual of Benedict XIII observed. But private Masses are altogether prohibited, in whatever churches and private oratories, notwithstanding any contrary custom whatever.

1624. II. Private Masses can be said at any HOUR, from dawn until noon. - Thus the Rubric of the Missal,⁵⁷⁷ which also prescribes the time at which the conventual and solemn Mass is to be celebrated. But DAWN begins when the first brightness is spread over the earth, or from the beginning of light, which is various according to various places and times of the year. Let attention be given to the tables which are customarily appended to the directory of the divine Office. In regions where dawn is not had, the Rubric is understood "concerning the time which is equivalent and corresponds to dawn, that is, concerning the beginning of the civil, moral, and usual day, in which men are accustomed to rise at daybreak for works, according to the received and approved customs of the regions."⁵⁷⁸ - Moreover, in every region, the time both of dawn and of noon must be taken not mathematically, but morally, and "Benedict XIII agreed that a breadth of a third part of an hour can be tolerated, both before dawn, for Masses to be begun, and after noon," for them to be completed.⁵⁷⁹

The prohibition of celebrating before dawn and after noon obliges under grave sin in grave matter. It is clear from Trent,⁵⁸⁰ prescribing "that Ordinaries... by edict and proposed penalties should take care lest priests celebrate at hours other than the due hours." But grave matter would be to begin Mass an entire hour before dawn, that is, before the time at which, from the decree of Benedict XIII, it is licit to begin it, or an entire hour after noon. Short of an hour, the matter would be only light.

1625. From the aforesaid law various CAUSES can excuse, namely:

1. Exception of law, by which the solemn Mass of the Nativity of the Lord can be celebrated at midnight. Nor indeed is it licit on this night to celebrate successively two other Masses, nor to offer Holy Communion to the Faithful. Thus the S. R. C., April 28, 1703, in Savonen.; in Pisaren., April 20, 1641, etc.⁵⁸¹ Indeed, as an abuse there was

⁵⁷⁰Gardellini, n. 4583, ad 1, July 28, 1821.

⁵⁷¹Ibid., n. 4361, ad 9, March 27, 1773.

⁵⁷²Ibid., 4870, ad 2, August 31, 1839.

⁵⁷³Ibid., n. 3893, September 12, 1716.

⁵⁷⁴Ibid., n. 4526, ad 15, September 7, 1816.

⁵⁷⁵Ibid., n. 3204, March 11, 1690.

⁵⁷⁶St. Thomas, III, q. 83, a. 2, ad 2.

⁵⁷⁷Tit. 15, n. 1.

⁵⁷⁸Apud Gardellini, n. 1007; Roman Missal, September 18, 1634.

⁵⁷⁹Book VI, 341.

⁵⁸⁰Sess. 22, Decr. *de observ. in celebr. Miss.*

⁵⁸¹Gardellini, n. 3648, ad 3; n. 1319; n. 1391, May 31, 1642.

proscribed on September 18, 1781,⁵⁸² the custom by force of which any priest whatever, without Apostolic Indult, would celebrate Mass before dawn on the night of the Nativity. Yet this is conceded to Bishops, that in public oratories or chapels they can tolerate one Mass, even without chant, according to the custom of the region. Thus it is gathered from the response of the S. R. C., September 7, 1850.⁵⁸³

2. Apostolic privilege or Indult, conceded after the Council of Trent, by force of which it is licit for privileged persons to celebrate, for example, one hour before dawn or after noon; which ought to be understood of one hour before or after the time assigned for others not privileged; otherwise the privilege would profit little.⁵⁸⁴
3. Necessity, for example that Viaticum be furnished to one dying, in which case it would be licit to celebrate even at midnight.
4. A reasonable cause, for example that workmen and servants may be able to hear Mass very early in the morning. - Whence, if on a feast day the solemn Mass is prolonged rather far, a private Mass can be said one hour and more after noon; and probably also two hours, at least with the license of the Bishop, lest namely a great part of the people lack Mass. Likewise, from the cause of a journey, or of the funeral of some magnate, or of a sermon, or of Ordinations, it would be licit to celebrate Mass one hour after noon, or before dawn.⁵⁸⁵
5. Dispensation; for the Bishop can dispense in some particular case, from a reasonable cause. And all religious Superiors have power in this same faculty toward their subjects, since they are their Ordinaries.⁵⁸⁶ - But Paul III admonishes: "Let them use sparingly any Indult whatever of celebrating, or causing to be celebrated, before day; because, since in the ministry of the altar Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who is the brightness of eternal light, is immolated, it is fitting that this be done not in the darkness of night, but in the light."⁵⁸⁷

It is asked: Whether and what sort of sin it is to celebrate Mass before the recitation of Matins?

Resp. 1. If it concerns private celebration, several authors with St. Antoninus say it is mortal; others with Tamburini and Holzmann recognize no fault in this. But more commonly and more probably others with Benedict XIV⁵⁸⁸ teach that it is by no means mortal, both because it is not a necessary disposition for celebrating, and because an obligation of this kind is neither expressed in the Rubric nor commonly received. But they think it is not excused from venial fault, because in the Rubric this is now numbered among defects, and therefore it cannot be said to be of mere counsel. But any moderate reasonable cause excuses, as study, a journey, the will of the Superior, the expectation of the people, etc.⁵⁸⁹

Resp. 2. If it concerns a conventual and solemn Mass, authors "commonly and more truly affirm that it is mortal, unless a just cause intervenes, and a grave and public one, and without scandal. The reason is that such is the custom received in all churches where public prayers are said; so that, by acting otherwise, the public worship of God, the common good, and the suitable governance of the Church would be gravely injured."⁵⁹⁰

1626. III. It is licit to celebrate only ONCE in a day. In antiquity it was indeed licit to perform the Mass several times on the same day, but for many centuries now this has been prohibited under grave obligation. "Except on the day of the Lord's Nativity," says Innocent III,⁵⁹¹ "unless a necessary cause suggests, it suffices for a priest, once in the day, to celebrate only one Mass."

There is excepted 1. The Day of the Nativity of the Lord. For on this Feast it is licit for any priest to celebrate three Masses, but the pastor is held to apply only one for the people (cf. n. 1609, q. 4). 2. A case of necessity: if indeed a great part of the people, on a Sunday or Feast of precept, would lack Mass, the priest can, with the license of the Bishop, celebrate twice. We say with the license of the Bishop, "to whose judgment it is left to determine whether a just and true reason of necessity intervenes in particular cases. Nor is it right for this faculty to be imparted indiscriminately to Bishops, but only on account of a true cause of necessity in a particular case."⁵⁹² But if there seems to be a grave cause of BINATING, concerning which nevertheless it is not clear whether it is canonical or not, the mind and practice of the Holy See is that

⁵⁸²Ibid., n. 4404.

⁵⁸³Cf. *Corresp. de Rome*, tom. I, p. 381; and Bouvry, pars 3, tit. 15, rub. 4, n. 5 and 6.

⁵⁸⁴Book VI, 346; cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 384-387; likewise Benedict XIV, Instit. 68, n. 11.

⁵⁸⁵Book VI, 344.

⁵⁸⁶Ibid., 343-344.

⁵⁸⁷Apud Benedict XIV, Instit. 13, n. 2.

⁵⁸⁸*De Sacrif. Missae*, L. 3, c. 13, n. 4.

⁵⁸⁹Book VI, 347.

⁵⁹⁰Ibid., 348; and *Exam. Ord.*, n. 113.

⁵⁹¹L. 3, Decretal., Tit. 41, cap. 3.

⁵⁹²Lucidi, I, cap. 3, n. 380.

Bishops have recourse to it; namely when it concerns license to be conceded not for an act, but to be valid for a longer span of time. But if a sudden case occurs, in which recourse to the Bishop is not easy, his license can be presumed.⁵⁹³

It is asked: When is NECESSITY judged to be present for celebrating twice?

Resp. From the common opinion of theologians, this necessity is present in a threefold case. - 1. If some presbyter has two parishes, and the people cannot come together into either parish. 2. If some presbyter, although he does not have two parishes, nevertheless rules two peoples so distant from each other that one of them cannot stand by while he celebrates, while it could easily come together in some chapel.⁵⁹⁴ 3. If all parishioners cannot at the same time come together for one Mass, whether on account of the narrowness of the church, or on account of the distance of places, Mass can be repeated in the same church.⁵⁹⁵

Therefore, these and similar circumstances occurring, another priest who can offer another Sacrifice being altogether lacking, there will be present a legitimate necessity of repeating the Sacrifice. Otherwise, however, any other cause being removed, such as scarcity of the priest, or the convenience of those who would wish to satisfy the precept of hearing Mass in their private chapels, or even very ancient custom which sometimes could be adduced, etc., it is not licit for a priest to repeat the Sacrifice.⁵⁹⁶

NB. Concerning the rite to be observed in the repetition of Mass, see the Appendix to the Roman Ritual.

II. On the Place of Celebration 1627. Principles. I. By common and ordinary law, it is not licit to celebrate Mass except in CHURCHES, or in ORATORIES deputed to divine worship by the Bishop. - This is clear from Trent,⁵⁹⁷ prescribing: "Let Bishops not suffer that this holy Sacrifice be performed by any seculars or regulars whatever in private houses, and altogether outside the church and oratories dedicated only to divine worship, to be designated and visited by the same Ordinaries." That this Tridentine precept obliges under grave obligation is clear both from the very words which the Council uses and from the end which it intends.

CHURCHES are dedicated to divine worship through Consecration, which is reserved to the Bishop, or through blessing, which, by mandate of the Bishop, can be imparted by a simple priest.⁵⁹⁸

But ORATORIES in which it is licit to celebrate are only PUBLIC Oratories. Under this name come both those which have access on a public road and are open to anyone from the people, and those which have been erected in palaces of Bishops, monasteries, seminaries, hospitals, prisons, etc. (cf. n. 678). - Oratories which are dedicated to divine worship in perpetuity can indeed be consecrated, but ordinarily they are customarily only blessed. - Indeed, if they were probably judged not going to remain for long in the same place, the blessing would more advisedly be omitted. Yet deputation of the Bishop, by himself or through another, is always required. - But in houses of Regulars, erection is made through regular Superiors.⁵⁹⁹

It is said 1. By common law; for, from Apostolic Indult, it is licit to celebrate in private oratories. - Nor indeed can Bishops concede this license, unless grave and urgent causes are present, and only by way of act.⁶⁰⁰ But in private oratories, it is not licit to perform Mass except on the days expressed in the Indult, and with one of the persons present to whom the Indult has directly been conceded. Nor can several Masses be celebrated there if in the Indult it is said, as it usually is said: one Mass may be celebrated daily; except if celebration had to be made for ministering Viaticum to a sick person lying ill in the same or a neighboring house; in which case, even with the indultary absent, it would be licit to celebrate.⁶⁰¹ Indeed, it is licit to celebrate in the house of the sick person or in a nearer place, if the place is decent, lest the sick person be deprived of Viaticum, namely when it can be carried neither publicly nor secretly. Thus the S. C. de Propag. Fid., December 14, 1868.⁶⁰²

Note. 1. The privilege of a private Oratory is at the same time personal and local, and therefore adheres to the designated place and is extinguished with the person.⁶⁰³ 2. Private Oratories are not to be blessed with the form prescribed in

⁵⁹³Benedict XIV, Const. *Declarasti Nobis*; Book VI, 351; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 127; cf. Bouix, *De Parocho*, pars IV, cap. 6.

⁵⁹⁴*Acta S. Sed.*, vol. I, p. 8.

⁵⁹⁵Benedict XIV, *ibid.*; cf. *Thesaurus*, tom. I, p. 63.

⁵⁹⁶Cf. Lucidi, vol. III, n. 43; likewise *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 389, Instruction of the S. C. DE PROP. FIDE.

⁵⁹⁷Sess. 22, *de observand.*

⁵⁹⁸Cf. Pontifical and Roman Ritual.

⁵⁹⁹Gatticus, *De Oratoriis*, cap. 12, n. 18.

⁶⁰⁰Benedict XIV, Const. *Magno*, June 2, 1751; Book VI, 359; *De Priv.*, n. 64; likewise S. C. C., December 20, 1856, *Thes. Res.*, tom. 115, p. 522.

⁶⁰¹S. R. C., August 27, 1836; Gardellini, n. 4782, ad 8.

⁶⁰²Cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 395.

⁶⁰³Book III, 319, clause I.

the Ritual, since they are not vowed to God in perpetuity.⁶⁰⁴ The blessing of a house or place can be used. 3. Bishops, in certain circumstances, enjoy the privilege of a portable altar; namely when, in cases permitted by law or by special license of the Apostolic See, being absent from the house of their own habitation, they make delay in another's house; and similarly when, on the occasion of sacred Visitation or a journey, they are received somewhere as guests. Therefore in these cases, in the houses where they are staying, they can either perform Mass themselves, or command that another priest perform it before them. - But these cases removed, in no way is it licit for them, in houses of laymen, to celebrate or cause to be celebrated the Sacrifice of the Mass. Thus from the Decree of Clement XI, issued December 15, 1703, and from the Constitution *Apostolici ministerii* of Innocent XIII, May 5, 1723.⁶⁰⁵

It is said 2. By ordinary law; for, in a case of necessity, it is licit to celebrate Mass in any decent place whatever. "But CASES of necessity are: 1. if the church is destroyed; 2. if some priest is making a long pilgrimage through deserted places, or places of infidels; 3. if the church is not capable of the people, so that many would lack Mass; 4. if an army is found in camps, or a multitude of those sailing on the seashore. Thus commonly."⁶⁰⁶ Therefore in these and similar circumstances, lest the people be deprived of Mass on a feast day, it is licit to celebrate outside the church. But it is fitting that license be obtained from the Bishop if it can conveniently be sought. But if the case of necessity is doubtful, the Bishop can well dispense.⁶⁰⁷

It is asked: Whether it is licit to celebrate Mass at SEA?

Resp. That this be licit, an Apostolic Indult is required; which is customarily easily conceded under the following conditions: 1. if the distance from shore is long; 2. if the sea is calm, and another priest or deacon assists, who, if some movement is stirred up, may hold the chalice firmly.⁶⁰⁸

1628. II. It is prohibited under grave obligation, unless necessity is present, to perform sacred rites in a church POLLUTED, EXECRATED, or INTERDICTED. This is clear from Canon Law and from the Rubrics of the Missal, where it is had: "if, while a priest is celebrating, the church is violated before the Canon, let Mass be dismissed."⁶⁰⁹

The reason for the first and second case is that it is not fitting that the Immaculate Host be offered and divine Offices be celebrated in a place that has become base or notoriously contaminated; whence one knowingly celebrating in a notoriously violated church sins gravely, although he incurs no censure or irregularity. But in the third case, the prohibition is in punishment of the delinquent, and the priest illicitly celebrating in an interdicted place incurs irregularity (cf. n. 1309 and 1377).

We said: unless necessity is present; for, in a case of necessity, namely if the people do not have another church, it is licit, with the permission of the Bishop if he can be approached, otherwise without it, to celebrate in an execrated or polluted church, which nevertheless is not reconciled by that celebration.⁶¹⁰ Likewise, in an interdicted place, on the more solemn feasts, it is permitted to celebrate, as was said at n. 1308.

1629. Questions. Q. 1. When is a church judged POLLUTED?

Resp. A church, or public oratory, is polluted or violated in four ways, as follows:

1. Through voluntary and injurious homicide, or one consummated within the church, through an action physically killing and sacrilegious, whether with shedding of blood or in another way, for example by poison, strangling, and although death itself happens outside the sacred place. Whence a church is not polluted through accidental homicide, or one done by an insane person or by another in defense of himself, with moderation of inculpable defense, or proceeding from a wound inflicted outside the church. But it is polluted through homicide which otherwise would be just through the sentence of a judge. Except, if a disturber of the republic could not otherwise be captured⁶¹¹ (cf. n. 582, 4).
2. Through copious shedding of human blood, arising from striking or a grave wound, and gravely injurious to the immunity of the Church, as they commonly hold. - Whence a church is not polluted if the shedding of blood is accidental; if it proceeds from playful or light striking, as in a quarrel of boys; if a few drops flow; if the external action which is the cause of the shedding was not consummated in the sacred place, but outside. On the contrary,

⁶⁰⁴S. R. C., March 11, 1820, ad 10; Gardellini, n. 4565; *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 397.

⁶⁰⁵Book VI, 358; *De Priv.*, n. 63; cf. Benedict XIV, *De Sacr. Missae*, sect. 2, n. 46.

⁶⁰⁶Book VI, 359; cf. Gardellini, note to Decision of the S. R. C., August 27, 1836, n. 4783.

⁶⁰⁷Book VI, 359.

⁶⁰⁸*Ibid.*, 356.

⁶⁰⁹Can. 11, dist. 1, *de Consecratione; De defectibus*, X, 2.

⁶¹⁰Book VI, 361; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 115.

⁶¹¹Book VI, 364.

it is polluted whenever a physically and theologically grave striking happens in the church, although blood is shed outside the church itself; because the sacred place is violated not so much through the shedding of blood as through the injurious action from which it proceeds.⁶¹²

3. Through voluntary and sacrilegious shedding of human seed performed in the church, whether it was through pollution, or fornication, or any other manner whatever. When a church is polluted through the conjugal act, see n. 783. To the question “whether a consecrated church which for two days served for military stations and watches is to be judged profaned, and therefore needs the reconciliation prescribed by the Pontifical,” the S. R. C. on February 27, 1847, judged that one must respond: it is to be reconciled as a precaution.⁶¹³
4. Through the burial of an excommunicated person to be avoided, a denounced heretic, or an infidel or non-baptized person. - Except, more probably, if he is a catechumen; because he is not judged an infidel, on account of baptism of desire: likewise, if he is an infant enclosed in the womb of a dead mother, and not baptized. But otherwise, if having been brought forth into the light, he died without baptism; for then the church or cemetery is polluted from his burial.⁶¹⁴ Thus from the decree of the S. C. of Immunity, August 18, 1821. And here it must be noted that, the church having been polluted, the cemetery also is polluted if it is contiguous, but not vice versa. Therefore, the church having been reconciled, the cemetery is similarly reconciled.⁶¹⁵

It must further be noted that, for a church to be polluted through the aforesaid crimes, it is required: 1. that they be perpetrated within the church itself, that is, in those parts which properly pertain to the body of the church, which extends from the upper vault to the pavement, and from the interior door to the last wall; 2. that they be notorious by notoriety of law or fact; whether immediately from the beginning, or by succession of time; for in each case the reputation of the church is equally lost.⁶¹⁶ - As soon as the pollution has been made notorious, the sacred Eucharist ought to be removed, and, the altars having been stripped, all movable things are to be taken away.⁶¹⁷

Q. 2. How is a polluted church to be reconciled?

Resp. If it was consecrated, it is to be reconciled according to the rite of the Roman Pontifical by the Bishop, or by a priest from delegation or Pontifical privilege, such as Superiors of Regulars have for their churches, provided water blessed by the Bishop is employed, or by the one reconciling himself, if the Bishop is distant by two days' journeys or 14 hours.

If the church was only blessed, it can be reconciled by a simple priest, the accustomed prayers and lustral water blessed by himself or another priest having been employed.⁶¹⁸ But whether the delegation of the Bishop is prerequisite for this is not certain. Several affirm from the Roman Ritual, but Benedict XIV denies,⁶¹⁹ and his opinion, at least when necessity urges, can be brought into practice. But a private Oratory, since it is not a sacred place, is not judged to be polluted, and therefore does not need reconciliation.

Q. 3. When is a church EXECRATED, and how is it rendered SUITABLE for worship?

Resp. 1. It is execrated when it loses its consecration or blessing: which happens “if the walls according to the greater part are destroyed, or all of their plaster or at least a greater part is removed at the same time.” But it is not execrated if only the roof or upper vault is changed, or if destruction and repair are made successively through small parts, although the whole church would be renewed.⁶²⁰ And the same must be said if it was converted to profane use; because then it needs only reconciliation.

Resp. 2. An execrated church is again to be consecrated or blessed, according to the rite and form prescribed for the consecration or blessing of churches.⁶²¹

§ 2. On the Things Required for the Celebration of Mass For celebrating Mass rightly and legitimately, many things are required which can be referred: 1. to the altar and its furnishings; 2. to the sacred vessels and their accessories;

⁶¹²Ibid., 365.

⁶¹³Gardellini, n. 5077.

⁶¹⁴Book VI, 366; cf. Craisson, n. 4800.

⁶¹⁵Book VI, 367.

⁶¹⁶Ibid., 364 and Book III, 460.

⁶¹⁷Craisson, n. 4802.

⁶¹⁸Book VI, 363.

⁶¹⁹*De Synodo*, L. 13, cap. 15, n. 2, end.

⁶²⁰Book VI, 368; cf. S. R. C. Response of January 16, 1836, *Monitore ecclesiastico*, vol. IV, p. II, p. 78.

⁶²¹Craisson, n. 4789.

3. to the sacred vestments; and 4. to the minister of the priest.

I. On the Altar and Its Furnishings 1630. 1. The ALTAR, that is, the stone ordained and consecrated for sacrificing, is required under grave obligation for the celebration of Mass. This is clear from the perpetual discipline of the Church, and it is prescribed in the Rubric of the Missal.⁶²² - But a twofold altar is distinguished: the one fixed, which is consecrated as joined to a base; and the other portable, or altar-stone, which is consecrated as separated from a base. - Each must be consecrated by a Bishop, and in it, while it is consecrated, Relics of martyrs are to be placed, and indeed from a grave precept.⁶²³ Yet sometimes, from Indult of the Supreme Pontiff, faculty is conceded of celebrating on a broken altar, or one lacking Relics, if otherwise celebration cannot be made.

The altar remains suited for celebration as long as it is not execrated. Now it is EXECRATED: 1. if, when it is fixed, the consecrated stone is removed from the lower structure, but not if the whole altar is transferred to another place;⁶²⁴ 2. if it is enormously broken, say if the table has been divided into two or several notable parts, or also if the part divided by fracture is from those parts in which special anointings had been employed;⁶²⁵ 3. if the sepulcher of the Relics is violated, through fracture or removal of the seal, namely of the cover by which the sepulcher is closed. But if only the seal of the Bishop impressed in wax has been erased, the altar is not execrated.⁶²⁶

2. "Let the altar be covered with THREE CLOTHS, or clean altar-cloths, blessed by the Bishop or by another having power, the upper one at least oblong, which reaches down to the ground, the other two shorter, or one doubled." Thus the Rubric of the Missal.⁶²⁷ Wherefore let it be NOTED: 1. The cloths must be made from linen or hemp, but not from another material, although rivaling linen or hemp in cleanliness, whiteness, and tenacity.⁶²⁸ 2. To celebrate with cloths not blessed does not exceed venial fault, from which any reasonable cause excuses. 3. To celebrate without any cloth is judged a mortal sin, from which grave necessity nevertheless excuses; to celebrate with two cloths, or one doubled, will be venial; and the same seems to be said if celebration is made upon one single cloth and not doubled.⁶²⁹
3. On the altar, in the middle, let there be placed a CROSS WITH AN IMAGE OF THE CRUCIFIED, open, visible, and of such size that it comes at once into the sight of the celebrant and of the people. Thus the Rubric of the Missal.⁶³⁰ It is not indeed mortal, as the very common opinion holds, to celebrate without a cross, but it cannot be excused from venial sin.⁶³¹ Yet a cross is not required if a sculpted or painted image of the crucified Savior holds the principal place in the larger picture of the altar.⁶³² On an altar where the Most Holy Sacrament is publicly exposed at the time of the Sacrifice, the cross can be placed or removed according to the custom of places.⁶³³
4. "Let CANDLESTICKS be placed on the altar, at least two, with candles lit, here and there on each side." Thus the Rubric of the Missal.⁶³⁴ This precept obliges under grave obligation, nor can even the necessity of ministering Viaticum exempt from it. Whence, if the light fails before consecration, one must altogether desist from celebrating; otherwise, if after consecration: in which case it is better, although the candles can be relit, to continue the Mass without delay, because such continuation pertains to the unity of the Sacrifice. To celebrate with one wax candle, according to the more probable and more common opinion, is only venial, from which therefore any reasonable cause excuses. To celebrate with candles of tallow or oil is commonly held as mortal, from which only a grave cause excuses.⁶³⁵ Nevertheless, if the prescribed wax candles are present, it is not prohibited to employ candles of another material, for example stearin, outside the table of the altar, for increasing solemnity. The third wax candle to be lit after the *Sanctus* can be omitted, since it is prescribed from a merely directive Rubric, and today common usage

⁶²²Rub. gen., tit. XX.

⁶²³Roman Pontifical, *de benedict. altaris*; S. R. C., October 6, 1837, Gardellini, n. 4828.

⁶²⁴S. R. C., May 15, 1819, Gardellini, n. 4562.

⁶²⁵S. R. C., March 3, 1821, Gardellini, n. 4577, note.

⁶²⁶Book VI, 369, ad 3, doubt 2; *1 El. qq. ref.*, n. 70; likewise S. R. C., December 5, 1851, and March 14, 1861, Gardellini, n. 5162 and 5313.

⁶²⁷Rub. gen. Missal., tit. XX.

⁶²⁸Decree, May 18, 1819, Gardellini, n. 4563.

⁶²⁹Book VI, 375; *1 El. qq. ref.*, n. 71.

⁶³⁰Rub. Miss., XX; Gardellini, n. 4590, ad 8, September 17, 1822.

⁶³¹Book VI, 393.

⁶³²Benedict XIV, Decree *Accepimus*, July 16, 1746, Gardellini, n. 2231.

⁶³³S. R. C., September 2, 1741, Gardellini, 4119, ad 5.

⁶³⁴Rub. Miss., loc. cit.

⁶³⁵S. R. C., September 7, 1850, Gardellini, n. 5150, likewise 4593 and 4378, ad 7.

bears thus.⁶³⁶ - More candles than are prescribed by the Rubric can also be lit in private Mass, on account of the solemnity of some feast, or even on account of devotion; but not on account of the dignity of the celebrant, unless he is a Cardinal, Bishop, or Abbot having the use of Pontificals.⁶³⁷

5. A MISSAL containing at least the Canon is required under grave obligation; but, without Pontifical Indult, it is not licit to use any Missal other than the Roman. - Yet a pilgrim priest, celebrating in a church to which a proper Missal has been conceded, can use it, in the case in which a Roman Missal cannot be had. It is similarly licit, according to the probable and very common opinion, sometimes to celebrate without a Missal, if none can be had, provided from past experience it is morally clear that every danger of erring is absent.⁶³⁸

Note. Some other things, yet of lesser necessity, are prescribed in the Rubric. Among other things these are read: Let the altar “also be adorned with a pallium, or frontal, of a color, as far as can be done, suitable to the feast or Office of the day,” unless nevertheless a just cause excuses, for example poverty or contrary custom. “At the foot of the cross let the tablet called of the Secrets be placed. At the Epistle corner, a cushion, or another decent support, is to be placed under the Missal, and on the same Epistle side there is to be prepared... a small bell, glass cruets of wine and water, with a basin and a clean hand-towel in the little window or on a small table prepared for these things. - On the altar let nothing at all be placed which does not pertain to the Sacrifice of the Mass or to the ornament of the altar itself.”⁶³⁹

II. On the Sacred Vessels and Their Accessories 1631. The sacred vessels are these: chalice and paten, pyx and lunette of the monstrance, to which the monstrance itself can also be numbered; the accessories are: corporal, pall, purificator, burse, and veil. Wherefore let the following be noted:

There is required, under grave obligation, for the celebration of Mass: 1. A CHALICE, and say the same of the PATEN, made from due material, and consecrated by the Bishop. Thus from the Rubric of the Missal.⁶⁴⁰ The use of a small spoon for pouring water into the chalice is prohibited by no law.⁶⁴¹

The Chalice with Paten “ought to be either gold, or silver, or at least to have a silver cup, gilded within.” On account of poverty, a chalice with a cup of tin is permitted,⁶⁴² but not of bronze, copper, or another material.⁶⁴³ From a more recent concession, chalices of aluminum mixed with other metals, commonly *Bronzo di alluminio*, are permitted, provided they receive certain silvering and gilding within, according to the instruction of the S. Rit. C.⁶⁴⁴

The chalice and paten must necessarily be consecrated by the Bishop; nor do they receive consecration from the fact that someone, even in good faith, has celebrated in them while they were not yet consecrated.⁶⁴⁵ Abbots having the use of Pontificals can consecrate sacred vessels, and similarly bells, for their churches, but not for others.⁶⁴⁶

Both chalice and paten are execrated if they are notably broken; for example if there is a hole in the bottom, even a very tiny one; if the cup is separated from a fixed foot, but not if from a turned one; because in the first case the chalice loses its form, not likewise in the second, since the parts of the chalice can be joined without new artifice. They are also execrated when they are gilded anew; wherefore they need a new consecration.⁶⁴⁷

To the question: “Whether a consecrated chalice remaining whole is to be judged to have lost its consecration from this alone, that it was employed by heretics for profane use, for example for drinking at table?” the Qualifiers of the Holy Office responded in the year 1674: “that it remains execrated.”⁶⁴⁸

There are required: 2. A PYX or ciborium, and a Monstrance for preservation and public exposition of the Most Holy Eucharist. These ought to be of solid and decent material, just as the cup of the pyx and the lunette of the monstrance, namely from the same material as that which is prescribed for the chalice, or even from gilded copper.⁶⁴⁹ The pyx indeed

⁶³⁶Book VI, 394.

⁶³⁷S. R. C., September 12 or 24, 1857, Gardellini, n. 5251, ad 9.

⁶³⁸Book VI, 390.

⁶³⁹Gardellini, n. 5367, April 28, 1866; Rubr. gen., tit. XX; Ritus, I, 1.

⁶⁴⁰Rubric *de defect.*, X, 1.

⁶⁴¹S. R. C., February 6, 1858, Gardellini, n. 5256, ad 4.

⁶⁴²Rubric *de defect.*, X, 1.

⁶⁴³S. R. C., August 31, 1867, Gardellini, 5386, ad 6.

⁶⁴⁴Decree, December 6, 1866; cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, vol. II, p. 232, and vol. VI, p. 590.

⁶⁴⁵Book VI, 380; cf. S. R. C., August 31, 1867, ad 8, Gardellini, n. 5386.

⁶⁴⁶Book VI, 381; *1 El. qq. ref.*, n. 73; likewise S. R. C., September 27, 1659, Gardellini, n. 2003, ad 19.

⁶⁴⁷Book VI, 370, doubt 2, and *2 El. qq. ref.*, n. 26; likewise S. R. C., June 14, 1845, Gardellini, n. 5011.

⁶⁴⁸*Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 422.

⁶⁴⁹Roman Ritual, *de Euch.*; S. R. C., August 31, 1867, Gardellini, n. 5386, ad 7.

and the lunette ought, from the precept of the Church, to be blessed by the Bishop, or by a priest having faculty.⁶⁵⁰ As regards the monstrance, it is not indeed required that it be blessed, yet it is laudably blessed.

There are required: 3. Corporal, pall, and purificator of linen or hemp. Yet for the Indies an Indult was conceded by Clement XIII of celebrating upon a corporal of cotton cloth.⁶⁵¹ These linens ought to be of the greatest cleanliness, first of all the corporal, so that it is held as mortal to celebrate on an enormously unclean corporal, unless necessity excuses, for example if the celebrant or others would otherwise have to omit Mass of precept. - It is necessary that the corporal and pall have been blessed by the Bishop or by another having faculty.⁶⁵² But for the purificator no blessing is prescribed.⁶⁵³

Yet the necessity of the aforesaid things is not the same in all. To celebrate without a corporal or with one not blessed cannot be excused from mortal sin, unless grave necessity urges. With respect to the pall, the matter is controverted; wherefore, if a pall is lacking, or if it must be waited for through a quarter of an hour, another corporal can be used in its place, or, this also lacking, the purificator or burse. But if a purificator cannot easily be had, it is probably licit to celebrate without it, and in its place to use a clean small towel, which afterwards is no longer employed for profane use.⁶⁵⁴

Note. The corporal can be adorned at the extremities with gold or silk, but not likewise in the middle. - It is similarly licit to cover the pall, on the upper part, with silk cloth or woven gold, provided the linen pall attached beneath covers the chalice, and the upper cloth is not of black color, or does not bear some insignia of death.⁶⁵⁵

There is required: 4. a veil, and this silk, and a burse, of the color of the vestments. - But these are not to be blessed separately, nor is it any sin to celebrate without them.

1632. It is asked: To whom is it licit TO TOUCH the sacred vessels and linens?

Resp. 1. If they actually contain the Most Holy Sacrament, outside a case of necessity or danger of profanation, it is licit for no one, short of grave fault, to touch them, even mediately, except a priest or deacon. Thus commonly.

Resp. 2. If they are empty, it is permitted to touch them: 1. to subdeacons, also in the ministry of the altar; 2. to acolytes, and from custom to other clerics, outside ministry; likewise to regulars and Nuns who are sacristans, from privilege; 3. to all laymen from a reasonable cause; which lacking, they sin, according to the very common and truer opinion, but not more than venially, scandal and contempt being excluded. "And today," says St. Alphonsus, "it can be said from custom that this is licit... to all who serve churches in clerical habit....; at least I say these are excused from fault, because while they exercise the office of sacristan, there is always some necessity of touching sacred vessels." And the same applies to the touching of corporals after use.⁶⁵⁶ From the things said it is inferred that sacred vessels, if they are to be stripped, restored, or gilded, are licitly touched by the artisan, because a just cause is present.

Resp. 3. With respect to the WASHING of sacred linens, a threefold washing is required. - The first of these is to be performed by subdeacons, whose peculiar office it is.⁶⁵⁷ Yet there are not lacking those who teach that it can also be made by any tonsured cleric. It would be more fitting if the second and third washing were also done by a consecrated person; nevertheless there is no sin if they are done by laymen. - If a layman performs the first washing, he sins, but only venially; but when a just cause intervenes, the washing lacks every fault. - Moreover it is required, from canon law, that the vessels in which sacred linens are washed serve no other use, and that the water of washing be poured into the sacrarium; nor can derogation be made from this precept by any contrary custom.⁶⁵⁸

III. On the Sacred Vestments 1633. The SACRED VESTMENTS in which the priest ought to be clothed in the celebration of Mass are the following: amice, alb, cincture, maniple, stole, and chasuble or planeta: the latter three and the alb are called MAJOR by liturgical authors; the amice and cincture, MINOR. Wherefore it must be noted:

1. The priest, for performing the Sacrifice of the Mass, ought to be clothed with all the aforesaid vestments. Thus from the Rubric of the Missal.⁶⁵⁹ The precept with respect to the aforesaid vestments, although it obliges the celebrant in conscience, nevertheless does not urge equally in all its parts. For: 1. To celebrate without any sacred vestment

⁶⁵⁰Book VI, 385; 1 *El. qq. ref.*, n. 74.

⁶⁵¹*Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 433.

⁶⁵²Ritus Miss., I, 1, end.

⁶⁵³S. R. C., September 7, 1816, Gardellini, n. 4526, ad 26.

⁶⁵⁴Book VI, 387-389.

⁶⁵⁵Ibid., 388; S. R. C., January 10, 1852, ad 1; cf. *Analecta J. P.*, series 1, p. 1429.

⁶⁵⁶Book VI, 382.

⁶⁵⁷Can. 40, dist. 1, *de consecr.*; S. R. C., September 12 or 26, 1857, Gardellini, n. 5251, ad 30.

⁶⁵⁸Book VI, 387; 1 *El. qq. ref.*, n. 72.

⁶⁵⁹Ritus, I, 1.

is never licit; nor can this ever be made honorable by any cause, not even by danger of death, unless by Pontifical dispensation alone, if perhaps sometimes it is conceded, say in time of persecution.⁶⁶⁰ 2. To omit some one from the major vestments is a mortal sin; yet in a case of grave necessity, it is probably licit to celebrate without stole or maniple. - 3. To celebrate without cincture, or without amice, probably is not mortal; indeed, there is no sin if, these being lacking, a reasonable cause of celebrating is present, such as even the devotion of the celebrant alone.⁶⁶¹

But vestments “ought not to be torn or rent, but whole, and decently clean and beautiful.”⁶⁶² To celebrate with vestments enormously unclean or torn is mortal, unless necessity excuses, namely if the celebrant or others would otherwise have to omit Mass of precept. - If they are not very unclean or torn, it will be venial; indeed no sin, if others cannot be had.⁶⁶³

2. Vestments ought to be blessed by the Bishop, or by another having faculty. Thus the Rubric of the Missal.⁶⁶⁴ This blessing is required by the same necessity as the vestments themselves, since vestments not blessed are esteemed in the same way as non-sacred vestments.⁶⁶⁵ Moreover, regular Prelates cannot, without special privilege, bless sacred vestments. Such privilege is ordinarily conceded to them only for their own churches. If nevertheless they have blessed for other churches, the blessing, although illicit, is nevertheless valid.⁶⁶⁶ - Bishops, without Pontifical Indult, cannot delegate to others the faculty of blessing sacred vestments;⁶⁶⁷ *a fortiori*, regular Prelates cannot do this.
3. With respect to the material of vestments, these things are to be observed: 1. Amice and alb must be made from linen or hemp;⁶⁶⁸ 2. the cincture can be woolen or silk, although it is more fitting that it be linen;⁶⁶⁹ 3. vestments of suitable color can be made from silk or half-silk, or from gold texture; but not from glassy texture, nor from linen cloth or cotton,⁶⁷⁰ nor finally from wool; yet linen, just as cotton, can be mixed in the texture of the vestments.⁶⁷¹
4. “The vestments of the altar, of the celebrant and of the ministers, ought to be of the color suitable to the Office and Mass of the day, according to the use of the Roman Church, which has been accustomed to use five colors: white, red, green, violet, and black.”⁶⁷² - Hence, there are excluded vestments both of various colors and of yellow or blue color.⁶⁷³ Nevertheless a certain mixture of other colors is not reprobated, by way of ornament, provided one color is truly predominant. Nor are vestments made from gold cloth reprobated; indeed, rather, the custom of places is to be tolerated by which, for any color whatever except violet and black, they are employed.⁶⁷⁴ The aforesaid Rubric, since it treats of a thing which accompanies the Mass, more probably is not only directive, but also preceptive. Nevertheless, scandal excluded, it obliges only venially, and therefore any reasonable cause excuses from every sin, as if at a gathering of priests there were not enough vestments of the due color.⁶⁷⁵
5. Sacred vestments are execrated when they are notably and indecently torn, or have lost their form; or when, other parts having been added, they are so repaired that in the estimation of the prudent they can no longer be judged the same.⁶⁷⁶ But torn vestments, or those consumed by age, must be consumed by fire, and not employed for profane uses.⁶⁷⁷

1634. It must further be noted: 1. “Vestments ought not to be taken from the altar for the celebration of Masses, since this belongs only to Bishops, whether they celebrate solemnly or privately.”⁶⁷⁸ But, if the sacristy is lacking, or a table prepared for this, they can be placed upon the altar, not in the middle, as for Bishops, but at the Gospel corner. Yet this is licit to no one on an altar where the Most Holy Sacrament is exposed.⁶⁷⁹

⁶⁶⁰Cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 419: concession of Gregory XVI for ten years, July 26, 1841.

⁶⁶¹Book VI, 377.

⁶⁶²Ritus, I, 2.

⁶⁶³Book VI, 376.

⁶⁶⁴Ritus, I, 2.

⁶⁶⁵Book VI, 377.

⁶⁶⁶S. R. C., August 27, 1707, Gardellini, n. 3775.

⁶⁶⁷Book VI, 378, doubt 4; S. R. C., May 16, 1744, Gardellini, n. 4159, ad 5.

⁶⁶⁸S. R. C., May 15, 1819, Gardellini, n. 4563.

⁶⁶⁹Ibid., January 22, 1701, Gardellini, n. 3575, ad 7, and December 23, 1862, n. 5326.

⁶⁷⁰Ibid., September 22, 1837, n. 4814, ad VIII, 3, and September 11, 1847, n. 5099.

⁶⁷¹S. R. C., December 18, 1877, Gardellini, n. 5715.

⁶⁷²Rub. gen. Miss., XVIII, 1.

⁶⁷³S. R. C., September 22, 1837, n. 4814, ad VIII, 1, 2.

⁶⁷⁴February 23, 1839, n. 1847; April 28, 1866, n. 5363.

⁶⁷⁵Book VI, 378, doubt 5.

⁶⁷⁶Ibid., 371.

⁶⁷⁷Ibid.

⁶⁷⁸Decree of Urban VIII, at the beginning of the Missal.

⁶⁷⁹Bouvry, *Rit. celebr. Miss.*, tit. 1, rub. 1, n. 4.

2. The celebrant ought to be shod on the feet. Concerning which the S. R. C., August 31, 1872, in Gerunden., responded: "Clerics, especially in sacred functions, ought to employ stockings or shoes which approved Clerics of the place or Diocese are accustomed publicly to use."⁶⁸⁰ To celebrate without cause, with bare feet, contempt excluded, does not exceed venial sin; if it happens from necessity or reasonable cause, there is no sin.⁶⁸¹
3. The celebrant, approaching the vestments, ought to be "clothed in garments suitable to himself, of which at least the exterior reaches the heel of the foot."⁶⁸² This rubric, scandal and contempt excluded, seems to oblige only under venial sin. Yet various Councils have prescribed its observance under penalty of suspension incurred by the very fact by the delinquent, in the place of his own residence.⁶⁸³
4. "Let no one dare to use a small cap in the celebration of Mass, without express license of the Apostolic See, notwithstanding any contrary custom whatever."⁶⁸⁴ Hence the Doctors say it is mortal to celebrate the whole Mass with covered head; otherwise, if until the Canon, contempt and scandal excluded.⁶⁸⁵ But in an extraordinary case, if the illness is not long-lasting, it will be licit from presumed license to celebrate with the small cap, provided it is removed from the Preface to the end of Communion.

Similarly, "Innocent XII... ordered the Ordinaries of places to be warned that they should not permit anyone, without privilege of the Apostolic See, to perform the sacrosanct Sacrifice of the Mass with false hair."⁶⁸⁶ But several authors testify that this law has become obsolete in various places.

IV. On the Serving Minister 1635. I. It is licit for no priest to celebrate without a SERVING MINISTER. Thus all from the formal prescription of law,⁶⁸⁷ which obliges under grave obligation. - Yet necessity excuses from this law; whence the Doctors commonly say that it is licit to celebrate without a minister: 1. if the necessity of ministering Viaticum urges; 2. if the people, or the celebrant himself, ought to satisfy the precept of hearing Mass; 3. if, Mass having begun, especially after the oblation has been made, the minister departs, not going to return shortly.

II. The minister serving the celebrant ought to be MALE. For it has been guarded by law "that no woman presume to approach the altar, or minister to the presbyter, or stand or sit within the rails."⁶⁸⁸

This precept obliges under grave obligation, and therefore, when necessity urges, it would be better to celebrate without a minister than with a woman ministering. Yet in a case of necessity, a woman, especially if she is a nun, could respond from afar, provided she does not minister at the altar by offering the cruets, etc.⁶⁸⁹

Note. 1. Although the rubrics concerning the rite to be observed by the minister are preceptive, nevertheless "let the celebrant not make himself scrupulous if the minister pronounces badly, nor easily correct errors, lest he disturb himself or those standing around, or the order of the Mass"; it suffices if he supplies those things which are omitted by the minister. 2. A lesser necessity suffices for celebrating with a minister who does not know how to respond than without a minister.⁶⁹⁰

You will ask whether it is licit for a minister to serve a priest celebrating unworthily. Resp. No, unless he is excused by a grave cause. Thus St. Alphonsus⁶⁹¹ against Suarez and others, who deny that such cooperation is illicit whenever the priest could easily find another minister (cf. n. 1377).

§ 3. On The Observance Of The Rubrics 1636. "How great care must be employed, that the sacrosanct Sacrifice of the Mass be celebrated with every worship of religion and veneration, anyone will easily be able to judge, who has considered that in the sacred Scriptures he is called accursed who does the work of God negligently. But if we necessarily confess that no other work so holy and divine can be handled by the Christian faithful as this tremendous mystery, it also sufficiently appears that every labor and diligence must be placed in this, that it be performed with the greatest possible interior cleanness and purity of heart, and with the exterior appearance of devotion and piety."⁶⁹²

⁶⁸⁰Gardellini, n. 5507.

⁶⁸¹Book VI, 402.

⁶⁸²*Rit. cel. Miss.*, I, 2.

⁶⁸³For example, Council of Auch, n. CXXV; Council of Rouen, Decr. 16, n. 1; cf. *Collect. Lacen.*, vol. IV, 1124 and 529.

⁶⁸⁴Decree of Urban VIII, loc. cit.

⁶⁸⁵Book VI, 398.

⁶⁸⁶Benedict XIV, *De Synodo*, book 11, cap. 9, n. 5; cf. also *Thesaur. Resol.*, tom. II, p. 206, in Melphiten.

⁶⁸⁷L. I, Decretal., tit. 17, cap. 6.

⁶⁸⁸L. 3, tit. 2, c. 1.

⁶⁸⁹Book VI, 392; S. R. C., August 27, 1836, Gardellini, n. 4782, ad 10.

⁶⁹⁰Book VI, 391.

⁶⁹¹Book VI, 89.

⁶⁹²Trent, sess. 22, Decree.

Now, for the devout celebration of Mass, exact observance of the rubrics contributes much; and of this we must now treat.

1637. Principles. I. The rubrics which define the rite, manner, and norm of celebrating OBLIGE under precept grave in its kind.

This is proved, 1. from Trent, where it is said:⁶⁹³ “If anyone shall say... that the approved rites of the Church customarily employed in the solemn administration of the Sacraments may either be contemned, or be omitted by the ministers at pleasure without sin, or be changed into new others... let him be anathema.” These words certainly have the greatest force concerning the celebration of Mass, in which the most august of all the Sacraments is confected and administered.

2. From the Bull of St. Pius V, where it is said: “Commanding, and strictly enjoining upon each and all... in virtue of holy obedience, that they chant and read Mass according to the rite, manner, and norm which by this Missal is now handed down by Us.”⁶⁹⁴ And Sixtus V gives the reason for this precept, saying: “Sacred rites and ceremonies contain a great instruction of the Christian people, and a profession of the true faith; they commend the majesty of sacred things, lift up the minds of the faithful to the meditation of the highest things, and also inflame them with the fire of devotion.”⁶⁹⁵ On these things see the Ascetics.⁶⁹⁶

1638. II. The SOURCES of the rubrics which must be observed in the celebration of Mass are the Missal, the Ceremonial of Bishops, and the Decrees of the S. R. C. Thus from various Constitutions of the Pontiffs.

1. The primary source of the rubrics is the MISSAL. Yet concerning these rubrics the question is raised: whether they are all preceptive, or whether some are only directive, or of counsel? “There are diverse opinions on this point. We follow the opinion of Quarti, Merati, and Tournely, who say that the Rubrics concerning things to be done WITHIN Mass are all preceptive, and oblige according to the gravity of the matter; for in the Bull of St. Pius V it is said thus: ‘strictly enjoining that they chant and read Mass according to the rite, manner, and norm prescribed in the Missal.’ Note the words *strictly enjoining*. But concerning the rubrics about things to be done OUTSIDE Mass, many Doctors probably say that some are only directive, as the washing of the hands after Mass, and the prayers before or after Mass.”⁶⁹⁷ (cf. 1639. A. 4).
2. The CEREMONIAL OF BISHOPS is the complement of the Missal in solemn Offices. It obliges everywhere, since in the three Bulls placed there it is said: “The aforesaid Ceremonial is to be observed in all churches, especially in cathedral and collegiate churches.”⁶⁹⁸
3. The SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES authentically interprets the Rubrics and promotes their observance. Concerning its Decrees or decisions see what was said about the decrees of the Roman Congregations in the Treatise on Laws (n. 169, q. 2).

What must be done, you will ask, if in some place a CUSTOM contrary to the Rubrics is in force? - Resp. 1. “The S. Congregation of Rites constantly tolerates a custom, at least immemorial, contrary to the rubrics. Therefore, with a safe conscience, it is licit to conform oneself to diocesan custom, especially in things of lighter moment, which do not yield to deformity of public worship.”⁶⁹⁹ - Resp. 2. An unreasonable custom, or one not yet prescribed, certainly must be abolished. But when that occurs, and how prudently one must then act, we have said above (n. 267 sqq. and 1422).

The S. RIT. C., at the petition of all the Churches in the kingdoms of Spain, on June 11, 1605, declared: “That the Book Ceremonial (of Bishops) does not take away immemorial and laudable customs.” But the same Congregation, being again asked: “Whether ancient customs, namely those which are opposed to no statute of the Church, have been abrogated by these words of the Rescript: *Let the Ceremonial always and by whomever be observed*,” on May 6, 1826, in Alexandrina, responded: “Recourse must be had to this Sacred Congregation in particular cases.”⁷⁰⁰

1639. III. The observance of the Rubrics must be so accurate that nothing from them is OMITTED, that nothing is ADDED to them, and that nothing in them is CHANGED. And indeed:

- A) As to omission: 1. To omit the ordinary parts of the Mass, namely those which are always recited or done in Mass, is a GRAVE sin, if the matter is notable. Thus, for example, it will be mortal to omit in the Canon any prayer, or the

⁶⁹³Sess. 7, can. 13.

⁶⁹⁴Book VI, 399.

⁶⁹⁵Constitution *Immensa aeterni Dei*.

⁶⁹⁶See especially St. Thomas, 3, q. 83; St. Bonaventure, *Expositio Missae*, cap. 2; and St. Alphonsus, opusculum *Del Sacrif. di G. C.*

⁶⁹⁷*Exam. Ord.*, n. 112; cf. Schober, cap. I, n. 3, adnot. 4, where there is a conforming Response of the S. R. C. (August 18, 1854) concerning the washing of hands.

⁶⁹⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹⁹Book VI, 401 (from the 6th ed.).

⁷⁰⁰Gardellini, n. 266, and n. 4620; cf. *Rev. des sc. ecclés.*, t. IV, p. 78, and XXIX, p. 299, where several abusive and unreasonable customs are reviewed.

Pater noster, or the breaking of the Host with its commingling in the chalice, or the purification of the paten and chalice after the consumption, or eight or ten words in the Canon. So likewise it will be mortal, outside the Canon, to omit the whole Introit, or two of the principal Collects, or the Epistle, Gospel, Offertory, or the infusion of water into the wine to be consecrated. But it will be venial to omit only the psalm *Judica*, the *Kyrie eleison*, one of the Collects, one or another cross over the Oblata, the striking of the breast, or the washing of the fingers; and Lugo and others probably say the same concerning the Gospel of St. John.⁷⁰¹ But defects of this sort, by coalescing, can become grave matter.

2. To omit the extraordinary parts, namely those which are not said in every Mass, is not a mortal sin, unless taken together they constitute notable matter. Thus it would be only venial to omit the *Gloria*, the *Credo*, the Sequence, the Tract, the proper Preface, the proper *Communicantes*, and the proper *Hanc igitur*.⁷⁰² The same seems to be said if someone does not recite the things which are sung by the choir, or omits the incensation in a solemn Mass.⁷⁰³
 3. To mutilate words, or to insert syncopation, the sense being preserved and scandal being excluded, is only venial; indeed, there is no sin if it happens from natural defect.
 4. To omit the washing of hands before Mass is a venial sin, indeed mortal if the hands are very unclean.⁷⁰⁴ - Likewise, it is venial to omit the prayers while putting on the sacred vestments.⁷⁰⁵ Likewise venial is it to use, without just cause, only water in the purification of the chalice and washing of the fingers; we say without just cause, such as there would be if the celebrant were an abstainer, or if the wine were red, so that the purificators would be much stained from it.⁷⁰⁶ By Apostolic Indult, January 13, 1665, this is also permitted on account of scarcity of wine in the Kingdoms of China.⁷⁰⁷
- B) As to addition, it is certain among all that it is mortal to add something in Mass with the intention of introducing a new rite. Wherefore he would sin gravely who added new public prayers. But if from inopportune devotion several Collects from the same Missal are added, or the *Credo*, or *Gloria*, *Pater*, *Ave*, or something similar, this does not exceed venial fault. Yet it is reasonably judged to be mortal to add the *Gloria* and *Credo* in a Mass of Requiem, because such an addition seems to be a sufficiently grave disorder.⁷⁰⁸
- C) As to change: 1. He cannot be excused from venial sin who recites in a clear voice those things which are to be said quietly, or conversely; or even who pronounces what is to be recited secretly so quietly that he cannot hear himself.⁷⁰⁹ “Quarti rightly says, however, that he is not excused from mortal sin who should so pronounce the words of Consecration.”⁷¹⁰
2. Likewise it is venial to perform imperfectly the prescribed rites, for example genuflections, signs of the cross, elevations of the hands, and the like.⁷¹¹
 3. To change one Epistle for another, one Gospel for another, one Preface for another, does not exceed venial fault.
 4. To change the Mass, for example by celebrating a votive Mass on forbidden days, is not mortal, scandal and contempt being excluded. Nevertheless it is strictly, and therefore of itself under grave obligation, prohibited to celebrate a Mass of Requiem on the same days. “For the rest, all agree that votive Masses or Masses of Requiem can be celebrated for grave causes.”⁷¹² (cf. n. 1642, q. 4).

It is asked: If something in Mass has been inadvertently omitted or changed, and the celebrant, having progressed further, remembers the matter, is he bound to repair the defect?

Resp. No, regularly speaking, because he would disturb the order of the Mass. It is said regularly speaking; “because 1. if it is of the substance, for example something pertaining to the consecration, it is certain that it must be repeated; 2.

⁷⁰¹*Exam. Ord.*, n. 125; Book VI, 403-406.

⁷⁰²*Ibid.*, n. 125, and Book VI, 409.

⁷⁰³Book VI, 410, doubt 4.

⁷⁰⁴*Ibid.*, 407.

⁷⁰⁵*Ibid.*, 409.

⁷⁰⁶*Ibid.*, 410, doubt 3.

⁷⁰⁷*Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 450.

⁷⁰⁸Book VI, 411.

⁷⁰⁹Book VI, 414-416.

⁷¹⁰*Ibid.*, 414.

⁷¹¹*Ibid.*, 400.

⁷¹²*Ibid.*, 420; cf. also 421.

if, while praying secretly, after a few words he certainly notices that he has omitted something notable, for example on Easter day the *Communicantes*, he must go back a little and repeat.”⁷¹³

1640. IV. Besides the external observance of the rubrics, INTERNAL ATTENTION and DEVOTION also are required. For “the Sacrifice, besides the character of prayer, has in addition the character of the most excellent worship of religion; and he seems to inflict grave irreverence upon it who, while by a religious act he professes to worship God, voluntarily distracts himself.” Wherefore, if voluntary distraction is had in the Canon, and especially in the consecration and consumption, it will be a mortal sin. But if it is had outside the Canon, the same must be said as concerning the canonical Hours.⁷¹⁴

Preparation for Mass and thanksgiving also refer to devout celebration. He who approached to celebrate without any preparation, at least one made at home, could not be excused from some fault. - In thanksgiving one must remain at least through a quarter of an hour. Indeed, if nothing prevents it, it is to be desired that a half-hour be spent on it. Yet the prayers which in the Missal are assigned “to be said according to the convenience of the priest” can be omitted without fault, because in the Rubric there is not a precept about them, but only an intimation.⁷¹⁵ Nevertheless it seems otherwise must be said of the Cantic of the children, which is read as prescribed in the Missal, in the very Order of Mass.⁷¹⁶

1641. From these things you will infer: 1. That a fitting SPACE OF TIME be spent in reading Mass; generally, according to the rule which Benedict XIV hands down, it ought not be shorter than a third, nor longer than a half-hour; for a shorter time would not allow all things to be done with due decorum, and a longer time would bring tedium to those standing by.⁷¹⁷ 2. Nor can a priest be excused from mortal sin who completes Mass in less than a quarter-hour, even if the Mass is among the shorter ones, or of Blessed Mary on Saturday; because in so brief a space he necessarily commits two grave defects, one of grave irreverence toward the Sacrament, the other of scandal toward the people. And in fact it cannot be that Mass is completed within a quarter-hour without either words or ceremonies being passed over, or at least without the decency and gravity due to so great a Sacrifice being notably violated. But also such overhasty haste tends to the harm of the people; for it diminishes in those standing by the sense of piety and veneration which is due to the most august Sacrifice. And hence it is why Roncaglia gravely affirms that Bishops and Prelates of Regulars are bound, and indeed under grave obligation, to extirpate this shameful and scandalous haste.

The Venerable Cardinal Bellarmine complains of this lamentable abuse, and with him Benedict XIV and then St. Alphonsus, sorrowfully exclaiming: “This,” he says, “is worthy of most abundant tears, that through the carelessness or impiety of some priests the sacrosanct mysteries are treated so indecorously that those who handle them seem not to believe that the majesty of the Lord is present. For thus some, without spirit, without affection, without fear and trembling, with incredible haste, finish the Sacrifice, as if by faith they did not see Christ the Lord, or did not believe themselves to be seen by Him.”⁷¹⁸

1642. Questions. Q. 1. Whether an INFIRM priest can celebrate, if he cannot observe all the Rubrics?

Resp. Yes, if he omits only few and lighter ones, especially if he celebrates privately. “Indeed,” says Croix, “one who could not celebrate without a cane can licitly use it. And Gobat adds that if someone could not celebrate unless leaning upon the altar with both arms, he would licitly celebrate thus privately, but not publicly unless he did this from necessity. Yet I think this does not exceed venial sin, from which he seems able to be excused who, on account of infirmity, could not stand upright, and from his devotion wished to celebrate, provided the wonder of the people be avoided. Croix and others also say that if someone cannot elevate the host, but can do the rest, he can celebrate privately, and even publicly if necessity is present and the people is warned; but I think it enough to warn the people only, if someone celebrates from devotion.” Thus St. Alphonsus.⁷¹⁹

With respect to the BLIND or the DIM-SIGHTED, it must be noted: “Lugo, Vasquez, and others probably say that a priest licitly celebrates who, because of weakness of sight, recites the Mass from memory, provided he discerns the chalice and host sufficiently to avoid irreverence; and provided that, in order to avoid remark, he has a Missal on the altar.”[^vol2-0037-fn-1] But it is certain among all that it is illicit for a priest who is entirely blind to celebrate without a special Indult, which is not difficult to obtain. - A clause is generally added to the Indult, prescribing that he not celebrate without the

⁷¹³Ibid., 403.

⁷¹⁴Ibid., 410, doubt 5.

⁷¹⁵Ibid., 410, doubt 2; cf. *Prax.*, n. 156.

⁷¹⁶*Can. Miss.*, end.

⁷¹⁷Book VI, 400; *H. A.*, XV, 84-86; *Exam. Ord.*, n. 125.

⁷¹⁸Ibid.; cf. also the opusculum *La Messa strapazzata*.

⁷¹⁹Ibid., 402.

assistance of another priest, who can warn him if he fails in certain things. But on the feast of the Nativity of the Lord, one having the Indult cannot celebrate three votive Masses of the B. V. M.[^vol2-0037-fn-2]

Q. 2. Whether it is sometimes licit to INTERRUPT Mass?

Resp. 1. To interrupt the Sacrifice essentially and by design, so that only one species is consecrated, or so that, after the consecration of both species, the celebrant departs without consumption, is never licit, even to avoid death. "But to mutilate accidentally and indirectly is sometimes licit, for example when fire or an enemy rushing in to kill occurs; for then the priest could consume the consecrated host, or carry it with him, not consecrating the chalice; because then he does not mutilate the Sacrifice, but is excused from completing it. Thus commonly."[^vol2-0037-fn-3]

2. To interrupt Mass accidentally, by interposing something, is licit in the following cases: 1. on account of a sermon after the Gospel, or also, with the consent of the Ordinary, on account of an address which the priest, after receiving Communion, gives from the altar to the people before distributing Communion to them.[^vol2-0037-fn-4] 2. In favor of an arriving Prince, Cardinal, Bishop, or crowd of pilgrims, who otherwise could not hear Mass; or on account of a similar cause, from which, if the oblation has not been made, the Mass can be begun anew, so that those arriving may hear the whole Sacrifice; nevertheless there is no obligation of this, and therefore the custom of places must be followed. - 3. If before the Canon the priest remembers some impediment, for example that he is not fasting, or in the state of grace, or is irregular or excommunicated, provided the Mass can be left without scandal or grave note (cf. n. 1559). Likewise, if an excommunicated person to be avoided presumes to be present and cannot be expelled (n. 1292, 3). - 4. If a grave necessity urges, either his own, for example illness, or that of his neighbor, as if one about to die must be baptized or absolved. Yet in other Sacraments not so necessary it is not fitting to interrupt the Consecration and Consumption, unless the dying person were nearby and there were no need to remove the vestments; or unless he could not receive the Sacrament of Penance on account of frenzy, but only Extreme Unction.[^vol2-0037-fn-5]

In these cases, however, whenever the altar is left, let the Most Holy Eucharist be locked in the tabernacle; and when the priest returns, let him begin where he ceased. But if he had interrupted the Consecration, and the delay had been more than one hour, he would have to begin from the beginning; because after so great an interruption it is not judged the same Sacrifice.[^vol2-0037-fn-6]

Q. 3. Whether a Mass BROKEN OFF by one priest must be completed by another?

Resp. "If the priest, before consecration, becomes gravely ill, or falls into syncope, or dies, the Mass is omitted; if this happens after the consecration of the Body only, before the consecration of the Blood, or when both have been consecrated, the Mass is to be completed by another priest from that place where the former ceased, and in a case of necessity even by one not fasting, although he has already celebrated that day. But if he has not died, but is infirm, yet so that he can communicate, and there is no other consecrated Host present, the priest who completes the Mass should divide the Host, and give one part to the infirm one, and consume the other himself."[^vol2-0037-fn-7] But if the priest fails after the consumption of only the Body of Christ, the chalice is to be consumed by another. Moreover a probable opinion holds that the priest who supplies is not to be sought beyond about one hour; otherwise it is not judged one Sacrifice.[^vol2-0037-fn-8]

Q. 4. Whether the Mass must always agree with the OFFICE of the celebrant?

Resp. The general rule is that, as far as can be done, the Mass should agree with the Office; for Holy Church orders the Office and the Mass to the same end, namely to honoring the same Mystery or the same Saint. - Yet this rule admits its exceptions, namely:

1. VOTIVE Masses can be said at the discretion of priests, when the Office is not double, or of a Sunday, or of a feria or privileged Octave. But this should not be done except for a reasonable cause, for example on account of a special devotion either of the celebrant, or of one assisting, or of the one giving an alms. - The Mass for bridegroom and bride is permitted even on a double, both minor and major; and a solemn votive Mass for a grave matter, even on feasts of a superior rite, the things to be observed being observed, as the Rubricists explain. Masses of the DEAD can be said as votive Masses, and they also enjoy a more ample privilege if they are to be celebrated on the day of death, on the third, seventh, thirtieth, and anniversary day.
2. A Mass to be celebrated IN ANOTHER CHURCH must sometimes agree with the Office of that church, namely: 1. if a Feast is celebrated there which excludes votive and Requiem Masses, and if the color of the Office is different from the color of the celebrant's Office; - 2. if a Feast is celebrated with solemnity and gathering of the people; - 3. if the celebrant supplies the place of the pastor; - 4. if a foreign priest celebrates the conventual Mass in the church of

monks or of nuns. These things apply equally to public oratories, even taken broadly (cf. n. 1627). - But in private oratories, and likewise in the chapels of nuns, the Mass must always agree with the Office of the celebrant, even if the Office is of a Blessed whose Mass he cannot say in another church without special privilege.[^vol2-0037-fn-9]

Here moreover let the Decree of the Council of Trent be noted (sess. 23, cap. 16), saying: "Let no wandering cleric, without commendatory letters of his Ordinary, be admitted by any Bishop to celebrate Divine things and administer the Sacraments." A Bishop can require the observance of this decree, under threatened censures, even from exempt Regulars, as the S. C. of the Council judged.[^vol2-0037-fn-10] - Priests who are known, and priests from neighboring dioceses, are commonly excepted, who are customarily admitted to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass without proofs or commendatory Letters of this sort being exhibited or required, as daily practice teaches. But in populous cities, and in those places to which foreigners commonly come frequently, as here at Rome, the rigor of the law is observed.[^vol2-0037-fn-11]

Admonition. From the things said thus far it is easily gathered how great an obligation lies upon priests to know rightly all the Rubrics to be observed in the celebration of Mass, especially those which are found at the beginning of the Missal. There also are indicated the defects which can occur, and the celebrant is taught what he ought to do in any case.