

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II - Treatise VI: On Extreme Unction

Contents

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

Article II. On The Matter And Form Of Extreme Unction	23
§ 1. On The Matter Of Extreme Unction	23
§ 2. On The Form Of Extreme Unction	25
Chapter II. On The Minister Of Extreme Unction	26
Chapter III. On The Subject Of Extreme Unction	27

Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, Volume II

Treatise I: On the Sacraments in General and Treatise VI: On Extreme Unction

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 VI. On Extreme Unction

1870. EXTREME UNCTION, just as it is the last Sacrament, so, according to D. Thomas, is the crown of spiritual life; for, fortified by this Sacrament, a man is disposed proximately to entrance into the heavenly fatherland.

The Treatise on Extreme Unction very fittingly follows the Treatise on Penance; for, according to the Council of Trent (sess. 14, on E. U.), Extreme Unction is the consummative Sacrament of Penance: insofar, namely, as it consummates and perfects penance, deleting the remnants of sins, and imposes an end to the Christian life, which ought to be perpetual penance. "Extreme Unction," says St. Thomas,¹⁰⁷ "is compared to Penance as Confirmation to Baptism; namely in such a way that Penance is of greater necessity, but Extreme Unction is of greater perfection."

The things to be said concerning this Sacrament will be set forth in three chapters. In the first, the discourse will be concerning the nature of Extreme Unction; in the second, concerning its minister; and in the third, concerning its subject.

Chapter I. On The Nature Of Extreme Unction

One must treat: 1. Of the notion and effect of this Sacrament. 2. Of the matter and form by which it is constituted.

Article I. On The Notion And Effect Of Extreme Unction

1871. DEFINITION. Extreme Unction is "a Sacrament instituted by Christ and promulgated by Blessed James, for conferring the health of the soul, or even of the body, on the sick who are in danger of life, through the anointing of blessed oil and the prayer of the priest."¹⁰⁸

Principles. - I. Extreme Unction is truly and properly a SACRAMENT of the New Law. - It is of faith; and it is clear: 1. from the words of James (5, 14 and 15): "Is any one of you sick? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." - 2. From Trent, sess. 14, on Extreme Unction, can. 1: "If anyone shall say that Extreme Unction is not truly and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James, but only a rite accepted from the Fathers, or a human figment: let him be anathema."

This Sacrament was instituted by Christ the Lord after the resurrection, as the more common opinion holds with Suarez; and it was promulgated by St. James, as is clear from the text alleged above.¹⁰⁹

1872. II. Besides sanctifying grace, which, like the other Sacraments, it produces, Extreme Unction has ITS OWN PROPER EFFECTS, which are the following:

1. The PRIMARY effect is to strengthen the soul in its last agony. "This Sacrament," says the Council of Trent (sess. 14, on E. U., cap. 2), "alleviates and confirms the soul of the sick person, by exciting in him great confidence in the divine mercy; by which the sick man, supported, both bears more lightly the inconveniences and labors of disease, and more easily resists the temptations of the devil lying in wait for his heel."

2. The SECONDARY effect is threefold: 1. To delete the remnants of sin, such as obscurity of mind, hardness of heart, love of sensible things, diffidences, anxieties, and similar things which are contracted from sins. - 2. To take away part of the punishments which remain to be expiated for sins. (These two effects are produced greater or lesser according to the degree of disposition of the sick person.) - 3. To confer health of body, if it is expedient for the health of the soul, as Trent has it (loc. cit.); and to this end the prayers placed in the Ritual are also directed. But the Sacrament does not work this effect by way of miracle, lest faith be emptied out; but by a certain supernatural power, which aids natural causes, as far as the body is capable of their action.¹¹⁰

1873. Questions. Q. 1. Whether and in what way sins ARE REMITTED through Extreme Unction?

Resp. 1. Although the principal effect of this Sacrament is not to remit sins, neither mortal nor venial, as the Thomists more commonly and more probably teach against the Scotists, and as the Apostle James himself seems to suggest, saying conditionally "and, if he be in sins"; nevertheless, remission of sins must be specially attributed to it; for the Apostle

¹⁰⁷III, q. 65, a. 3.

¹⁰⁸H. A., XVII, 1.

¹⁰⁹Book VI, 706; cf. *Dogm. in Trid.*, sess. 14, on Extreme Unction, n. 2-4.

¹¹⁰Cf. Book VI, 731.

continues, saying: “they shall be forgiven him,” and Trent teaches similarly: “delicts, if any are still to be expiated, it wipes away.”

Resp. 2. But concerning the mode in which mortal sins are remitted, Theologians do not agree. - Some with Gonet, Sporer, etc., to whom St. Thomas seems to give support,¹¹¹ say that they are remitted per accidens, since it is a question of a Sacrament of the living; but others more probably and more commonly, with Suarez, Tournely, etc., teach that they are remitted per se, not indeed directly, but consequently; for it is clear that Extreme Unction was instituted to take away the remnants of sins; but because these cannot be taken away from a soul in which sin is found, unless the sin itself is first taken away, therefore this Sacrament, consequently, takes away sin.¹¹²

Q. 2. Whether through EACH ANOINTING partial grace is conferred?

Resp. 1. Suarez and others affirm it; because any anointing with its own form already signifies grace independently of the other anointings. - 2. But St. Thomas with the more common opinion denies it; because no anointing of itself constitutes the Sacrament, nor even a partial Sacrament; hence, grace is not conferred unless when the Sacrament is completed by the last anointing. - Each opinion is probable.¹¹³

Q. 3. Whether this Sacrament can be VALID and UNFORMED, so that, with the obstacle receding, grace is conferred?

Resp. “The Doctors commonly affirm. Hence the Salmanticenses with others infer that, if a sick person in good faith, or destitute of senses, received the Sacrament in mortal sin, it suffices that afterwards he have attrition, for grace to be received. Otherwise, if in bad faith. - But this runs, if the obstacle is removed while the same disease and danger persevere, at least as regards the effect of special helps, as Suarez and others say.”¹¹⁴

From these things you will gather that through Extreme Unction souls often are saved, both because the Sacrament supplies strength and helps without which the sick person would yield victory to the devil; and because it is received more easily with a lesser disposition, and with a more lasting efficacy; and finally because it is the most salutary admonition of all concerning the proximity of death.¹¹⁵

Article II. On The Matter And Form Of Extreme Unction

§ 1. On The Matter Of Extreme Unction 1874. A twofold matter is distinguished, namely remote and proximate.

I. The REMOTE matter is oil expressed from olives, and blessed by a special blessing by a Bishop.¹¹⁶

But the choice of this matter was most fitting: “for, as OIL greatly profits for mitigating pains of the body, so the power of the Sacrament diminishes the sadness and pain of the soul. OIL besides restores health, brings cheerfulness, and supplies, as it were, food to light; and then it is most greatly accommodated to restoring the strength of a wearied body. All these things declare what, in the sick person, is effected by divine power through the administration of this Sacrament.” - Thus the Roman Catechism.¹¹⁷

We said, 1. IT IS OIL; for it is clear from the words of the Apostle, *anointing him with oil*; and this oil, by necessity or validity of the Sacrament, must be the juice of the olive; because in common use this juice alone is designated by the name of oil. Hence Eugene IV, in the Decree to the Armenians, expressly names oil of olive. “This oil moreover, at least from the precept of the Church, ought to be simple, that is, without any admixture of another liquid,” as Benedict XIV teaches.¹¹⁸

2. BLESSED BY A BISHOP: wherefore Trent (sess. 14, cap. 1) has these words: “For the Church understood that the matter is oil blessed by a Bishop.” But whether this blessing is not only of precept, but also of the necessity of the Sacrament, is disputed; but Authors most commonly affirm it with St. Thomas, and today the matter is plainly certain. For to the doubt: whether, with the oil of the sick lacking, it is licit to administer, under condition, the Sacrament of Extreme Unction with oil blessed by a simple priest, at least in a case of extreme necessity, for instance when the dying person, destitute of senses, previously gave no sign of sorrow and does not give it: the response was always Negative. Thus the Holy Office

¹¹¹ *Suppl.*, q. 30, a. 1, c.

¹¹² Book VI, 731.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 707.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, qu. 2.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Bellarmine, *De Extr. Unct.*, cap. VIII, and Benedict XIV, *De Syn.*, Book 8, cap. 6.

¹¹⁶ *H. A.*, XVII, 2; Book VI, 708.

¹¹⁷ *De Extr. Unct.*, n. 5.

¹¹⁸ *De Synodo*, lib. 8, c. 1, n. 3.

on January 13, 1611, before Paul V, and September 14, 1842, before Gregory XVI.¹¹⁹ Nevertheless, the blessing of oil can be committed by the Supreme Pontiff to a simple priest, as is clear from the Decree of Clement VIII,¹²⁰ who (indirectly) declared that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction conferred on Latins by Greek priests, with oil blessed by the same priests, is valid.¹²¹

3. Blessed BY A SPECIAL BLESSING, i.e. in order to Extreme Unction: for that this is required by necessity of the Sacrament the Salmanticenses with Bellarmine affirm probably, against Suarez and others; because, just as by the blessing of chrism the matter is deputed for the Sacrament of Confirmation, so by the blessing of the oil of the sick the matter is deputed to the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.¹²² Hence, in a case of necessity, the Oil of catechumens or Sacred Chrism can indeed be employed UNDER CONDITION. But when the oil of the sick itself has been found, the anointings must be repeated under condition; and the same must be done if by error the priest had employed those oils.

It is doubted: Whether one single drop of oil suffices for administering the Sacrament? - St. Alphonsus responded: "Only speculatively probable is the opinion saying that it suffices to administer this Sacrament with one drop of oil, without spreading it over parts; not, however, practically, because this would not be a true anointing."¹²³ Nevertheless, for the value of the Sacrament, it certainly suffices to dip the extreme part of the finger in oil for the individual anointings which are made under the repeated form.

Note. This oil (as also the oil of catechumens and Sacred Chrism), from the precept of Clement VIII¹²⁴ (which according to the more probable opinion obliges under grave sin), must be renewed yearly; and, the renewal having been made, the oil of the preceding year must be burned (namely in the lamp which burns before the Most Holy Sacrament); nor is it licit to use it any longer, except in the case in which the new cannot be had. - But if the new does not suffice, another, not blessed, can be mixed with it, but in lesser quantity, as the Ritual says. Indeed, it is licit to renew the admixture several times, provided that the oil to be mixed in is always in lesser quantity, and true necessity requires this.¹²⁵ - See the rest in the Ritual.

1875. II. The PROXIMATE matter is the anointing of certain parts of the body, and at least of the five senses, made by a priest. - From the Roman Ritual, principally five parts of the body ought to be anointed, namely: 1. the eyes (or eyelids) or eyebrows; - 2. the ears (at the lowest part of the ear, so that it can be wiped more easily); - 3. the nostrils, i.e. both nostrils (outside), or the extremity of the summit of the nose, with one anointing; - 4. the mouth, with the lips compressed so that one anointing can be made (if this could not be obtained, it will be enough that the lower or upper lip be anointed); - 5. the hands (outside for priests, inside for others); - 6. the feet (either on the soles, or above the feet, according as custom bears or diocesan Statutes prescribe, or as it can be done more conveniently).¹²⁶ Although, however (from the common opinion), this anointing of the feet is not of the necessity of the Sacrament, nevertheless it cannot be omitted at the priest's pleasure.¹²⁷ - 7. The reins; whose anointing is not of the necessity of the Sacrament, as is clear from the Roman Ritual, where it is read: "But the anointing of the reins in women, for the sake of modesty, is always omitted; and also in men, when the sick person cannot conveniently be moved. But, whether in women or in men, another part of the body ought not to be anointed for the reins." At Rome it is customary to anoint the reins of men from each side, or at least from one side, upon the bone which they call the ischion (hip): for thus the sick person scarcely needs to be moved. Elsewhere, the anointing of the reins is omitted in all indiscriminately; nevertheless the S. R. C. (August 1, 1858) desires that it be introduced where it is not in use.¹²⁸ Meanwhile, the custom of the diocese is to be observed by the priest.

1876. Questions. Q. 1. In what way ought the anointings to be made?

Resp. 1. From the ROMAN RITUAL, each anointing ought to be made with the thumb dipped in the holy oil, in the manner of a cross, adapting the cross and the words in the anointing of each part, always beginning from the right. "But the minister, if he is in Sacred Orders, or the priest himself, after each anointing, should wipe the places anointed with a new little ball of cotton or of something similar, and should place it in a clean vessel, and afterwards carry it to the church, burn it, and cast the ashes into the Sacrarium."

¹¹⁹Cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 670 and 671.

¹²⁰Instruction on the Rites of the Italo-Greeks, August 31, 1595 (*Bullar.*, tom. V, p. III, 72).

¹²¹Book VI, 709, dub. 3.

¹²²*Ibid.*, dub. 2.

¹²³*H. A.*, App. II, § 4, III; cf. Book VI, 709, dub. 4.

¹²⁴Cf. Bull of Approbation of the Roman Pontifical.

¹²⁵Book VI, 708; cf. Konings, n. 1502, q. 4.

¹²⁶S. R. C., August 27, 1836, in Rhedonen. (cf. Gardell., n. 4780 with note).

¹²⁷Book VI, 710-711.

¹²⁸Del Vecchio, II, n. 781, annot. 1.

Resp. 2. It is certain that it is not of the necessity of the Sacrament that the anointings be made through the immediate contact of the hand; wherefore in a case of necessity, i.e. when plague is raging, a little rod anointed with oil can be employed, which afterwards is to be burned.¹²⁹ - Nor is it of the necessity of the Sacrament that a double anointing be made in double parts; since the tinder of sins is now sufficiently indicated through the anointing of one part: hence, when necessity urges, or if the sick person cannot be turned to another side, it suffices to anoint one eye, one ear, etc. Nor finally is it essential to observe the order of the RITUAL among the anointings of the parts; since the inversion of order does not impede the signification of the Sacrament. - But, outside the case of necessity, these three things are to be observed under grave sin, as is commonly taught.¹³⁰

Q. 2. Whether the anointing OF THE FIVE SENSES is of the necessity of the Sacrament?

Resp. It is controverted. - The first opinion (speculatively probable), with Merbesius, Tournely, etc., denies it; for from St. James a simple anointing is prescribed, and in Trent mention is made of only one anointing by these words: "this sacred anointing"; whence it seems to suffice that a man be anointed in only one part, so that he may be called anointed. But the more common and safer opinion (to be held under grave sin in practice) affirms that the simple anointings of the five senses are of the necessity of the Sacrament. Thus St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas, Suarez, Bellarmine, etc., who gather this chiefly from the use of the Church.¹³¹

Q. 3. Whether and in what way are the BLIND, DEAF, MUTILATED to be anointed?

Resp. "If someone is mutilated in some member, the part nearest to that place is to be anointed, with the same form of words." Thus the Roman Ritual. In the same way, those blind from birth, deaf, and mute are to be anointed, namely near the organs of the senses of which they are deprived; for although they have not sinned exteriorly through them, nevertheless they could have sinned through the interior powers to which those correspond, e.g. through desires of seeing, hearing, etc. Thus D. Thomas and the Salmanticenses with the common opinion.¹³²

§ 2. On The Form Of Extreme Unction 1877. The FORM of Extreme Unction is this: *Through this holy anointing, and His most loving mercy, may the Lord forgive thee whatever THROUGH SIGHT* (if the eyes are anointed, and so concerning the others) *thou hast committed. Amen.* - It is clear from the Council of Trent and from the Roman Ritual. The indicative form would be invalid, as is taught more truly; for from the words of St. James, *And let them pray over him*, it ought to be deprecatory.¹³³

Moreover, to one asking why the form of this Sacrament is deprecatory, the Roman Catechism responds:¹³⁴ "This was constituted by the best right; for since this Sacrament is therefore applied so that, besides the spiritual grace which it bestows, it may also restore health to the sick; nevertheless, because it does not always follow that the sick recover from diseases, for that cause the form is completed by prayer, so that from the kindness of God we may obtain that which the power of the Sacrament is not wont to effect by a constant and perpetual order."

As regards the form, LET THE FOLLOWING BE NOTED:

1. To the essence of the Sacrament pertain the words: *Through this anointing may the Lord forgive thee whatever thou hast committed.* - There are indeed some who deny that the word *thou hast committed* is of the essence; but undeservedly: for this word expresses the remission of sins, which is the principal effect of this Sacrament.
2. The word *holy* does not pertain to the essence, as all confess; nor these other words: *through His most loving mercy*, because one who prays God that He forgive already implores His mercy, as the Authors more commonly and more probably teach. Nevertheless, to omit these last words would be a grave sin against the use of the Church, in a grave matter; but neither can the word *holy* be omitted without fault.
3. The form is not to be ended before the other part of the same sense has been anointed. If the priest fails between the anointings, the anointings already made are not to be repeated, unless a fourth part of an hour has now elapsed; in which case they would have to be repeated under condition.¹³⁵

¹²⁹Book VI, 710; H. A., ib., 3.

¹³⁰Book VI, 710; cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 679.

¹³¹Book VI, 710, Quaer.; H. A., XVII, 4.

¹³²Book VI, 732, 3.

¹³³Book VI, 711; H. A., XVII, 5.

¹³⁴*De Extr. Unct.*, n. 7.

¹³⁵Book VI, 711; H. A., ib., 5.

4. Once the form has been ended, in the individual anointings, the sick person with those standing by can respond Amen. And it will be excellent if, while the five senses of the body are being anointed, he expressly grieves concerning the faults committed through them.¹³⁶

IT IS ASKED. In what way, WHEN NECESSITY URGES, must the Sacrament be conferred?

Resp. 1. "If someone labors in extremis, and danger is imminent lest he depart before the anointings are finished, let him be anointed quickly, beginning from that place: *Through this holy anointing*, etc. Then, if he still survives, let the prayers omitted, placed in their own place, be said." Thus the ROMAN RITUAL.

2. If the danger of death is so imminent that all the anointings do not seem able to be carried out in the due manner, let the priest make one anointing, under condition if it is valid, on some sense (yet more advisedly on the forehead, since the nerves of all the senses descend from the head), using this form: *Through this holy anointing... may the Lord forgive thee whatever thou hast committed through the senses: sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch*; therefore placing first the word *thou hast committed*, because if it were pronounced at the end, and meanwhile the sick person should die, there is no Sacrament. - If the sick person survives, the anointings, as Lacroix rightly affirms, are to be repeated on the individual senses, and the other omitted prayers are to be added.

3. But if it is doubted whether the sick person still lives, let the priest continue the anointing under condition, saying: *If thou livest, through this*, etc. "But if the sick person, while he is anointed, departs, let the priest proceed no further, and let him omit the aforesaid prayers." Thus the RITUAL.

Chapter II. On The Minister Of Extreme Unction

1878. Principles. I. Only and every priest can VALIDLY administer the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. - That only a priest is the minister of this Sacrament is clear both from the words of St. James already cited: *Is any one of you sick? Let him bring in the priests of the Church*, etc.; and from the definition of the Church in Trent, sess. 14, on Extreme Unction, can. 4. But that any priest, even one excommunicated, can validly administer this Sacrament, is clear from the fact that Extreme Unction was not instituted by way of judgment, as Penance was, and therefore for its conferral the power of Order suffices.

You will ask whether this Sacrament can be validly administered to the same sick person by SEVERAL priests? - Resp. Affirmatively, if the individual priests anoint a different sense, and in anointing pronounce the form suitable to this sense (for if one anointed, and another uttered the words of the form, the Sacrament would not be conferred, as is clear). - And in reality, that Extreme Unction was in antiquity administered in this way in the Latin Church is gathered from several ancient Rituals;¹³⁷ but today, on account of the contrary practice of the Church, the same would be gravely illicit.

1879. II. Only the pastor of souls, or a priest delegated by him, administers Extreme Unction LICITLY. This is drawn from Trent; and the reason is that it belongs to the pastor alone to feed his sheep and to lead them to the pastures of blessed eternity (If a Bishop becomes sick, the right of fortifying him with the last Sacraments belongs to the Canons, i.e. to the more dignified one among them).¹³⁸ Hence he sins gravely who administers this Sacrament without permission of the pastor or Bishop, since in a grave matter he injures the right of another.¹³⁹

Nevertheless, interpretative, or reasonably presumed, permission probably suffices; and this certainly is had when the administration of the Sacrament urges, and the sick person cannot be anointed by the pastor or vice-pastor, either because they are absent, or because they do not wish to anoint him, and otherwise the Bishop cannot be approached. In such a case of necessity, any priest, even a Regular, provided he is not excommunicated or suspended, can licitly confer this Sacrament, because the Pope is censured to give permission. Thus commonly Suarez, the Salmanticenses, and others, against a few. But outside the case of necessity, permission is not easily to be presumed.¹⁴⁰

And here it is to be noted that Religious (or Regulars) who presume, outside the case of necessity, to administer the Sacrament of Extreme Unction (or of the Eucharist by way of Viaticum) to clerics or laymen, without parochial permission, incur an excommunication reserved to the Pope: from the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis* (cf. n. 1341).

1880. Questions. Q. 1. Whether and how great is the OBLIGATION of conferring this Sacrament?

¹³⁶*Praxis*, n. 274.

¹³⁷Cf. Benedict XIV, *De Synodo*, lib. 8, cap. 4, n. 5.

¹³⁸Cf. *Acta S. Sed.*, VIII, 210.

¹³⁹Book VI, 722.

¹⁴⁰*Ibid.*; *H. A.*, XVII, 6.

Resp. 1. A pastor, unless a just cause excuses him (such as danger of life), is held by reason of his office, and indeed under grave sin, to confer it on his subjects asking for it. Indeed, in any case whatever, not even excepting danger of life, he is held to this if the sick person for a long time has no longer confessed and probably is judged to be in the state of mortal sin, and because of the privation of the senses cannot be absolved except under condition.¹⁴¹ - 2. Another priest, when the pastor is absent, is held to the same from charity; indeed under light obligation, in the common case; but under grave obligation, if the sick person greatly needed this Sacrament, e.g. if otherwise he would be about to die without any Sacrament.¹⁴²

Q. 2. In what way, or BY WHAT RITE, must Extreme Unction be administered?

Resp. It must be administered with surplice and violet stole, with a minister and a light, and with the prayers prescribed in the Ritual. - Wherefore the following things COME TO BE NOTED:

1. The surplice and stole are required under grave sin, on account of reverence for the Sacrament. Exception, according to the probable opinion, is the case in which these were lacking, and the sick person would be about to die without the protection of this Sacrament. For Christ the Lord is not presumed, on account of the lack of sacred vestments, to wish the sick person to be deprived of so great a good.¹⁴³

2. Outside the case of necessity, more probably, it is venial to anoint without a minister. But it is never licit to use the ministry of a woman; hence, when a man is absent, let the priest himself respond to the prayers.¹⁴⁴

3. Probably it is not mortal to administer this Sacrament without a light; but one light suffices, according to the Ritual. To omit the sign of the cross in the anointings is only venial; indeed, it would be no sin if it were omitted on account of imminent death, so as to act more quickly.¹⁴⁵

4. To omit the prescribed prayers, except in a case of necessity, is, of itself, a mortal sin. But the litanies and other prayers to be recited by the assistants are, more probably, only of counsel.¹⁴⁶

5. The holy oil cannot be solemnly carried as Viaticum; but neither is it to be carried secretly and, as it were, stealthily, unless necessity excuses. The Cross is carried without a shaft, as in the funerals of little children. In the room of the sick person, all things ought to be, as is fitting, clean and well disposed.

Note. It is not licit for the pastor to keep the sacred oil constantly at home, "except in the case of great distance from the church: in which case the rubric is wholly to be observed as regards honorable and decent, and safe custody." Thus the S. R. C., December 16, 1826.¹⁴⁷ We said constantly, for St. Alphonsus adds:¹⁴⁸ "The pastor can rightly keep the holy oil in his own house at night, while he foresees probable danger, as if, when called to confer Unction, it would not be available."

Chapter III. On The Subject Of Extreme Unction

1881. Principles. I. The SUBJECT of Extreme Unction is only a baptized man, who has attained the use of reason and is in danger of life from disease. - It is clear: 1. from the words of St. James: *Is any one of you sick?*, etc.; 2. from Trent (sess. 14, cap. 3), where it is declared: "This anointing is to be applied to the sick, but especially to those who lie so dangerously ill that they seem to be placed at the exit of life."

Hence, for the VALID reception of this Sacrament the following things are required:

It is required, 1. that the one to be anointed BE BAPTIZED; for Baptism is the gate of the Sacraments. But this Sacrament can be conferred on an adult immediately after Baptism. "The reason is both because, more truly, through Baptism the remnants of mortal faults committed before Baptism are not wiped away, such as torpor toward good and proneness toward evil; and because the primary effect of this Sacrament is not so much the remission of faults as the strengthening of the sick person against the temptations of the devil, as Suarez and others commonly say."¹⁴⁹

¹⁴¹Book VI, 729; *H. A.*, VII, 28; XVII, 6.

¹⁴²Book VI, 729, 12.

¹⁴³Book VI, 726.

¹⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 724.

¹⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 728.

¹⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 727.

¹⁴⁷Gardell, n. 4623, in Gandaven.

¹⁴⁸Book VI, 730; *Praxis*, n. 275, fin.

¹⁴⁹Book VI, 721; cf. *Collect. S. Sed.*, n. 685.

It is required, 2. that the one to be anointed HAS ATTAINED THE USE OF REASON. For otherwise the form would become vain: *May the Lord forgive thee*, etc. Hence it follows: 1) Children who have not yet attained the use of reason cannot be anointed. On the contrary, whatever Soto with others may say, children endowed with reason are to be anointed, although they cannot receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist and have not yet reached the age of seven, as Benedict XIV teaches.¹⁵⁰ In doubt concerning the use of reason, let them not be deprived of so salutary a remedy, but let them be anointed under condition: *If thou art capable*.¹⁵¹ - 2) The perpetually insane cannot be anointed; otherwise, if they have had lucid intervals; or even if it is probable that they had them, in which case they ought to be anointed under condition. But the RITUAL admonishes: "If the sick person, while he labors under frenzy or insanity, likely could do anything against the reverence of the Sacrament, let him not be anointed, unless the danger is removed altogether," for instance, if he is held or even bound. - 3) The sick who are destitute of the senses ought to be anointed, and indeed without condition, if they have given a sign of a pious soul, or have lived as Christians, so that it can be presumed that they would have asked for the Sacrament if they had been masters of reason: or, as the Ritual speaks, if they likely would have asked. And the reason is that, in one receiving this Sacrament, an interpretative intention suffices (cf. n. 1434, 3).

It is required, 3. that the sick person BE SICK UNTO DEATH, "so that there is fear concerning his death," as the Council of Florence says in the Decree to the Armenians. - Hence, neither validly nor licitly can the healthy be anointed, even if they are in open danger of death, such as those in danger at sea, in battle, etc.; those to be punished by public death; women laboring only with common pains in childbirth, even if they give birth for the first time, or at other times have been in danger of life; otherwise, if most grave torments supervene, through which illness with danger of death is verified. But those can be anointed who are infected with lethal poison; likewise those laboring under some evil on account of which they are about to undergo a difficult operation of surgery; likewise decrepit old persons "who fail from old age (as the Ritual speaks) and seem to die day by day, even without another infirmity": for old age itself is a disease.¹⁵²

To the following question: "Sometimes, when Missionaries are visiting Christians committed to themselves, there occurs a sick person laboring with hectic fever or a similar disease, who according to experience will live still several months, but within a year will die. - It is asked whether, in such a case, the Missionary can administer Viaticum and Extreme Unction to him, because when the truer case for receiving them will be present, a Missionary will not be able to be had present, on account of the great distance and other circumstances impeding this?" The S. C. DE PROPAG. FIDE responded on February 20, 1801: Affirmatively.¹⁵³

1882. II. For the LICIT and FRUITFUL reception of Extreme Unction, certain dispositions of the subject are required besides. For it is primarily, and of itself, a Sacrament of the living (cf. n. 1395).

Hence, besides the intention, at least presumed, of receiving the Sacrament, which is also necessary for validity, there IS REQUIRED: 1. Confession of sins, if the sick person is in the state of mortal sin. - 2. Contrition, at least estimated, in the case in which he cannot confess; for he must be at least putatively in grace; but if he has only attrition, the Sacrament will not lack its effect (cf. n. 1395 and 1397, qu. 2). - 3. The Most Holy Eucharist, from the general custom of the Church (but at most under venial sin), must be premised, unless vomiting or another reasonable cause excuses.¹⁵⁴ - The other dispositions, such as lively faith, firm hope, perfect conformity with the divine will, etc., effect that a richer fruit is perceived from the Sacrament (cf. n. 1437).

The RITUAL admonishes: "But to the impenitent, and those who die in manifest mortal sin, and the excommunicated... (the Sacrament) is to be denied." - Nevertheless, it is given both to the drunken now about to die, and to those wounded in a brawl now destitute of senses, and to any others whatever concerning whom it is doubted whether they are in the state of mortal sin or are sufficiently disposed. - Benedict XIV also says:¹⁵⁵ "Concerning any faithful person, concerning whom the contrary is not established, it must be presumed that he would have asked for this Sacrament, if he could have."¹⁵⁶

1883. Questions. Q. 1. In what degree of infirmity CAN or OUGHT Extreme Unction be conferred?

Resp. 1. It CAN be conferred validly and licitly as soon as the sick person is prudently or probably judged to be in danger of death, although not yet proximate. It is proved from Trent (sess. 14, cap. 3, on Extreme Unction), where it is had: "This anointing is to be applied to the sick, but especially to those who lie so dangerously ill that they seem to be placed at the

¹⁵⁰Book VI, 720.

¹⁵¹Ibid., 719.

¹⁵²Ibid., 712-714; H. A., XVII, 7.

¹⁵³Collect. S. Sed., n. 361; cf. also n. 687.

¹⁵⁴H. A., XVII, 9.

¹⁵⁵De Syn., Book 8, c. 6, n. 5.

¹⁵⁶Cf. Berardi, Prax. Conf., n. 778-780.

exit of life.” That particle especially sufficiently indicates that Extreme Unction can be ministered also to the sick who do not yet seem to be at the exit of life. The matter is proved more strongly from the Bull *Ex quo* of Benedict XIV,¹⁵⁷ in which it is read: “Let the Sacrament of Extreme Unction not be administered to those well in health, but only to those who labor under a grave disease.” Wherefore, whenever Viaticum can be furnished to a sick person who is not fasting, Extreme Unction can also be given to him; indeed, it is expedient that it then be given. - But if it were given in a GRAVE disease, though danger of death at least remote were not judged to be present, it would indeed be given validly, but illicitly; if in a LIGHT disease, it would be administered neither licitly nor validly.¹⁵⁸

2. It OUGHT to be given when danger of death urges; for thus the RITUAL speaks: “This Sacrament ought to be furnished to the sick who labor so gravely that danger of death seems to be imminent.” - Nor is the last time of life to be awaited, as the Roman Catechism says:¹⁵⁹ “They sin most gravely (priests) who are accustomed to observe that time for anointing the sick person when already, all hope of health having been lost, he begins to lack life and senses.” The reason is, says St. Alphonsus, because the sick person is deprived of the richer fruit which he would have received if, master of himself, he had received the Sacrament; likewise because he is deprived of spiritual strength for resisting the devil and for bearing the inconveniences of disease; he is perhaps deprived also of health of body, if he had been anointed at the suitable time, according to what was said at n. 1872; indeed also of the eternal salvation itself of the soul, in the case in which, existing in mortal sin, he would have attained grace with the help of attrition. - All these things, at least heaped together, seem to bring grave damage to the sick person.¹⁶⁰

Q. 2. Whether and when can this Sacrament be REPEATED?

Resp. It must be repeated: - 1. In a different and dangerous infirmity; for it is ordered to healing; “but healing medicine ought to be repeated as often as infirmity is repeated,” as D. Thomas says.¹⁶¹ - 2. In a different danger of a long infirmity; for the RITUAL says: “In the same infirmity it ought not to be repeated, unless it is long-lasting, as when the sick person has grown better and again falls into danger of death.”

Hence, IN A LONG-LASTING DISEASE, such as phthisis and dropsy, if the sick person after anointing certainly has remained in the same state of infirmity, or only for a brief time, for instance for 4 or 5 days, has had himself better, it ought not to be repeated. - But if such a change has intervened in his state that with probability it must be judged that he had exited from the danger of death, because for a notable time, for instance for a month, he had had himself better than before, in such a case, with Benedict XIV as witness,¹⁶² one must stand for repetition of the Sacrament, “because,” he says, “this repetition is more conformed to the ancient custom of the Church, and through it a new spiritual help comes to the sick person.”

Q. 3. Whether the reception of this Sacrament is NECESSARY for salvation?

Resp. 1. It is not necessary by necessity of means, since salvation can be obtained without this Sacrament. Thus all. - But whether it is necessary by necessity of precept is controverted. St. Alphonsus judges the affirmative opinion as very probable, and altogether to be advised in practice: but this, not now by reason of a precept, concerning whose grave obligation it is not established; but by reason of charity which the sick person owes to himself, and which urges especially in the extreme article of life. For although other protections, with which he can fortify himself, are not lacking to him, nevertheless he would act mercilessly toward himself if willingly he deprived himself of this most powerful protection. For he who is in danger of death, on the one hand, is able to excite himself to good acts only with great difficulty, and on the other hand is subject to strong attacks of enemies, since “in this point of time (as Trent speaks), the snares of the devil are more vehement.” Hence (thus the Blessed Doctor concludes) he seems to expose himself to great danger of succumbing to temptations, who neglects to fortify himself with this Sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord as a most firm protection in so great a conflict.

2. Although of itself it is not established that there is a grave obligation of receiving Extreme Unction, nevertheless all agree that the sick person PER ACCIDENS is held, and indeed UNDER GRAVE SIN, to the reception of the Sacrament, whether by reason of special necessity, namely if, existing in mortal sin, he could not receive another Sacrament, or by reason of scandal to be avoided, or finally by reason of contempt. - For it is certain that formal contempt induces grave fault. Moreover, contempt is censured formal when the sick person refuses this Sacrament because he values it little;

¹⁵⁷Bull *Ex quo*, § 46.

¹⁵⁸Book VI, 714; *H. A.*, XVII, 7.

¹⁵⁹*De Extrema Unctione*, n. 9.

¹⁶⁰Book VI, 714; *Prax.*, n. 273, 274.

¹⁶¹*Contra Gent.*, Book 4, c. 73.

¹⁶²*De Syn.*, Book 8, c. 8, n. 4; Book VI, 715.

but not when he refuses from some repugnance or ignorance. It is confirmed from the Bull of Martin V: This Sacrament can neither be neglected without fault, nor condemned without mortal sin. "Hence, the Pontiff seems sufficiently to have expressed that contempt of this Sacrament indeed carries grave fault, but negligence no more than light fault."¹⁶³

Note. Concerning ASSISTANCE TOWARD THE DYING, see the Opusculum of St. Alphonsus at the end of the *Praxis Confessarii*, or in *Hom. Apost.*, last Treatise, Appendix II. - Concerning the Indulgence to be imparted to the dying¹⁶⁴ (cf. n. 1854, 9).

¹⁶³Book VI, 733; *H. A.*, XVII, 12.

¹⁶⁴Cf. also Berardi, *Prax. Conf.*, n. 783-791.