PASTORAL QUESTIONS

I

Questions Concerning Chastity and Lust

Proposed for the benefit of the clergy

by Fr. Benedict H. Merkelbach, O.P.

Fourth edition, enlarged and corrected

Liège, La Pensée Catholique, 1936.
The English translation is our own, made from the Latin
for the Morals of the Church library, where the text may be read and searched online.

Contents

Title Pages and Approvals **3**

Pastoral Questions — Questions Concerning Chastity and Lust — Pastoral Questions I — Questions Concerning Chastity and Lust ... 3

To the Benevolent Reader **4**

On Chastity and Lust **5**

Question One: Concerning the Genital Organs and Generation — Physiological Notions ... 6

Question Two: Concerning Chastity and Lust in General — Theological Principles 12

Question Three: Concerning Consummated Lust According to Nature 26

Article I: Concerning Fornication 27

Article II: Concerning Stuprum and Raptus 30

Article III: Concerning Adultery 32

Article IV: Concerning Incest 34

Article V: Concerning Carnal Sacrilege 35

Question Four: Concerning Lust Consummated against Nature 36

Article I: Concerning Solitary Sin, or Pollution 38

Article II: Concerning Sodomy 45

Article III: Concerning Bestiality 46

Article IV: Concerning Unnatural Concubitus with a Woman 47

Question Five: Concerning Imperfect Lust, or Impudicity 48

Question Six: Concerning Internal Lust 55

Question Seven: Concerning the Causes and Remedies of Lust 59

Question Eight: Concerning Spouses in the Use of Marriage 70

Article I: Concerning the Essence and End of Conjugal Copulation 70

Article II: Concerning the Circumstances of Conjugal Copulation 73

Article III: Concerning Accessory Acts Connected with Conjugal Copulation 77

Article IV: Concerning Excess in the Use of Marriage 80

Article V: Concerning the Conjugal Debt and Concerning Defect in the Use of Marriage ... 89

Index (as printed) **94**

Publisher's Notices **95**

Little Works Published by R. P. Merkelbach, O.P. 95

II. Concerning Embryology and the Ministration of Baptism: 2nd Edition 95

III. Concerning Various Categories of Penitents: 2nd Edition 95

IV. Concerning the Minister of Penance and His Offices: 2nd Edition 96

V. Concerning the Parts of Penance and the Dispositions of the Penitent 96

Title Pages and Approvals

Pastoral Questions — Questions Concerning Chastity and Lust — Pastoral Questions I — Questions Concerning Chastity and Lust

Proposed for the benefit of the clergy

by

Father fr. Ben. H. Merkelbach, O.P.

Master and Doctor of Sacred Theology, and Professor of Moral Theology in the Pontifical Angelicum Institute of Rome

Fourth edition, enlarged and corrected

La Pensee Catholique, Liege (Belgium), 38 Quai Mativa
Paris (6th): Maison Casterman, 66 Rue Bonaparte
Amsterdam: N. V. De R. K. Boek-Centrale
Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schoningh
Torino-Roma: Casa editrice Marietti
London, W.C. 1: B. Herder
Montreal: Granger Freres
Madrid: Editorial Voluntad

1936

Nihil obstat:
Brussels, 2 November 1936
Fr. B. M. Bonte, S. Th. L.
Louvain, 2 November 1936
Fr. H. M. Bisschop, S. Th. L.

It may be printed:
Fr. Joannes-M. Massaux
Prior Provincial, O.P.
Brussels, 3 November 1936

Imprimatur:
Liege, 4 November 1936
G. Simenon, Vicar General

To the Benevolent Reader

Since in the pastoral ministry there is no practical matter more important, indeed none of such daily application, as that which treats of the distinguished virtue of chastity and of the unspeakable vice of lust, we desire to speak with you concerning it; and all the questions regarding it, which you will find scattered through various parts of theology and treated at length in works of greater size or of a special character, we here propose reduced to a brief, clear, summary and at the same time complete exposition.

Moreover, as in the third edition, so in this fourth edition, we have been solicitous for a fuller exposition, a more adequate expression, and a better understanding; and, with a few things to be added, when some controversy occurred or a new question had arisen, we judged that we should dwell upon them somewhat.

We confidently hope that the work will be pleasing to you, beloved confrere, and most useful to a ruler of souls.

The Author

On Chastity and Lust

I. At the threshold of this treatment, let it be pleasing to write out the words which Saint Alphonsus there brings forward, n. 415: "Now with difficulty we undertake to treat that matter whose very name alone infects the minds of men. Let the chaste reader, I ask, pardon me if he finds here several questions and circumstances, omitted by others, discussed and explained: would that I had been able to explain myself more briefly or more obscurely. But since this is the more frequent and more abundant matter of confessions, and that because of which the greater number of souls slip down into hell, hence it was necessary for me, for the instruction of those who desire to learn moral science, to explain myself clearly, although as chastely as could be done, and to discuss very many particulars. Yet I beg students who are preparing themselves for the office of hearing confessions to read this treatise for this end alone, casting away every curiosity altogether; and at that time often to lift their mind to God and commend themselves to the Immaculate Virgin, lest, while they strive to gain the souls of others for God, they themselves suffer the loss of their own."

II. But since the aforesaid matter cannot be sufficiently understood unless entirely accurate physiological notions are present concerning the organs and actions that serve generation, from the natural sciences we here briefly add a general description of them, without, however, descending into the minutiae of things: avoiding a useless abundance which is apt to beget confusion together with dangerous curiosity, so that we may say neither more nor less than is necessary for knowing the whole matter perfectly.

Accordingly, the special questions to be treated are:

1. Physiological notions concerning the genital organs and generation;
2. Concerning chastity and lust in general;
3. Concerning consummated lust according to nature;
4. Concerning consummated lust against nature;
5. Concerning immodesty, or imperfect lust;
6. Concerning internal lust;
7. Concerning the causes and remedies of lust;
8. Concerning spouses in the use of marriage.

III. Concerning the present matter the following may usefully be consulted:

1. All scientific works of anatomy or physiology, among which the following may be regarded as more widely known among the clergy: Vivat, *Woordenboek* (under the words: *Geslachtsorganen*, *Ei*, *Eierstokken*, *Embryo*, *Bevruchting*, *Zaad*); and Dr. Vigouroux, *Traite de Medecine pratique*, vol. IV.

2. Among theological works: Saint Thomas, II-II, q. 151-154 and Supplement, q. 42, art. 3; q. 49, art. 4-6; q. 64; with the commentaries of Cajetan, Sylvius, and Billuart (*On Temperance*; *On Marriage*); Lessius, *On Justice and Right and the Other Cardinal Virtues*; P. Ledesma, *On the Great*

Sacrament of Marriage; Th. Sanchez, *On the Holy Sacrament of Marriage*; Saint Alphonsus, *Moral Theology*; Bouvier, *Moral Theology*; *On the Sixth and Ninth Precepts*; Berardi, *Practice of Confessors*; Aertnijs, *Fascicle of Moral Theology: On the Use of Marriage*; Noldin, *On the Sixth Precept and the Use of Marriage*; Tanquerey, *Moral Theology* (appendix *On Chastity*, supplement *On Marriage*); Ill. Waffelaert, *On the Cardinal Virtues*; De Smet, *On Betrothals and Marriage*; and *Collationes Brugenses*, vol. V, VI, and VII; Em. Van Roey, *Special Question concerning the Sixth Precept of the Decalogue*; Wouters, *On the Virtue of Chastity and the Opposed Vices*.

3. Among works at once anatomical and theological: De Breyne, *Moechialogie*; *Moral Theology in Its Relations with Physiology and Medicine*; Van Olfers, *Pastoral Medicine*; Capellmann, *Pastoral Medicine*; Latin translation, *Pastoral Medicine*, of which a new edition was made through the care of Drs. Bergmann; Eschbach, *Physiological-Theological Disputations*; Antonelli, *Pastoral Medicine*; Surbled, *Morality in Its Relations with Medicine and Hygiene*; *The Hygiene of Marriage*; Gemelli, *Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery*; *On the Definition of the Concept "Impotence of Coeundi" under the Aspect of Pastoral Medicine*; Salsmans, *Medical Deontology*; Vermeersch, *On Chastity*; Schim van der Loeff, *The Reproductive Life of Man*, together with W. J. Duynstee, *The Doctrine of Chastity*.

Question One: Concerning the Genital Organs and Generation — Physiological Notions

I. The principal genital organs of the man are:

A. External: 1. The two testicles (*teelballen*, *zaadklieren*, seminal glands): they are two glands, or "two ovoid little bodies which, hidden within their covering or scrotum (*balzak*, *bourse*), protrude beneath the lower body and hang outside the trunk. They have obtained their name *testes* because they bear witness to virility."[1] In the testicles the zoosperms (*spermatozoides*, *levenskiemen*, *zaaddraden*) are elaborated, which seem to consist, as it were, of a head and a tail and to move after the manner of animals; nevertheless they are not regarded as animals, but merely as cells, because no sensitive life has thus far been discerned in them.[2] These are the masculine element essential to generation. They are mixed in a fluid which is produced from the same testicles and which can be ejaculated together with the zoosperms. But in order that it may be ejaculated and flow more easily, in its passage there is mixed with it a fluid which is secreted from various interior glands: thus a mixed liquid of white color and oily odor is obtained, perfectly suited for ejaculation. Such ejaculation is called pollution. The fluid elaborated by the testicles is called semen or sperm. When the semen is mixed with zoosperms, it is perfect semen, apt for generation: the zoosperms are the essential element of the semen.[3]

[1] Eschbach, cited work, diss. I, ch. 2, art. 2.

[2] They are about 50/1000 millimeters in length: the head has 5/1000 millimeters; the segment or body 6/1000, and the tail 40/1000 millimeters.

[3] Not only spermata are produced by these testicles, but they are at the same time sources of internal secretion, which is mixed with the blood, and to which are attributed the signs of virility (beard, hair in the pubic region, masculine voice) and the power of nourishing sensual appetite. Vermeersch, *De Castitate*, n. 7.

2. The virile member, or rod (*roede*, *verge*: ordinarily about 9 cm. long in repose, about 15 cm. in erection): it is the organ destined for intromission into the genital organ of the woman and for depositing the semen there; beneath it is the urethra, or canal, which emits both sperm and urine.[4] When it is filled with blood, the virile member is erected; and then, before the expulsion of semen, there is customarily produced and slightly emitted, from the glands which flow into the virile member, a thinner fluid. This effusion is called distillation by theologians.[5] The extreme part of the member is occupied by the glans (*eikel*, *gland*), very excitable, which is covered by the prepuce (*voorhuid*), the extreme little skin of which the Jews used to cut away: this glans is the principal seat of venereal pleasure.

[4] "Yet not in such a way that they are mixed. For, while the erection of the rod and the ardor of ejaculation continue, the urinary bladder, on account of the contraction of the smooth muscle of the urethra, is so closed that urine cannot go forth from the urinary bladder and be mixed with the sperm." Piscetta and Gennaro, *Elementa Theologiae moralis*, VII, p. 5.

[5] In men, therefore, theologians distinguish pollution and distillation, because there is a twofold emission of diverse nature. The first is of the fluid mixed with zoosperms, thicker and denser. "In pollution the effusion of humor is more copious and joined with a great commotion and pleasure of the genitals; in distillation, on the contrary, the effusion of humor is often slight and occurs almost drop by drop, and ordinarily with only a slight commotion and pleasure, or scarcely any that is perceived." Noldin, cited work, n. 40. This humor, moreover, is of a thinner nature and without special color or odor.

B. Internal: 1. The two deferent canals (*vasa deferentia*, *zaadleiders*, 40-50 cm. long), which have their beginning from the testicles and, by a long circuit, flow into the urethra as ejaculatory canals.

2. The two seminal vesicles (*zaadblaasjes*), which are one among the various organs of a certain secretion. The deferent canals pass by them; hence zoosperms are often found in them, and these remain there for some time. From this they received their name, seminal vesicles, as if they were receptacles of the zoosperms.

II. The principal genital organs of the woman are:

A. External: 1. The external pudendum (*schaamspleet*), by which name is meant the complex of exterior parts, of which the principal are: the large lips (*schaamlippen*), or the two folds of the exterior skin; the small lips, or two smaller folds situated between the large lips; the clitoral organ (*kittelaar*), or a very small organ analogous to the virile member, without a urethra, 1-2 cm.,[6] which is situated at the summit between the small lips, is pleasurably erected, and is an instrument of pleasure; the urinary meatus, or opening placed beneath the clitoral organ, through which urine is emitted; and so forth.

[6] Sometimes it appears greatly developed, 6-7 cm., and then certain women abuse it, approaching others after the manner of a man. This is one of the forms of the sin of sodomy.

2. The female genital canal (*scheede*: ordinarily about 7-9 cm. long in front, 8-10 behind), which is found beneath the clitoral organ and urinary meatus, in the middle between the small lips. It is a canal of cylindrical form leading from the exterior part to the interior, and is the receptive organ destined for receiving the virile member, the due vessel; through it also the monthly blood is emitted and the fetus comes forth; hence it is flaccid and very extensible. Its mouth in virgins is regularly covered by a membrane, the hymen, the seal of virginity (*maagdenvlies*), which usually imitates the figure of a half moon, so that it does not close the whole mouth. In the heat of concupiscence the female genital canal emits, rarely outwardly, rather into the

cavity of the uterus, a fluid similar to that which men emit in distillation; this is rightly called distillation, or also feminine pollution, while the ancients called it the seed of the woman. Erroneously, however: for although it renders copulation more suitable and the intromission of the man easier, nevertheless it in no way directly serves generation.

3. To these may be added the breasts or paps, which are destined not for generation itself but for producing and giving milk.

B. Internal: 1. The uterus or womb[7] (*baarmoeder*), which communicates with the female genital canal and is destined to contain the fetus.

[7] The ordinary dimensions in the normal state differ from virgins to multiparas, namely from about 60 mm. to 68 mm. in length, and from 38 to 43 mm. in breadth.

2. The ovaries (*eierstokken, eiklieren*): these are two glands to the right and to the left of the uterus, by which the ova, 200/1000 mm., are produced. The ova are the feminine element essential to generation.

3. The oviducts, or tubes (*eileiders*, 10-12 cm. long), which are two canals which communicate with the uterus and through which the eggs descend into it.

In the woman there are three principal seats of pleasure: first and chiefly the clitoral organ; secondly, the female genital canal as far as the uterus; thirdly, the mammary papillae of the breasts, the excitation of which carries with it an excitation, even a vehement one, of the genital organs. Hence, although by nature modesty is greater in the woman, by which she is drawn back from lust, nevertheless venereal satisfaction is greater; and therefore, after a woman has become lustful, she is often more prone to libido than the man.

III. The evolution of the genital organs.

In the fetus before the end of the third month the sex cannot be sufficiently distinguished, but the external genitals appear the same. Hence it is already understood that the opinion of Aristotle, whom many scholastics followed, is false, according to which the male fetus is animated after 40 days, the female after 80 days; for at this time the distinction of the sexes does not yet sufficiently appear. From the middle of the third month a certain point or genital tubercle is seen, which indicates the external organ, between two folds of skin which are divided below by a middle furrow. Already a little earlier there are two small internal glands, which in the course of the third month begin slowly to evolve and become ovaries in the female, testicles in the male. For these, before birth, are hidden in the abdomen in the lumbar region beneath the kidneys, and from birth they descend into the scrotum; yet it sometimes happens that one or both do not descend, and then one remains rudimentary: ectopia, displacement. But as the fourth month begins, the distinction of the sexes begins to appear in the external organ: in the male, the upper part or point increases greatly and evolves into the virile member, while in the female it remains small and becomes the clitoral organ; the lower part, or folds, in the male increase and are joined so that the scrotum may be formed; in the female they are more absorbed, and thus become the lips of the external pudendum.

From the time of puberty the organs begin to become apt for generation. The testicles begin to produce semen, and also internal secretion and zoosperms, although the semen is not immediately

accustomed to be prolific. In our regions this time generally runs from the thirteenth or fourteenth to the sixteenth year; the elaboration of semen, once begun, of itself perseveres through the whole of life, even in old age, although then it does not always remain prolific.

Puberty in the female exists from the time of ovulation, which is customarily revealed by the menstrual flow, following the separation of a mature ovum, the lunar month being 28 days. This is a flow of blood which women suffer each month from the time of puberty, among us from the twelfth or thirteenth to the fifteenth year, up to about the fiftieth year: for each month in the ovaries an egg matures, at least one, which, having been separated from the ovaries, is carried into the uterus of the woman. At the same time the interior parts of the uterus are filled with blood, so that, if conception occurs, blood may be supplied for the evolution of the fetus. But if the egg has not been fertilized, the blood, and with the blood the egg, flows out through the female genital canal at a later time. This flow is called menstruation (*regles*, *lunes*, *menstrues*, *stonden*, *maandstonden*) and ordinarily lasts for two or three days, sometimes for more. Sometimes the health of the woman requires that the menstrual flow be provoked or checked by art, that is, by means of medicines. But from the age of about 45-50 years, ovulation and the flow of blood cease, and a little afterward the woman is no longer apt for generation but becomes sterile; this is called the age of return, or menopause (*retour d'age*, *age critique*, *kritische tijd*, *de jaren*, *de keerjaren*, *de slechte jaren*).[8]

[8] Similarly, removal of the ovaries suppresses the flow of blood; likewise fertilization, and sometimes lactation.

At the time of puberty the breasts also develop in the female, so that they are able to produce milk; in the man they remain in a rudimentary state.

IV. Carnal copulation and fertilization. The essential elements of fertilization are the virile sperm, in which the zoosperms are contained, and the feminine ovum. Fertilization requires that some zoosperm enter the ovum before, having been separated from the ovary, it arrives through the oviduct into the uterus. To obtain this there is required the physical conjunction of man and woman, or carnal copulation (*copula*, *coitus*, *paring*), by which the man introduces the erect virile member into the woman's genital canal, so that in the very heat of the flesh he may emit and pour out the semen there. This copulation, in order that of itself it may be apt for generation, comprises:

1. the erection of the virile member, by which it is enlarged and made rigid;
2. its introduction into, and intromission within, the woman's genital canal, whence the man must injure and tear the seal of virginity in a virgin, which, once torn, does not return: the defloration of the virgin;
3. in the same place, in the heat of the flesh, the agitation and contraction of the virile member and the effusion of semen. To this in the woman, from the heat of concupiscence, there corresponds abundant distillation and contraction of the female genital canal; but these two are not necessary for generation.

The zoosperms, introduced into the female genital canal, swim in the semen and move themselves by vital motion so as to tend toward the interior parts of the female genital canal and uterus; and the uterus, as if by sucking, draws the spermatic fluid, thus seconding the motion of the zoosperms. Opposite this, the ovum separated from the ovaries descends through the oviduct. The progress of the ovum is slow, 7-8 days or more; on the other hand the motion of the zoosperms is relatively rapid, so that within the space of a few hours they enter the oviduct, where they can live for several

days, 7-8 or more, and await the ovum.[9] But if one zoosperm reaches the mature ovum, it will enter it, and from the conjunction of both fertilization and generation will occur. From the head of the zoosperm and the nucleus, or germinal vesicle, of the egg, there will be made one new cell, surrounded by the radiated protoplasm of the egg, which is the origin of the whole new living being.[10]

[9] Therefore fertilization does not occur immediately after copulation, since the zoosperms can live for several days in the living body of the woman. Even after death they still move for one and a half to two days. At a temperature of 38-40 degrees they show themselves more lively; at a temperature of 20 degrees they appear without motion. They are killed by cold water; they are slain by electric lightning. Alkaline fluids favor their motion; acids harm them.

[10] Hence the doctrine of many Scholastics, among whom is Saint Thomas, can no longer be sustained, who asserted that the feminine element in generation is merely passive. For although the masculine element actively provokes and determines the transformation of the ovum and conception, and the feminine element passively undergoes that transformation, though it seems to concur actively to some extent by attracting the head of the zoosperm, nevertheless each concurs actively in the same way toward the formation of the new being, namely by its own vital powers.

And so, by carnal conjunction, the man and woman have truly been made one from two: they have brought about one action by two similar parts, just as, so to speak, one organ is composed from each body. Namely, they constitute one principle of generation and one flesh.[11] By reason of the carnal commingling, not only does the member of one become the member of the other, but they are truly one flesh: the man has deposited something of himself in the woman, and the woman has made that semen her own; and the semen, which is something of the man, has now come into the possession of the woman's uterus. Thus marriage is truly and absolutely consummated.

[11] "They shall be two in one flesh, that is, through carnal mingling they are made one flesh; and thus the members of one become the members of the other ... from two there is made one principle in the act of generation." Saint Thomas, *In I ad Cor.* VI, 16. Likewise Cajetan: "in one perfect and just, that is, legitimate, principle of carnal generation." Cf. Vermeersch, cited work, p. 13. Some have erroneously understood carnal commingling as mingling with menstrual blood: for even if there is no menstruation, nevertheless by copulation marriage is consummated.

But if, after copulation, the zoosperms enter the ovum, they will be one flesh not only in the act of marriage, but also in its effect, in the new flesh composed from them. And thus a perfectly consummated marriage becomes still more fully consummated.[12]

[12] For then there will be the strictest commingling of flesh or of the elements serving generation, namely of semen and ovum.

But it should be noted that generation can strictly occur without intromission into the female genital canal, and that it suffices that the man deposit the semen at the mouth of the female genital canal, which then, by vital motion and by the attraction of the female genital canal, can enter. But in this way fertilization can occur only very rarely and accidentally; hence it does not suffice for copulation as nature instituted it, and men who are able to accomplish only this, and cannot effect intromission into the female genital canal, are impotent for completing copulation and for contracting marriage. A fortiori, artificial fertilization does not suffice for copulation, by which semen previously emitted is introduced by some art into the female genital canal or uterus; this, moreover, is gravely illicit.[13]

[13] In the decree of the Holy Office, 24 March 1897, the matter concerns artificial fertilization properly so called. It would be otherwise if, after copulation had been duly performed and the semen deposited not indeed at the mouth but in the entrance of the female genital canal, it were gathered there, without being drawn out of the female genital canal, and by means of a little syringe carried more deeply toward the uterus. For in this way at no moment would the semen be deprived of its ordination toward the end of generation; hence this would not seem to be anything but assisting nature.

V. Impotence and sterility. The impotence of coeundi, or of copulating, is one thing; the impotence of generating is another. The former dirimently impedes marriage, which consists in the mutual handing over of bodies in order to carnal copulation, and therefore has as its immediate end copulation itself: this is impotence with respect to marriage itself. The latter, the impotence of generating, does not impede marriage itself, but only the further principal end for which marriage was instituted: this is not impotence of marriage, but only its sterility.

In other words: the primary end of the institution of marriage is one thing, and is generation; and the end of the thing instituted, or of marriage itself, is another, and is copulation of itself apt for generation. If this immediate end is attained, the thing itself is valid, even if by accident it is impossible that the further end, or primary end of the institution, be attained. But carnal copulation of itself apt for generation is essentially the act by which, through intromission of the virile member into the female genital canal, virile semen is emitted and deposited there. Hence whatever renders that copulation impossible, absolutely or relatively, constitutes the impediment of impotence; whatever does not impede copulation, but only generation, is not impotence, but only sterility. Hence:

A. Impotence (*onvermogen*) is present whenever there are not organs ready for carnal copulation, or when, though the organ remains, copulation is nevertheless impossible. It is absolute or relative according as it is toward every person or toward only some person. Hence:

1. In the man impotence is: a) absence of the virile member; b) defect of both testicles, or their perfect contusion or atrophy;[14] c) double vasectomy, or resection of both deferent canals; d) disproportion of the virile member; e) hypospadia[15] and epispadia, by which the meatus opens not at the extremity but in the middle of the virile member, whether on the lower part or on the upper part, so that the semen cannot be poured into the female genital canal; f) aphrodisia, or excessive heat, by which, from exaggerated excitation, the semen is lost before copulation; and anaphrodisia, or excessive frigidity, by which erection of the virile member and expulsion of semen are impeded.

[14] Those who lack both testicles are called eunuchs; cf. Mt. XIX, 10 sq. Some are *spadones*, who are born thus; others are castrated, who by human art have been deprived of the testicles or even of the virile member itself. "A *spado*, or one who is born a eunuch, and one who was castrated as an infant, is incapable of true copulation; those deprived of both testes in adult age remain capable of copulation for some time, but generally through a more or less ample interval afterward they can no longer exercise copulation itself. Those deprived of the testes are deprived of the internal secretion by which the energy of copulating with effusion is nourished, so that they are destitute of satiative copulation with effusion, and then of the faculty of copulation." Thus Vermeersch, cited work, n. 60 and 84.

[15] De Smet, *De Matrimonio*, n. 551, note 4, notes that that defect is sometimes cured by a mere change of position in copulating.

The first three make impotence absolute; the fifth and sixth make it relative; the fourth makes either one. The sixth ordinarily does not render one perpetually impotent; concerning the third it is disputed whether potency can be restored.

2. In the woman impotence is: a) defect of the female genital canal or of an opening in it, so that it cannot be perforated at all; b) excessive narrowness; c) vaginismus, by which, from excessive

excitation, the external pudendum is closed, cannot endure intromission, and impedes copulation.

In the first case there is absolute impotence; in the second, relative; in the third, either one, and not always perpetual.

B. Sterility (*onvruchtbaarheid*) 1. in the man is the absence of prolific semen because, on account of an accidental and transient cause or an obstruction, the semen here and now is destitute of zoosperms, or because, on account of disease of the testicles, the seminal vesicle, the urethra, and so forth, the zoosperms are not sufficiently lively, or perish too quickly, or lack a necessary element, or are not apt to enter the ovum.

2. In the woman it is: a) perfect excision of both ovaries or perfect atrophy of them, so that no ovum is present; b) a vice or disturbance of the organ by which the ovum cannot mature; c) an impediment by which, whether naturally or artificially, for example from ligation of the oviduct or excision of the uterus, no conjunction of ovum and sperm is possible.

From these things one already understands that about which there was so much dispute: why absence of the testicles or of the emission of semen in the man is impotence, while absence of the ovaries or of the ovum in the woman is not.[16] Namely, because the emission of semen is of the essence of copulation of itself apt for generation, whereas the ovum is not an essential element of copulation, but only of generation.

[16] Thus the Holy Office, 3 February 1887; 23 July 1890; 31 July 1895; Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, 2 April 1909. Cf. Vermeersch, who maintains that this is the legitimate sense of the responses, and replies to adversaries, cited work, p. 53-55.

VI. Observation. From the preceding it is clear that both zoosperms and ova are living cells, endowed with their own vital principle, and not animated by a human soul; hence in no way can they be regarded as parts or organs of the body of the man or woman, although they are located in the body. This is very much to be noted for avoiding the false and depraved consequences of certain persons.

Question Two: Concerning Chastity and Lust in General — Theological Principles

I. Chastity has an affinity with the word "to chastise," because according to the dictate of right reason it represses or restrains concupiscence, which most of all needs to be restrained. It is, namely, a special moral virtue, a species of temperance, which inclines one to the honesty of moderating the sexual appetite and venereal pleasure. This pleasure is perceived in the genital organ and is ordered to generation; hence it is called venereal, because the gentiles made the goddess Venus the patroness of this pleasure.

It is said to be: 1. a special virtue, because it has a special object, the concupiscence of venereal pleasure to be moderated. Hence it regards the sexual appetite immediately and per se; the other senses mediately and per accidens, insofar as they concur in exciting venereal pleasure.

2. A species of temperance: temperance moderates the sensitive appetite in those things which most strongly allure; but among these, the pleasures of the flesh in the use of the genital organs are more vehement; therefore the virtue which moderates them is a species of temperance.[1]

[1] Saint Thomas, *Summa Theologiae*, II-II, q. 151, a. 2 and 3.

3. One which inclines to the honesty of moderating the sexual appetite: for its material object it has the appetite of venereal pleasure; its primary material object, or formal *quod*, is the moderation of right reason to be placed in venereal pleasure; its formal object *quo* is the special honesty which consists in moderating the pleasures of the flesh according to the norm of right reason.

To chastity is joined modesty (*schaamachtigheid*, *eerbaarheid*): the former is ordered to the principal pleasures of copulation itself; the latter concerns the accompanying pleasures which are more apparent and are signs of venereal things, for example looks, kisses, touches, and so forth, concerning which man is especially ashamed before others, because they are more often detected. It is not a really distinct virtue, but a circumstance of chastity in general.[2]

[2] Ibid., a. 4.

II. Pleasure is the repose or complacency of the appetite in a present or possessed good: for whenever a human power, by acting, attains or possesses its proper object, pleasure arises in the appetite. But there are several human powers tending toward diverse goods; hence diverse pleasures also arise. And indeed there is:

a. spiritual pleasure in the will, from the possession of an intellectual or spiritual good;

b. sensible pleasure in the sensitive appetite and in the senses alone, from the possession of a sensible good proportioned to itself;

c. carnal or sexual and venereal pleasure in the same sensitive appetite, and also in the genital organs from the exercise or use of these, which per se pertain to the vegetative powers. But since the human powers are intimately connected with one another, it often happens that one pleasure draws another with it; and thus two intermediate pleasures arise between the three aforesaid pleasures. Hence five pleasures are distinguished by theologians:

1. Purely spiritual pleasure is that which arises either from the intellectual knowledge of some thing, for example when someone rejoices in the knowledge of some truth long sought, or arises from the thing known itself, for example if someone rejoices in God, or in virtue, whose beauty he considers. It is morally good or evil according as that which pleases is good or evil, for example to rejoice in the knowledge of the existence of God, or in a new means of stealing or of inflicting injury on another.[3]

[3] It is called purely spiritual by reason of the faculty, not by reason of the object, for "everything that we desire according to nature, we can also desire with pleasure of reason, but not conversely" (St. Thomas, I-II, q. 31, a. 3). Hence it can also be about a sensible or venereal object: concerning which see I-II, q. 31, a. 3, 4, 5; cf. q. 34, a. 1. Spiritual pleasure of itself follows the nature of rational love, whence per se it is good or evil according to the object. By Saint Thomas it is called

intelligible pleasure (q. 31, a. 5), pleasure of reason, or that which follows reason (a. 3). Hence, unlike sensible pleasure, one cannot act on account of spiritual pleasure alone: for this is per se joined to a good either honest or dishonorable.

2. Spiritual-sensible pleasure is that which arises from a more vivid representation, especially from the sight or touch of a person tenderly but honestly loved, especially on account of spiritual qualities. This pleasure also per se resides in the will, but is so vehement that it redounds into the sensitive appetite and is joined with a commotion of the heart and blood.[4] Such pleasure is accustomed to accompany the love of a mother for a son, of a spouse for a spouse, of a friend for a friend. Per se it is separated from carnal pleasure, and therefore on this side is morally indifferent.

[4] By Saint Thomas it is called spiritual pleasure with a redounding into the lower appetite (I-II, q. 31, a. 5).

3. Merely sensible pleasure is that which arises from some sensible thing other than a venereal one. It is, namely, a grateful and pleasant affection which is perceived in the very organs of the senses from the conformity or proportion of the sensible object with the sense, for example from the sight or touch of a thing that pleases, the sight of a beautiful thing, the touch of a soft thing, the taste of savory food.[5] Per se it is without venereal commotion, and therefore such pleasure per se is indifferent. If it is sought according to the order of nature, that is, with and on account of its natural end, it is good, for example when food and drink are thus taken with pleasure of taste; but if the pleasure is turned away from its proper end, or if it is sought for its own sake, it is evil.

[5] By Saint Thomas it is called sensible or animal pleasure according to knowledge, I-II, q. 31, a. 5 and 6.

4. Sensual or sensible-carnal pleasure is a pleasure which of itself is merely sensible, because it arises from a merely sensible, not venereal, thing, which nevertheless is apt to excite venereal pleasure, for example the look, touch, kiss, or merely sensible conversation of a person loved with sensitive affection on account of beauty. This pleasure as a whole resides per se in the sensitive appetite; nevertheless the more vehement pleasure is joined with a commotion of the heart and blood, and then it easily excites carnal commotion and redounds into the venereal appetite. Such pleasure, if by reason of the agent it involves the proximate danger of consenting to an inordinate venereal appetite, is a sin grave by its genus; if such danger is not present, nor on the other hand a reason fully excusing, such as the custom of the country, friendship not sensual but conformable to reason, and so forth, it is a light sin.

5. Venereal or carnal[6] or genital pleasure, which arises from the commotion of the organs and humors serving generation: by its nature it is an act of the sensitive appetite to which the voluptuous sense, or pleasurable alteration existing in the genital organs, is pleasing. For the man it consists in the pleasurable erection[7] of the virile member and the agitation of the same which pours forth semen; for the woman, in the pleasurable erection of the clitoral organ and in the contraction of the female genital canal with distillation. Therefore not every pleasure of the genitals is venereal: for in them also a merely sensible pleasure can be perceived; but that alone is venereal which is proper to these organs and can be perceived only in them. This is the proper matter of chastity and lust.

[6] The pleasure which is taken in food and drink, not indeed from taste but from the very touch of foods or drinks, is also bodily, and therefore with Saint Thomas can be called carnal, because it is perfected in the touch of the body (I-II, q. 72, a. 2). Yet this pleasure does not regard the present matter; and therefore in the present matter we take carnal pleasure in a stricter sense, for pleasure from venereal touch alone (ibid., ad 4). Both carnal pleasures are called by Saint Thomas sensible by reason of utility, namely for the conservation of animal nature; they are perfected in touch (I-II, q. 31, a. 6).

[7] From venereal and pleasurable erection must be distinguished a purely natural and quasi-mechanical erection: the former is from venereal phantasy or with pleasure; the latter is accustomed to arise from a merely physical cause and is had without any sense of pleasure. Cf. for example Aertnijs, *Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 219; Vermeersch, cited work, n. 28.

It is twofold: complete, perfect, or consummated; and incomplete, imperfect, or begun, according as it proceeds to the final natural term of the act and satiates nature, or arises from carnal commotion which does not proceed to the final term and does not satiate nature.

Therefore this pleasure, ordered and restrained according to right reason, is the object of chastity; inordinate and unrestrained, it is the object of lust. Unduly, either really to seek that pleasure, completely or incompletely, or by thinking to represent it to oneself and to have complacency in it in the mind, is lust.

III. Chastity in some moderates venereal pleasure, in others excludes it, by reason of the diverse state; hence it is usually distinguished as threefold:

1. youthful chastity, which abstains from every venereal pleasure until the time of nuptials;

2. conjugal chastity, which moderates the appetite of sexual pleasure in spouses and excludes whatever is illicit in the use of marriage;

3. widowed chastity, which after the dissolution of marriage abstains from every carnal pleasure, whether in perpetuity or until second nuptials.

By reason of the mode in which it is preserved, it is distinguished as imperfect, which abstains only from illicit pleasures of the flesh, and perfect, which abstains from all pleasures, even those licit in marriage.

IV. Virginity is taken in a twofold sense:

1. In a quasi-physical sense it signifies only the integrity of the flesh or of the genital organ, which is lost in men by voluntary pollution or effusion of semen, and in women by voluntary breaking of the membrane hymen, or virginal enclosure,[8] which occurs through carnal copulation with a man or through another touch.

[8] Because that hymen can also be absent by nature and is not always broken in the first copulations, since sometimes the membrane is so elastic and soft that it permits the introduction of the virile member without being torn, therefore some place the enclosure of virginity in a certain contraction and compression by which the parts of the orifice of the female canal are constricted until they have been dilated by carnal copulation. But we follow the common opinion.

In this sense virginity is not a virtue but a good of nature bestowed on all from birth; more specifically, women are accustomed to be called virgins because they alone have been endowed by nature with the seal of virginity. Thus, therefore, a virgin is a woman who has never had copulation, although she may have sinned against chastity by internal or external solitary acts. Likewise she

remains a virgin as long as the integrity of the flesh is preserved, although she may intend afterward to pass to nuptials.

2. In the moral sense, virginity, or virginal chastity, is the virtue which signifies a firm proposal of the will of preserving the integrity of the flesh and of abstaining perpetually from all venereal pleasures, both illicit and licit, in a subject never corrupted by libido. In this sense virginity differs from perfect chastity in that it is joined to integrity of the flesh, while perfect chastity can also be preserved by one who previously has already been corrupted by libido. And so two things are required for virginity taken in the full sense: a. integrity of the flesh, which is the material element of virginity; it consists in voluntary immunity from complete or satiative carnal pleasure and in voluntary preservation of the virginal enclosure; b. the proposal of the will, which is the formal element of virginity: without this proposal of preserving chastity perpetually, neither properly the virtue nor the accidental reward of the virtue, the aureole, can be had.[9]

[9] On the notion of virginity, cf. Saint Thomas, II-II, q. 152, art. 1; on the aureole promised to it, Supplement, q. 96, art. 5.

According to Saint Thomas,[10] virginity is a special virtue distinct from common chastity, because it has a special excellence. It is named from greenness, because it imports immunity from corruption, or from the burning of concupiscence, concerning venereal pleasures; and it differs from chastity because it abstains not only from illicit pleasures but from all venereal pleasures, and therefore proposes youthful chastity to be preserved perpetually.

[10] II-II, q. 152, art. 3.

But corruption can be threefold: a. bodily only, that is, the involuntary[11] breaking of the virginal seal or involuntary resolution of semen; b. corruption of the mind alone, that is, consent in a venereal matter without the work, whether it occurs by incomplete venereal pleasure or by revocation of the proposal; c. both at once, namely voluntary complete pleasure, or the voluntary or libidinous breaking of the seal of virginity.

[11] Various causes are assigned: jumping, riding in the manner of men, a fall, the attempt of the first menses, ulcers, and so forth.

In the third case virginity is lost irreparably; in the second, reparably; in the first, in no way.

V. Lust is the inordinate appetite, that is, love and use, of venereal pleasure; but it is inordinate if, outside legitimate use in conjugal copulation and in acts disposing toward it, pleasure is sought. For pleasure, just as also the use of the genitals, by its nature is essentially ordered to the propagation of the human race. But this cannot occur in due mode except in the permanent matrimonial union, which is altogether necessary for the right education of offspring. Therefore the appetite and use of venereal things is inordinate if it is sought: first, without order to the act of legitimate marriage; secondly, in that act, but in an illegitimate and undue mode, beyond the rules prescribed by nature and reason.

By reason of the mode in which it occurs, lust is one thing when it is **A. merely internal**, which consists in the mere affection for or desire of pleasure or of the use of venereal things, and is prohibited by the ninth precept of the Decalogue; **B. another when it is also external**, which occurs

with the use and commotion of the genital organs, and is prohibited by the sixth precept. This latter can be:

1. complete, perfect, and consummated, if the exterior act is brought to its natural term, that is, to satiative pleasure; whether a. it be natural or according to nature, and the act is apt for obtaining its natural end of generation, as fornication, adultery, incest; or b. it be unnatural or against nature, and the act is not apt for its natural end, but this is rendered impossible, as pollution, onanism, sodomy;

2. incomplete, imperfect, and begun, if the exterior act is not brought to its natural term and does not attain the final term of satiative pleasure. This stands to complete lust as beginning to term, means to end, inception to consummation; and therefore it is not so much called lust, which concerns the very pleasure of copulation, but rather immodesty concerning the accompanying pleasures.

By reason of the diverse intention of the will by which lust is committed, and therefore of diverse gravity and imputability:

1. one kind is directly and in itself willed, when someone intends and procures venereal pleasure itself for its own sake;

2. another is voluntary in the cause, when someone voluntarily places a cause which procures venereal pleasure, without willing and intending that pleasure in itself;

3. another is indirectly voluntary, when someone neither intends nor procures venereal pleasure, but does not prevent it, though it has arisen involuntarily, when he can and ought to prevent it.

Concerning the gravity of these outside marriage we must now speak.

VI. All lust outside marriage which is directly and in itself voluntary, whether complete or incomplete, even the least, is mortally evil and does not admit lightness of matter.[12]

[12] Cf. Disputed Question XV *De Malo*, a. 2, ad 16 and 17; Disputed Question XV *De Veritate*, a. 4, and ad 8; I-II, q. 74, a. 8; II-II, q. 153, a. 3, and q. 154, a. 4.

It is proved: 1. The matter is evident for complete lust: the use of the genitals is essentially destined to the propagation of the human race through conjugal copulation. Therefore every such use outside marriage is inordinate, and indeed in such a way that it is directly against the greatest common good of society, namely its conservation and due propagation. But this is a matter of the greatest moment, and therefore the inordination is of itself and always grave. For if this were not so, men would care little about entering marriage.

Moreover, the special deformity in it is that the action and pleasure most necessary to the common good and immediately destined to the good of the species are sought for personal pleasure and referred to the individual; and thus that which regards only the good of the species immediately is ordered to an individual good. These things will be clearer from what will be said below concerning pollution and fornication, and from what follows here.

2. The same holds for incomplete lust, even the least, provided it is willed in itself. The general reason is that it is impossible for anyone to seek incomplete venereal pleasure without implicitly seeking and willing the complete pleasure, and incurring its disorder, or having an affection toward complete lust. For:

Every venereal act as such has a natural order to conjugal copulation, or to the perfect act legitimately exercised in marriage, of which it is the natural beginning and preparation. But every venereal pleasure sought outside marriage removes that order and orders to an individual good that which is destined to the good of the species. Therefore every venereal pleasure sought outside marriage unduly tends to an individual good and removes the natural order toward the human species. But such inordination is intrinsically and gravely evil, because it is an inversion of the natural order by which an act of the species is exercised as if it were the work of an individual man, and because, with respect to the greatest good, namely the conservation of society, the subordination by which man, who is a part of the species, is constituted under the species, is violated; since this order, in this matter, is altogether necessary to human society itself, it must be preserved under grave obligation. Therefore every venereal act sought outside marriage is intrinsically and gravely evil.

Or otherwise: in fornication and pollution there is grave sin because the act and pleasure destined to the good of the species are referred to the individual. But the same is present in imperfect lust, directly and in itself voluntary. Therefore in it there is mortal sin. The minor is proved: he who voluntarily posits, and directly and in itself wills, the beginning, already wills the complement in affection, not as to be executed, but he has an affection toward it.[13] But imperfect lust and incomplete venereal pleasure by their nature are the beginning of consummated lust and of complete pleasure. Therefore he who voluntarily posits and directly and in itself wills imperfect lust has an affection toward complete lust, and thus sins mortally.

[13] It is founded on the principle of Saint Thomas, I-II, q. 1, a. 6, that "the beginning of anything is always ordered to its consummation"; whence he who wills the beginning, by that very fact implicitly and necessarily wills the consummation, just as he who wills a participated good by that very fact wills it "as tending toward the perfect good."

Hence in whatever matter, even the least, there is always the same injury to the natural order altogether necessary to society, and the entire reason of disorder.[14]

[14] On this matter Cajetan, Ill. Waffelaert, and P. Vermeersch may be consulted. The argument rests on the general principles by which mortal and venial sin are distinguished. Mortal sin is against charity; hence, since human society is a means necessary for man to arrive at his end, everything that is directly against society, or against that without which it cannot subsist, is also against charity, which unites us to God the last end. In other words: the means to the end imposed on man by God is that he preserve the natural order of things with respect to God, to neighbor, and in himself; therefore every substantial violation of order is grave matter. And indeed the law of nature does not merely say: avoid harm to neighbor or to society; but rather: preserve order lest harm arise. But lust, from its own nature, violates the natural order of things, because an act of the species is exercised as an individual act, and that which is destined solely to the good of society and is necessary to its conservation and propagation is ordered to an individual good. Therefore it is directly against society, in the mode stated above.

This is confirmed: a) according to Saint Thomas, the pleasure attached to an act exists on account of the act itself; hence consent to the pleasure is of the same malice as consent to the act: if the work is forbidden, the pleasure of the work is forbidden in the same way. But consent to the complete act of lust outside marriage is mortal sin. Therefore also any consent to the pleasure of this act. But every venereal pleasure is per se ordered to copulation, or to the complete act of which it is the beginning,

as has been said, and thus it is pleasure of the complete act, because it is always of the same notion.[15] Therefore every venereal pleasure sought for its own sake is mortal sin. "If consent to the pleasure of fornication thought about is mortal sin, a fortiori consent to the pleasure of fornication begun, or consent to the pleasure which is the principle or part of fornicary pleasure" - Cajetan on II-II, q. 154, art. 4.

[15] This argument in no way has force to show that other pleasures, even those sought for their own sake, are mortal sin, because they are not proper to the genital act, and consequently do not touch the essential order to the species.

And surely no one is pleased except in that which seems to him good and conformable to his appetite; therefore he who seeks the pleasure of a mortally evil work holds that work as good for himself, and consequently his affection tends into a mortally evil work. And thus he sins mortally, because he deliberately wills that his affection be conformed to a mortally evil work.[16]

[16] Thus Saint Thomas, in the places cited, especially I-II, q. 74, art. 8. Nor can it be objected that Saint Thomas there teaches only that morose consent to the complete pleasure of a consummated act is mortal sin. For in this case the question would concern only pleasure thought about spiritually, not pleasure really experienced in the genital organs, since complete pleasure perceived in the genital organ cannot be had without the complete exercise of the genital act and consummated lust. On the contrary, Saint Thomas:

b) On account of the vehemence of concupiscence of the flesh and the frailty common to men, it is morally impossible to contain concupiscence within fixed limits; hence consent itself to the least pleasure constitutes the proximate danger of consenting to further pleasure and to the complete act.[17] Therefore such consent to the least pleasure is also mortal sin. Hence even if the opinion holding that there is smallness of matter in lust directly and in itself willed were speculatively probable, nevertheless it would be practically improbable; and this seems to be the reason why proposition 40 was condemned by Alexander VII,[18] because it falsely supposes that a kiss had on account of carnal pleasure, that is, venereal pleasure, does not induce danger of consent to graver acts.

[17] The argument is suggested by Saint Thomas, Disputed Question *De Veritate* XV, art. 4, who writes concerning the contrary opinion of certain ancients: "The common opinion of the moderns contradicts this opinion, and it seems to turn toward danger of souls, since from consent to such pleasure a man can most promptly fall into sin."

[18] "There is a probable opinion which says that a kiss had on account of carnal and sensible pleasure which arises from the kiss is only venial, when the danger of further consent and pollution is excluded." Hence in the decree of the Holy Office, 4 February 1611, one reads: "Since in venereal matters there is no smallness of matter..."

Therefore all lust which is sought for its own sake outside marriage, by that very fact directly opposes the primary end of nature and the primary precept of the natural law, and therefore is a grave sin.

VII. Certain moderns have very recently sought a subterfuge, saying: only the consummated act is of itself gravely evil, but imperfect acts are of themselves venial, and are mortal only per accidens, whether on account of intention or affection, or on account of danger of further consent, or on account of scandal.[19] Namely, they introduce a new member into the distinction of the various pleasures, and between sensible pleasure, or even sensual pleasure, and venereal pleasure, which is satiative, they posit an intermediate pleasure, which they call sexual,[20] as if by nature, and not only by degree, it were distinguished from venereal pleasure.

[19] Before, they were only thinking this in mind, or even spreading it secretly and craftily; but now some writing has already been able to be published which defends this doctrine: *Quaedam moralia quae ex doctrina D. Thomae selegit P. A. Eaarakkers, O.S.Cr.* (1928). But when it had been reported by the bishops of the Netherlands to the Holy Office, the response was made

to the archbishop of Utrecht that "the little work itself was to be withdrawn from commerce" (1 May 1929), at the same time asking the said archbishop that in due time he make the Holy Office more certain concerning the execution of the decree.

[20] Thus in the said little work, p. 49 and 50.

Yet this theory: 1. is a new doctrine. Although some theologians once affirmed lightness in the matter of lust - yet several of these recede from us only in manner of speaking[21] - no one, so far as we know, has thus far taught that every imperfect pleasure is of itself venial, but all have regarded the graver carnal motions as mortal. But novelty, not indeed in some mere application of principles, but in the theological principles themselves, is always suspect; such is this novelty: that imperfect acts of lust are not of themselves mortal.

[21] Several said this concerning lust voluntary in its cause, or concerning sensible or sensual pleasure.

2. By physiological experience anyone can feel that imperfect venereal pleasure is of the same species as perfect pleasure: it is found in one and the same line and physiologically is of the same nature. Hence it is not related to perfect pleasure as a separated means and a merely extraneous disposition to an extrinsic term, but as inception to consummation, as the beginning of a motion which intrinsically tends and strives to extend itself to its proper term, and as part of the consummated work.

3. Moreover, every sexual pleasure, insofar as it is sexual, is essentially and exclusively ordered and directed, just as sex itself is, to generation and to complete satiative pleasure; and therefore, from the very physical nature of the act, it is impossible to will and seek the imperfect pleasure without the affection implicitly tending to the perfect and seeking it. Hence it is false that "incomplete motions ... are only preliminaries; they touch the act of generation only remotely, mediately, accessorily ... and belong to it only accidentally."[22] On the contrary, they express an essential order to it.

[22] Thus in the said little work, p. 62.

4. Hence they are mortal by the same reason as acts of complete lust, provided that they are directly and in themselves voluntary: for they always implicitly include an affection toward the complete act.

Perhaps they think to object:

a) That a human act tends into the object as it is proposed by reason: but reason can abstract from complete pleasure, indeed the will can exclude it.

Reply. It cannot exclude it, because consummated pleasure is necessarily desired implicitly by him who seeks its inception, which by its nature necessarily tends to consummation. The abstraction of the intellect and the intention of the will cannot change the nature of things.

Therefore just as he truly remains superstitious who, intending to exclude the intervention of the devil, uses vain means which cannot have an effect without the intervention of the devil, since he thus implicitly and necessarily seeks his intervention and so acts against his own intention; so he who, wishing to exclude complete pleasure, desires incomplete pleasure, acts against his intention: for by that very fact he implicitly and necessarily desires the complete pleasure, not as to be executed,

but as pleasurable, because the incomplete pleasure is not desirable except as the beginning and part of complete pleasure, and consequently except by reason of complete pleasure.

b) That theft admits lightness of matter, and yet light theft disposes to grave theft; likewise anger and envy are sometimes light and yet are a way to homicide.

Reply. Light theft is not the beginning of grave theft, but an act complete and consummated in itself and perfectly distinct from grave theft; nor does it immediately dispose to it, but through the facility caused by repeated acts. Likewise anger and envy are perfectly distinguished from homicide, indeed by complete species, so that they are only an occasion or cause, in no way the beginning or part of homicide itself.

c) That to become drunk for the pleasure of drink is mortal; and yet to drink wine from pleasure with a slight excess is only venial; therefore by parity concerning the pleasure of lust.

Reply. Drunkenness according to itself is not gravely evil by reason of the pleasure which is unduly sought in drink, but only because it has annexed to it deprivation of the use of reason. On the contrary, lust is that by which pleasure reserved to the good of the species is exclusively referred to the good of the individual.

d) That the moral virtues which concern the passions admit lightness of matter; therefore also the opposed sins, and consequently lust.

Reply. Chastity and lust not only concern the passions, but also express an immediate order to the common good and to justice. But the good of the human species and of society is grave matter, and therefore lust is gravely evil. Nevertheless it admits lightness of matter in marriage, when, with the primary end of due propagation preserved, sin is committed only against the due mode in the use of the genitals. Outside marriage, however, it is directly opposed to the very primary end of the genitals, and by this reason, when directly and for its own sake sought, it is always grave.

And so we can recognize no serious or solid probability in this new opinion.

Many call into doubt the efficacy of this argument; among them is Billuart, *De Temperantia*, diss. 5, a. 2, who brings forth many examples to overturn it. But those are not to the point, because in them the question concerns merely sensible pleasure voluntarily sought; or if carnal pleasure accompanies it, this is voluntary not directly and in itself, but only in its cause. Others object that lying is essentially a violation of order, and yet is not mortal. But the order which lust injures is, moreover, necessary to society. From this, therefore, that the natural order is violated, lust is intrinsically evil; from this, that a necessary order, and one essentially due to society itself, is violated, it is gravely evil.

And Billuart himself, diss. 6, a. 16, acknowledges this: "Pleasure is of the same notion," he says, "as that which is in copulation, to which it per se tends."

a. by the name of morose pleasure also understands "when reason does not repress an illicit motion of passion; as when someone, after he has deliberated that the motion of passion arising is inordinate, nevertheless dwells upon it and does not cast it out" (I-II, q. 74, art. 6), or "when after deliberation he does not restrain the inordinate act of the lower powers" (a. 5. Cf. Disputed Question *De Veritate* XV, a. 4, ad 10).

b. He applies his doctrine to acts of imperfect lust, which he a fortiori regards as mortal sins: "It was said above (I-II, q. 74, art. 7 and 8) that consent to the pleasure of mortal sin is mortal sin and not only consent to the act. And therefore, since fornication is mortal sin and much more the other species of lust, it follows that consent to the pleasure of such sin is mortal sin, and not only consent to the act. And therefore, since kisses and embraces of this sort are done on account of pleasure of this sort" - he does not say, as Ill. Waffelaert observes after Cajetan, "when or whenever they are done," because by their nature they have it that they are thus done; but, "since they are done," that is, are apt to be done - "it follows that they are mortal sins." He deduces the same conclusion from the same principle in Disputed Question *De Veritate* XV, art. 4: "From which it follows that whatever a man does from consent to such pleasure in order to nourish or hold such pleasure, as are base acts or libidinous kisses or other things of this sort, the whole is mortal sin." Hence to the objection: the acts of lust are touches, embraces, and kisses; but things of this sort do not seem to be mortal sin; he responds in Disputed Question *De Malo* XV, art. 2, ad 18: "Touches, embraces, and kisses, insofar as they are ordered to the act of fornication, follow consent to fornication; insofar as they are ordered to pleasure alone, they follow consent to pleasure, which is mortal sin. And therefore in either way they are mortal sins." But in these acts pleasure is sought not merely as thought, but as actually perceived and incomplete. Therefore, according to Saint Thomas, every pleasure is specifically, completely or incompletely, the pleasure of fornication or pollution, and therefore, when sought per se, is sought on account of the pleasure of mortal sin. Hence:

c. Saint Thomas expressly teaches that any pleasure whatever of lust outside marriage is mortal sin, namely in Disputed Question XV *De Malo*, art. 2: whether every act of lust is mortal sin; this doctrine he applies to internal lust (ad 16) and to imperfect acts (ad 18). Namely, he supposes that every pleasure of lust is of the same species and, by this reason, always mortal.

VIII. Lust voluntary in its cause, from which it is foreseen to follow, is sin to the extent that the cause, insofar as it influences it, is sin. Hence it is a sin grave by its genus, which admits lightness of matter.

It is proved: in venereal pleasure willed in the cause, the consent of the will is borne only toward the cause which provokes the pleasure; therefore it is evil only to the extent that the cause itself is evil. Hence the malice is to be determined from the influence on venereal pleasure; and besides this it must be seen whether perhaps there is a just and proportionate reason for placing the cause on account of a good effect and permitting the evil effect.

Now there are actions which cause a base motion per se, others per accidens, according as they are apt to cause it, or on the contrary are not apt to cause it although nevertheless they can cause it. Actions which by their nature are apt to excite venereal pleasure, and thus are ordered to generation, cause it per se, for example a base look, touch, or imagination. Moreover, of these actions some influence that effect proximately and notably, namely those from which the base effect always or almost always follows, for example a repeated touch on the obscene parts of another person;[23] others influence the base motion only remotely and lightly, from which therefore the evil effect rarely arises, for example a touch made in passing on the immodest parts of one's own body.[24] Their influence must also be considered relatively, because by its nature it depends somewhat on the varying inclination and disposition of the subject, as in childhood, youth, or old age, in affection or habit of mind, in a warm or cold bodily constitution; hence certain causes are more vehement with respect to

one such person, which are light with respect to another, for example a continued look at a naked person of the same sex, or a continued touch of one's own body.

[23] Actions gravely exciting, according to Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 864, are: "a more vivid practical thought concerning venereal matters; touch exercised on the obscene parts of another person, unless perhaps it is done entirely in passing in a person of the same sex without depraved affection; a voluntarily continued look at a completely naked person of the other sex; indeed also the look of a man at the naked chest of a woman, or the look at an obscene picture, at least if it is continued after commotion has already arisen."

[24] Actions lightly exciting, according to Lehmkuhl, ibidem, are: "touch or look on the immodest parts of one's own body made in passing; a non-immodest and light touch of a woman made in passing; taking her hand; a light kiss from an honorable cause; vain conversation with a woman; a non-fixed look at the chest; a fortiori other lighter looks."

Actions which of themselves pertain in no way to generation and are outside the genus of immodesty cause a base motion per accidens, for example to eat or drink immoderately, to use a bath, to ride, to sit or lie in a certain position, to exercise sight or touch on honorable parts on account of merely sensible pleasure. Indeed there are persons who, from actions which in no way relate to the venereal matter, are vehemently excited by a hidden force. Among causes per accidens are counted those actions which remotely and lightly influence the base effect, even if sometimes they influence it gravely, because this proceeds not from their nature but from the intervention of another cause, for example from the subject's infirmity, custom, obsession, weakness, heredity, and so forth.[25]

[25] From the preceding things those opinions can be reconciled which at first sight seem opposed, while some deny that the influence of the cause is to be determined from the disposition of the agent, while others on the contrary affirm it, or assert that it depends principally on the nature of the cause, secondarily on the disposition of the agent. Noldin says, for example, cited work, n. 35: "He who, on account of peculiar disposition and infirmity, suffers frequent pollutions from actions licit in themselves, which by their nature influence them only lightly, is not bound to abstain from those actions, provided consent to the pleasure is excluded: for in placing them he uses his own right." Namely, this is valid concerning causes per accidens, not concerning causes per se. On the contrary, Genicot, *Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 377: "For determining which causes influence gravely and which lightly, attention must principally be paid to the nature of the cause; secondarily to the disposition of the agent. Whether a cause by its nature influences gravely or lightly often appears easily enough to each one. But in many cases the matter is not so clear: in these especially one must attend to the condition from the disposition of the agent. For the influence of the same causes is very much diminished or increased according to age, constitution, force of imagination, education, degree of virtue, custom of hearing, seeing, handling base things, and so forth." Indeed Aertnijs, *Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 260, conformably to the doctrine of Saint Alphonsus: "He who, from inclination toward venereal things, has experienced frequent pollution from causes not indeed gravely immodest by their nature, nor on the other hand altogether light, but which in him more vehemently arouse pollution, is bound, when no reason is given for placing them, to abstain from them, and indeed under grave obligation: because with respect to such a person, on account of his inclination, causes of this sort excite not lightly but gravely." Namely, these things are valid concerning causes per se, not concerning causes per accidens.

With these things posited we say:

a. It is a mortal sin without sufficient reason to place a cause which per se proximately or gravely influences carnal motions or venereal pleasure, even if these by accident do not follow; for example very obscene reading, or a prolonged touch or look at an immodest part. One case is excepted: when someone from his own experience knows certainly that he is not gravely moved by an action of this sort.

Practically, however, for mortal sin two things are often required: first, that the cause influence grave motions, that is, vehement ones, or those sufficiently proximately disposing to pollution, or causing great pleasure; for since light and transitory motions are most frequent, to avoid the causes of all of

these would be very troublesome, indeed morally impossible, and therefore not to be urged under grave obligation, because often there is present a reason excusing in some measure, not from the whole, namely, but from so much; secondly, moreover, that the cause influence those grave motions proximately or gravely. Therefore Saint Alphonsus rightly notes[26] that even pollution itself is not mortal unless it proceeds from a cause per se mortal in the genus of lust or immodesty. It must be mortal, because since pollution is not willed in itself but only in the cause, it will be evil to that degree to which the cause itself is evil, that is, to which the cause is evil insofar as it is a cause or insofar as it influences; but every and only a cause which of itself gravely influences motions prohibited under grave obligation, unless there is present a reason excusing from a good effect which compensates the evil, is mortal insofar as it is a cause. It must be in the genus of lust, because otherwise it would influence pollution not gravely but only lightly, for example drunkenness or immoderate eating of meat.

[26] *Theologia Moralis*, book III, treatise IV, n. 484.

b. It is a venial sin without a just cause to place an action influencing lightly or remotely or per accidens into even vehement motions and complete venereal pleasure, provided those things do not please and no proximate danger of consent is present. For a light influence on a grave thing is a light thing.[27] Such things are a conversation not prolonged with a girl, a look, a touch, reading that is not very base. A sufficient reason is any reasonable cause of necessity, utility, or fittingness.

[27] And so an act which would influence only lightly into grave commotion, indeed into pollution, would for this reason be only venially evil. And in this there is a great difference from lust voluntary in itself: for direct intention toward venereal pleasure, even a small one, manifests a disposition of soul very different from that which is found in him who does not seek, indeed does not will, that pleasure. The first per se incurs proximate danger of consenting to further pleasure on account of his own propensity; not so necessarily the other.

c. It is no sin to place from a just cause an action from which inordinate motions are foreseen to follow, even pollution, provided the proximate danger of consent is always absent. A just cause is, for a priest, to hear confessions and to study base matters; for a surgeon, to look at and touch immodest parts; likewise for one serving the infirm or in baths; for all, to kiss women according to the custom of the country, to touch oneself from necessity, to ride for the sake of recreation or utility, to perform gymnastic exercises, to lie down in a more comfortable position, while sitting to put leg over leg according to custom, and to take warm foods and drinks moderately.[28]

[28] You will find the whole doctrine concerning lust voluntary in its cause expounded in Billuart, diss. 6, a. 12. P. Vermeersch proposes the matter otherwise and speaks of disguised lust, cited work, n. 374 and 388, in place of lust voluntary in its cause. Yet our mode seems clearer and more open, more conformable to principles and older. Moreover, although at first sight the distinguished theologian may seem to dissent, nevertheless in fact he teaches the same. "For observe," he says, "that the sin of imperfect lust is committed directly, not only when it is sought by express intention, but also when, without another immediate cause, acts are exercised which directly excite the flesh: for then you are judged to effect the venereal motion" (n. 374). Behold the principle; if now you want an example: "Kisses too frequently repeated, especially on the mouth or lips, too prolonged embraces, because they gravely move the flesh and have no cause among unmarried persons, are argued to be grave unless the carnal motion is positively repressed and, if pollution more strongly threatens, one ceases from these" (n. 401). Genicot-Salsmans has the right doctrine concerning lust voluntary in its cause as regards pollution voluntary in this way (*Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 401), but not as regards venereal motions, which are not proved to be grave, since in them, he says, there is no evident affection toward complete pleasure (n. 403). But this reason is null, for he who seeks incomplete pleasure by that very fact implicitly seeks complete pleasure, and he who wills the cause of pleasure implicitly wills the effect. Moreover this doctrine is new and is not found in the first editions made under the care of P. Genicot himself; it is not founded in tradition: the traditional doctrine holds that to place a cause per se gravely influencing

grave motions is of itself a grave sin; nor is it sustained according to principles: for if something is in itself gravely evil, as venereal motions outside marriage are, it is also gravely evil perfectly to cause it, in the case at hand to place a cause per se gravely influencing such motions. Others state more practically: if the motions are grave and excited without just cause, there is great danger, and the sin is grave; on the contrary, if the motions are light, the danger is small and the sin light. But this is said according to presumptions, according to that which often or ordinarily occurs. For if the motions are grave, danger is not always and for all persons grave, nor is it grave to place a cause lightly influencing such motions. On the contrary, if the motions are only light, nevertheless sometimes grave danger can be present. And so it must be said in principle: to place a cause per se gravely influencing venereal motions is of itself a grave sin; to place a cause influencing lightly or per accidens is of itself a light sin.

IX. Lust indirectly voluntary, which the will does not procure nor intend, to which it neither positively consents nor resists, but toward which it behaves negatively, and which it only permits because it does not repress it when it can and ought to repress it, is of itself venially evil; per accidens, sometimes mortal on account of danger of consent.

It is proved: in this a man sins, because reason and will are lacking in their office of directing and repressing the motions of the lower powers, nor can he bear himself indifferently to whether his motions and acts are inordinate or not; but:

a. per se he does not sin mortally, because positive consent of the will is lacking;

b. per accidens he would sin mortally if from this there were a proximate danger of consenting to venereal pleasure.

Hence man is bound to resist those motions positively, insofar as is necessary and morally possible for not consenting and for repressing the motions:

1. ordinarily not directly, that is, by contrary or violent acts, such as suppression of imagination, compression of the members, chastisement of the body, and so forth, because this is not necessary for the aforesaid end, or is too difficult, or even excites more;

2. but indirectly, by applying the mind to other incompatible things, especially those which more strongly affect the mind, for example by interrupting the work, pursuing business, an external occupation requiring special attention, praying, and so forth; indeed:

3. sometimes, if there is a just cause for not resisting otherwise and for not repressing the motions, positive resistance by a simple act of displeasure, at least implicit, suffices. This act is not to be frequently repeated, since until it is retracted it is judged morally to persevere. Thus if someone has experienced that other resistance is useless for checking the motions, or excites and increases them more; or if the motions have their origin from a necessary cause or from a useful action, as was said in the preceding number, c, and it is too troublesome to repel them, for example on account of duration; or if the motions are light and transitory, both because the causes exciting such motions are very frequent and therefore the obligation of repressing them would be too difficult, and because they are repressed better and more effectively by contempt: for solicitude about impeding them is accustomed to excite imaginations and increase the motions. All these things are easily verified in the scrupulous person, who therefore will show sufficient displeasure by simply despising the motions.

X. They object: 1. Anyone can licitly use, as he pleases, that which is his own. But in lust, adultery excepted, man uses nothing except what is his own, namely, his own body. Therefore.

Reply. Man does not have dominion over his own body, which he did not give to himself, but which was granted to him by God; he has only useful dominion or use, however, according to divine ordination. Hence, "from the fact that someone uses his body inordinately through lust, he does injury to God, who is the principal lord of our body" - II-II, q. 153, art. 3, ad 2. Namely, he usurps the dominion of God.

2. What nature does cannot be evil. But nature expels semen and effects pollution.

Reply. Distinguish: insofar as it is done by nature, conceded; insofar as it is done voluntarily by man, denied. Otherwise it could also be said: nature inflicts death; therefore it is licit voluntarily to inflict death on oneself or on others!

3. Natural tendencies and pleasures are good or ordered.

Reply A. Natural tendencies and pleasures are good or ordered - distinguish: pleasures of integral nature, conceded; of fallen or pure nature, denied, or subdistinguish: of nature considered completely, or of nature as rational, to which the lower tendencies must be subjected, conceded; of nature as animal, denied. Rational nature does not tend toward venereal pleasures except in order to the propagation of the human race in marriage.

Or B. Natural pleasures of themselves are not morally good or evil, except insofar as they are chosen conformably to right reason or not conformably to it.

4. The pleasures of foods are licit; therefore also those of venereal things.

Reply. Pleasures are licit if the operations to which they are joined are licit and are done rightly for a good end; hence the pleasures of foods are not licit unless they are sought in operations which, according to the order of reason, tend to preserving the life of the individual; and carnal pleasures are not licit except in order to preserving the human species in legitimate marriage.

Question Three: Concerning Consummated Lust According to Nature

Besides the vice against nature, which altogether impedes the due end itself of venereal pleasure, namely generation, there are six principal species of complete lust according to nature, from which generation, namely, can follow: simple fornication, stuprum, raptus, adultery, incest, sacrilege.

For sins differ in species according to objects morally diverse, namely those which include a diverse repugnance to right reason. But in lust according to nature, on the part of the proper object, there can be six diverse repugnances to right reason. Therefore.

The minor is proved: moral deformity and repugnance to right reason can be by comparison with the partner, who:

1. either is merely unmarried and consenting, not qualified, so that there is deformity only on the part of the end, insofar as the due education of offspring is impeded, and then it is simple

fornication, which is so called because it is simple lust against chastity alone;

2. or is a virgin under the power of her father, and then it is stuprum, even if violence is not inflicted upon the person;

3. or is one to whom violence is inflicted, and then it is raptus;

4. or is one joined to another, and then it is adultery;

5. or is one too closely related, to whom due honor is not preserved, and then it is incest;

6. or is one dedicated to God by vow, and then it is carnal sacrilege.

Nor should you say that these are not diverse species of lust, because they do not repugn to chastity in a special and diverse way but to other virtues: justice, religion, piety, and so forth. For there is also a special repugnance to chastity, and concupiscence is shown to be more inordinate, when someone tends so vehemently to lust that on account of it he does not fear also to sin against justice, religion, or piety. Namely, the species of sin is primarily from the end.

Concerning these diverse sins we must now speak in particular.

Article I: Concerning Fornication

I. Simple fornication (*hoererij*) is a wandering concubitus, namely of an unmarried man with an unmarried corrupted woman, by mutual consent.

It is said: 1. of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman, namely between persons who are altogether free from every bond of marriage, relationship and affinity, vow or sacred order; otherwise it will be another species;

2. corrupted, because if the woman is a virgin, it pertains to stuprum;

3. by mutual consent, because if violence is employed, or an unjust means, it is reduced to raptus.

II. Simple fornication is intrinsically and mortally evil, and therefore is not evil because prohibited by positive divine law, but is prohibited by natural law because it is evil.

It is proved: 1. from the Scriptures, which say that fornication excludes from the kingdom of heaven (Gal. V, 19-21; I Cor. VI, 9-11; Eph. V, 5-6); moreover this also regards the gentiles, who before Christ did not have the positive law, since the newly converted are said to have been washed, sanctified, and justified from this;

2. from the condemnation of proposition 48 by Innocent XI[1] and proposition 25 by Alexander VII;[2]

[1] "So clear does it seem that fornication according to itself involves no malice and is evil only because prohibited, that the contrary seems altogether dissonant from reason."

[2] "He who had copulation with an unmarried woman satisfies the precept of confession by saying: I committed with an unmarried woman a grave sin against chastity, without explaining copulation."

3. from reason, which Billuart proposes from Saint Thomas (II-II, q. CLIV, art. 2; *Contra Gentiles* III, 122; *De Malo* XV, 1) thus: "Simple fornication is concubitus according to itself deprived of the natural order to its end, namely the education of offspring, and therefore according to itself imports an inordination which tends to grave harm, not only of him who is to be born from such concubitus, but also of the common good and of human society, upon which very many and very grave evils rush in from the evil education of its members; therefore according to itself it is mortal sin.

"The antecedent is proved: the due education of offspring in the human species requires between male and female a lasting society, marriage, after coitus ... for it is manifest that for the education of man there is required not only the care of the mother by whom he is nourished for a time, but much more the care of the father by whom he is to be instructed, defended, corrected, and promoted in both interior and exterior goods.[3] But fornicary concubitus according to itself neither supposes nor imports a lasting society of male and female, but rather imports the contrary: for it is of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman, that is, of those who are bound by no bond between themselves; from which it happens that, so far as concerns the nature of the fornicary act, one party after coitus can at will desert the partner, not acknowledge the offspring, and exercise no care of him. This certainly occurs most frequently, and consequently there is the worst education of offspring. Therefore."

[3] Saint Thomas notes that nature itself inclines toward this permanent society: "For we see, first, in all animals in which the care of male and female is required for the education of offspring, that in them there is not wandering concubitus, but that of a male with a certain female, one or several, as is clear of birds ... and from this, secondly, it is naturally in males in the human species to have solicitude concerning the certainty of offspring, because the education of offspring is incumbent on them. But this certainty would be removed if there were wandering concubitus." II-II, q. 154, a. 2.

Nor does it stand in the way that in a determinate case someone could sufficiently provide for the education of offspring, indeed oblige himself to this and swear it; whence then fornication would be licit. "For the response is that this is per accidens to the fornicary act, but it belongs to it per se that the parties are not bound to remain together after coitus, since by it they are constrained by no bond to this insofar as they are fornicators, nor is anyone prohibited, so far as concerns the very notion of the fornicary act, from approaching any other woman; and therefore, so far as it is of itself, it is an act deprived of the natural and due order to the education of offspring. Therefore, that the fornicator after coitus long remains with the woman and helps her for the education of offspring does indeed cause fornication not actually to harm the offspring and the common good, but it does not remove the fact that it is according to itself harmful and disordered from the end of generation.... Moreover, in human acts specific goodness or malice is considered according to that which belongs to them per se, not according to that which belongs to them per accidens."[4] In other words: then the detriment which the inordination per se brings is per accidens absent or removed; but the natural order in concubitus is not restored, not even per accidens. Hence Saint Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 2: "That which falls under the determination of law is judged according to what commonly happens, and not according to what can happen in some case." Similarly, book III *Contra Gentiles*, ch. 122: "Natural rectitude in human acts is not according to those things which happen per accidens in one individual, but according to those things which follow the whole species."[5]

[4] Palmieri excellently says: "Although a pact may be made for educating offspring, this is per accidens, not per se, namely superadded to this union, which through itself remains according to its essence: therefore that obligation is not marital, but

such as could be undertaken by anyone, even on behalf of another. Therefore, considered per se, that union is opposed to the law of nature, even if that pact is superadded. Namely, the pact must be of the essence of the union, because this union from its essence is ordered to that end, the education of offspring." *De Matrimonio*, thesis 6.

[5] The argument is valid even if the concubitus is sterile, because concubitus according to itself expresses an order to generation; and consequently the law of nature must be understood according to those things which that order demands. "The common law," says Saint Thomas (Disputed Question *De Malo* XV, a. 2, ad 14), "is given not according to particular accidents, but according to common consideration. And therefore that act from which generation cannot follow according to the common species of the act is said to be against nature in the genus of lust, but not that act from which it cannot follow on account of some particular accident, such as old age or infirmity."

In one word: fornicators exercise copulation as if separated and act as individuals without due subordination to the species, and they partly deprive the carnal work of its natural order to the species.

III. Fornication, nevertheless, is not the gravest sin. For it is "against the good of the man to be born. And therefore according to its species it is a graver sin than sins which are against exterior goods, such as theft and other things of this sort," for example detraction; "but it is less than sins which are directly against God," or against divine good, for example directly against the theological virtues or religion, "and than sin which is against the life of a man already born, such as homicide,"[6] which is graver than all the species of lust.[7]

[6] Saint Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 3.

[7] Ibid., ad 3.

IV. Fornication, by reason of some circumstance, is sometimes called by a special name:

1. **Meretricium** (*openbare hoererij*, prostitution), if someone approaches a woman who publicly offers herself, as it were, to all, for the sake of gain or libido. Per se it does not change the species; nevertheless a prostitute will easily be guilty of adultery or sacrilege, being ready for all.

2. **Concubinage** (*bijslaping*, *samenhuizing*), if one has the custom of approaching some determinate woman, whether he has her at home or not. It is a notably aggravating circumstance because of the virtual proposal of remaining in sin; however, sometimes concubinage is understood of a habitual adulterous commerce, in which case it differs also in species.

3. **Onanistic fornication**, if from the very mode of exercising copulation the generation of offspring is prevented. This differs in species, because the sin is begun as fornication according to nature, but consummated according to a mode against nature: fornication begun, pollution consummated.

In practice, however, this distinction can be unknown; for the circumstance of onanism among unmarried persons is often customarily apprehended not as libidinous but rather as lessening the fault. Hence although onanistic fornication is objectively a graver sin, nevertheless it is not always so subjectively; but according to the affection and intention it will be graver or less grave than perfect fornication. He who chooses onanistic copulation so that he may harm the woman and society less is led by a less perverse affection than he who despises the burdens to be feared by the woman, so that he may satisfy himself more fully. But he who seeks pleasure without burden will sin more than he

who, with resigned mind, strives to bear the connected burdens, so that he may act according to nature.[8]

[8] Castillon, "Peccata secundum naturam," in *Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, vol. 47, p. 429.

V. Observations. 1. Fornicators are to be questioned discreetly: whether offspring was born; whether they impeded generation or procured abortion, for example whether the girl could have become pregnant; why not; whether they neglected offspring born.

2. The circumstance of seduction to fornication per se does not have to be declared in confession, because the other party by consenting was also a cause of the sin of the seducer.

3. It is licit, with the evil will changed, from displeasure at the sin, to break off fornication begun, even with danger of pollution, because we are always bound to cease from evil and pollution then is beyond the intention. On the contrary, it is illicit for him who perseveres in the affection of sin, because then he intends the loss of semen, for example from fear of infamy, and the sin is consummated in a mode against nature.

VI. Warning. It can happen that there is ignorance, even invincible ignorance, concerning the malice of fornication; in which case the one ignorant is altogether to be instructed.

Article II: Concerning Stuprum and Raptus

I. Stuprum (*viol, verkrachting, maagde- of vrouweschennis*), as a distinct species of lust, is violent concubitus. And indeed:

1. by more recent authors it is taken in the stricter sense, and is the violent or unjust defloration of a virgin, she being unwilling;

2. among the ancient scholastics, as Saint Thomas, it is taken in a less strict sense, as the illicit defloration of a virgin existing under paternal power, even when she herself consents;[1]

[1] II-II, q. 154, art. 6. The etymology of the name, which indicates violent concubitus, is nevertheless preserved; for there is a physical breaking of the seal of virginity. Violence is done to the body, not to the consenting person.

3. but in a broad sense, it is so called as the oppressive or injurious seduction of an honorable and unmarried woman, even one not a virgin or not a minor.

But in the aforesaid cases a virgin is understood not in the moral sense, but in the physical sense, as one who, although perhaps she has sinned, preserves the seal of virginity.

Raptus (*oplichting*), as a distinct species of lust, is taken by Saint Thomas in the broader sense, and is present whenever some violence in lust is employed in any way whatever, and it can be defined as force inflicted upon any person, or upon her parents, for the sake of fulfilling libido. But according to more recent authors it is taken strictly of a special violence, and is the violent or injurious abduction of a person for the sake of fulfilling libido. Hence what recent authors call stuprum strictly so called is called raptus by Saint Thomas.

II. Stuprum exercised with violence, even with one not a virgin, is evidently a distinct species of lust, because it imports grave injustice, since the right of the woman over her own body is violated; but if the woman is a virgin, a twofold injury is committed, since the seal of virginity is violently taken away. Stuprum is called violent not only when the woman is oppressed by physical force, but also when other unjust means are employed, as if copulation is extorted by threats or by fear unjustly inflicted, or by touches brought about by force, or by prayers so importunate that they are equivalent to violence, or by deceit or fraud, for example by abusing the ignorance of a girl who did not know copulation to be illicit, by fictitiously promising marriage, by oppressing a woman in sleep or in drunkenness, and so forth; but not if it is obtained by mere prayers, persuasions, blandishments, gifts.

III. Stuprum in the less strict sense, according to Saint Thomas,[2] is also a distinct species of lust, both because it is against paternal power, which exercises solicitude concerning the guarding of the virgin, and thus tends to the dishonor and grief of the father; and because the girl can be impeded from legitimate marriage and is placed on the road to fornicating further and acting as a prostitute, from which she was drawn back by the seal of virginity. Hence, even if the father were to consent and renounce his right, to which, moreover, he cannot fully renounce, this other malice would still remain.

[2] Ibid., a. 6.

Yet because the virgin herself consented, stuprum is not proved to import a new grave malice; and therefore it seems to be only a venial species, which per se does not have to be declared necessarily in confession.

IV. Every raptus contains injustice, because in it man uses an unjust means. Understood in the stricter sense, it is a special injustice, namely deprivation of liberty inflicted for the fulfillment of libido, and thus it constitutes a sin distinct in species. Hence it differs from the impediment of raptus, which is incurred when abduction is done for the sake of marriage. But if a girl of majority age is taken away from her parents by her own consent, it is not raptus, but flight; on the contrary, if a minor consents, when the parents or guardians are unaware or contradicting, it is raptus (can. 2353).

V. Observations. 1. A woman to whom violence is inflicted cannot bear herself merely passively; and therefore she is bound not only to resist pleasure internally, but also to manifest dissent externally, by crying out and by repelling the aggressor according to her strength. Nevertheless she is not bound to resist in that exterior mode which would expose her to danger of death or infamy, provided the proximate danger of internal consent is absent.

2. To a woman who has not had copulation voluntarily, but was oppressed by force or deceit, it is illicit to expel not only a fertilized ovum but also semen before conception. For man does not have dominion over semen, and moreover it is a greater injury, against human generation and the common good, to expel semen from the final seat destined for this by nature, than to procure pollution by which it is expelled from its instrumental seat.

But as to what some say, that in this case, immediately after copulation, before conception occurs, the semen bears itself in the manner of an unjust aggressor whom it is licit to repel: this is true during the action of copulation, but not once copulation has been posited, because then the aggression has

ceased and the semen is already in its proper natural place. For copulation is ended by the very introduction of semen into the female genital canal,[3] because, the semen having been ejaculated, the work of man ceases and the work of nature alone begins, whereby it happens that the emitted semen, by its natural propensity and by the attraction of the female genital canal, enters the female organs more deeply for fertilization. But to break off the work of nature in human generation is illicit.[4]

[3] And not by fertilization itself, as the adversaries suppose; otherwise the impossibility of generating would make one not only sterile but impotent, and would render marriage invalid.

[4] The question is only touched upon in passing, because it does not directly pertain to the present matter; and moreover it makes little difference for practice, because the case in which the oppression of a woman is to be attributed to violence alone and was altogether involuntary is very rare. For if it began by force or deceit, to which subsequent consent acceded, it will already not be simply unjust; and there will already be no place for blameless protection, since the woman ought to have used other licit means.

3. Nevertheless, an oppressed woman can and ought to move and turn herself and in every way impede and break off copulation lest she receive the semen, although it is to be poured out, because she has the right and obligation of impeding copulation, and the effusion of semen is to be ascribed to the malice of the man alone.

But it is permitted to observe that the doctrine which we propose, which is that of Saint Alphonsus, can be strengthened especially by a twofold consideration:

1. a priori: he who does not have dominion over human life or the human body also does not have dominion over that which is nothing but the principle of human life and body. But human semen is nothing other than the principle of human life and body. Therefore man does not have dominion over that semen, which is man in proximate potency (Saint Thomas, Disputed Question *De Malo* XV, a. 2). And therefore every action which is directly exercised about semen is illicit, except that which is intended by nature, namely matrimonial copulation.

2. also a posteriori: if it were licit directly to expel semen before conception, because it would bear itself in the manner of an unjust aggressor, by parity, indeed a fortiori, it would be licit directly to expel the fetus after conception, because in that case it would be more of an aggressor and unjust. But the Church teaches that this is illicit. Therefore the same must logically be held concerning the expulsion of semen.

And although a woman oppressed by prevailing force can protect the ovum lest it be fertilized, nevertheless she would not licitly do so by an action which would directly touch the semen or harm it; just as neither is it licit directly to kill an innocent person in order to protect oneself against unjust harm. Here the principle holds: evils are not to be done that goods may come.

He who desires more may go to our *Questions concerning Embryology*, p. 43, and in the appendix, "Concerning Conception Impeded after Stuprum."

Article III: Concerning Adultery

I. Adultery[1] (*overspel*, *echtbreuk*) is, as it were, an approach to another bed, and therefore can be defined: the violation of another's bed, or copulation with the spouse of another. But if both are married, there will be a twofold malice of adultery to be declared in confession; for each one commits

his own sin of adultery and, besides, by complicity cooperates in the adultery of the other. If he did not declare this in confession, he would deceive the confessor.

[1] Concerning adultery, these can usefully be consulted: *Revue Eccl. de Liege*, VII, January 1912: "Les effets de l'adultere"; and Loslever, *Amour libre ou Fidelite*.

II. Adultery, even when had only on one side, is a distinct species of lust because it includes a twofold grave malice: one against chastity, the other against justice, by violating the fidelity promised in marriage and the right over the body acquired by the spouse, while that which belongs to the spouse as to use is given to another. The co-adulterous party cooperates in this infidelity and injustice. Hence, besides the deformity of fornication, which it has from the fact that someone approaches one not his own and impedes the good of educating his own offspring, it has a deformity from this, that he approaches another's and thus impedes the good of another's offspring.[2] For this reason it also contains indistinctly a malice against religion, if the marriage is a sacrament; against piety, by breaking the unity of which each spouse is a part; and against the common good.

[2] Saint Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 8.

Hence it is a very grave sin, as is clear from the manner of speaking of Scripture: Lev. XVIII, 20; XX, 10; Deut. XXII, 22-24; Tob. IV, 13; Prov. VI, 29; Eccli. XXIII, 25-29; I Cor. VI, 9; and from the penalties of civil law.

III. Adultery is committed in three ways, and therefore three degrees are distinguished in it: the first is that of a married man with an unmarried woman; the second, of a married woman with an unmarried man; the third, of a married man with a married woman. The second is of itself graver than the first, because it is more repugnant for one woman to be mingled with several men than for one man with several women. For:

a. from mingling with several men the woman is usually made sterile and generation is impeded; but if it is not impeded, it is uncertain whose the offspring is;

b. the adulteress exposes herself to the danger of introducing illegitimate offspring into the family, with great harm to the husband and to the legitimate children, who are thereby deprived of part of the inheritance. See the treatise on justice. But all these things do not follow from the adultery of a married man with an unmarried woman.

The third degree is the gravest of all, because beyond the aforesaid things it contains a twofold malice of infidelity and a twofold malice of injustice.

IV. Adultery is also a special sin if the other spouse consents, as is evident from proposition 50 condemned by Innocent XI.[3] For although no injury is done to this one, as knowing and consenting, who, so far as he is concerned, has renounced his right or does not oppose it, nevertheless that right, arising from a contract for the public good, necessarily cannot be perfectly alienated, and much less the right of God or of society. Namely, the husband does not have an absolute right over the use of the wife's body, but an exclusionary right limited to the licit use of marriage. Hence the conjugal right remains whole, concerning which the spouses cannot yield, and therefore, although injury is not done to the husband, nevertheless there remains injury done to the state and right of marriage.

[3] "Copulation with a married woman, with the husband consenting, is not adultery; and therefore it suffices in confession to say that one has fornicated."

V. Observation. Copulation had with a person betrothed to another, from valid betrothals, implies a notably aggravating circumstance. Nevertheless, as it seems, the species is not changed, because the betrothed man does not yet have a strict right over the body of the betrothed woman. Such copulation is graver in the betrothed woman than in the betrothed man, because the betrothed woman is thereby notably less esteemed.

Article IV: Concerning Incest

I. Incest (*bloedschande*, *bloedschennis*) is copulation between blood relatives or those related by affinity. It is prohibited by natural law indeterminately for blood relatives; hence how far and to what degree the prohibition extends must be determined by positive law. For the non-baptized it is determined by civil law or custom; for the baptized, by ecclesiastical law. Thus incest is between those who, according to the law of the Church, cannot enter a valid marriage, or concubitus with a blood relative or one related by affinity within the degrees prohibited by the Church for marriage. The prohibited degrees in consanguinity extend to the third inclusive for the collateral line; in affinity, which now arises from marriage even ratified, to the second; in each, to any degree whatever for the direct line (can. 1076 and 1077). But if in some degree a legitimate dispensation has been obtained, it is no longer incest.

It is called incest (*in-castus*): as if by antonomasia it were against chastity.

II. Incest is a distinct species of lust because it contains a twofold grave malice, against chastity and against piety, or the reverence owed to relatives. Lev. XVIII, 6 and following; XX, 11, 12, 14; Deut. XXII, 20, 22, 23; I Cor. V, 1-5. Saint Thomas shows this thus, II-II, q. 154, art. 9:

"There it is necessary to find a determinate species of lust where there is found something repugnant to the due use of venereal things. But in the use of blood relatives or those related by affinity there is found something unfitting to venereal mingling for a threefold reason:

"First, because naturally man owes a certain honor to parents, and consequently to other blood relatives who draw their origin from the same parents in near degree.... But it is manifest ... that in venereal acts there especially consists a certain baseness contrary to honor; whence men are ashamed concerning these things. And therefore it is unfitting that such venereal mingling be done between such persons with one another....

"The second reason is that persons joined by blood necessarily live together. Hence, if men were not kept away from venereal mingling, too much opportunity would be given to men for venereal mingling ... especially because, as Aristotle says, *Politics* II, c. 2, since man naturally loves a blood relative, if there were added the love which is from venereal mingling, there would be too great an ardor and the greatest incentive of libido, which is repugnant to chastity.

"The third reason is that by this the multiplication of friends would be impeded. When a man takes an outside wife, all the blood relatives of the wife are joined to him by a certain special friendship, as if they were his own blood relatives."

III. Incests among blood relatives do not differ in species from those which are had among those related by affinity, because "a person related by affinity is joined to someone because of the blood-related person joined to him; and therefore, because one is for the sake of the other, consanguinity

and affinity make an unfittingness of the same notion, not degree" (ibid., ad 2). Indeed, according to many, all incests are of the same lowest species; but others say that incest among blood relatives of the direct line is distinguished in species from all others, or even incest between brothers and sisters.[1]

[1] Which the faithful easily judge.

Sometimes, however, another office of piety can be violated at the same time, and then certainly a diverse species is present: thus, for example, the incest of parents with children constituted under their power, because they detract from the office of right instruction; likewise, as it seems, the incest of a son with a stepmother while the father is living, by reason of the great injury toward the parent.

IV. Just as there is carnal kinship from the bond of blood, so there can be legal kinship from perfect adoption, which nevertheless is not recognized in Belgian law, and spiritual kinship arising from baptism between the one baptizing and the sponsors on one side, and the baptized on the other (can. 768). Such kinship differs in species from carnal kinship; and therefore besides incest properly so called, there can exist legal incest diverse in species, and there does exist spiritual incest, if copulation is had between the one baptizing or the sponsor and the baptized. This last includes malice against religion, because it is against the reverence of the sacrament.

V. Observation. Carnal sin committed by a bishop or pastor or rector of a college, and so forth, with subjects, although it is not spiritual incest properly so called because per se no spiritual kinship is present, nevertheless includes a malice of injustice diverse in species, insofar as someone induces to sin those whom by office he ought to draw back from vice. The mere cooperators of a pastor or moderator of a college do not necessarily sin in this way, although they can sin by scandal. Nor does the confessor who, outside confession, sins carnally with a penitent, because he neither contracts spiritual kinship nor acts as a spiritual superior, but as an equal, not in confession but outside it. But if he solicited on the occasion of confession, it would be carnal sacrilege.

VI. Warning. Sometimes it happens that the sinner does not perceive the special malice of incest in copulation had with more remote blood relatives or with those related by affinity. In such a case, so that he may conceive a greater horror of the sin, he will generally have to be instructed.

Article V: Concerning Carnal Sacrilege

I. Sacrilege is the violation of the sacred; hence carnal sacrilege in a more general sense is the violation of the sacred by a venereal act (*heiligschende onkuischheid*). But as a person, or place, or thing can be sacred, so a threefold sacrilege, distinct in species, is enumerated: personal, local, and real. It is so much graver as the person, place, or thing is more sacred, and as the profanation is graver. Hence a threefold species of carnal sacrilege is also distinguished, just as of sacrilege in general.

The personal alone is, in the stricter sense, a species of lust and carnal sacrilege (*vleeschelijke heiligschennis*), since it has the notion of sacrilege from its very object, the person carnally violated; in the others, the violation of the sacred bears itself rather as a certain circumstance changing the species and acceding to the object.

II. Personal carnal sacrilege, as a sin consummated according to nature, is copulation with a person consecrated to God by a vow of chastity. It is sacrilege strictly so called if the vow is public, because by a public vow alone, emitted before the Church, some person is made sacred; otherwise, if the vow

is private, there is at least complicity in the violation of a vow, which nevertheless pertains reductively to sacrilege, because it has a certain analogy with sacrilege.

Hence carnal sacrilege is committed not only when a sacred person acts luxuriously in himself or herself, whether externally or even internally, because thus that person violates himself or herself insofar as sacred; but also:

1. when a non-sacred person acts luxuriously upon a sacred person even resisting, because by the act he violates a sacred person;

2. a fortiori when a sacred person acts luxuriously upon a non-sacred person, who, if he or she voluntarily suffers this, cooperates at least in that person's sacrilege;

3. most of all when each person, as accomplice, is sacred; for then there is a twofold sacrilege. Yet one who is held to chastity by a twofold title, for example by priesthood and by religion, does not commit a twofold sacrilege, but one graver sacrilege, because he is obligated by one and the same formal motive.

III. Local carnal sacrilege (*vleeschelijke kerk- of tempelontheiliging*) is a completed act of lust, or one which proximately disposes to this, exercised in a sacred place, that is, a church or public oratory; for in such a base act of lust there is present a special repugnance to a sacred place.

IV. Real carnal sacrilege (*vleeschelijke kelk-vaat-sacrament-enz. ontheiliging*) is the use of a sacred thing for lust, for example to employ linens or sacred vessels for this, to promise a Mass as the price of a carnal act, and so forth. A special real sacrilege is the sin of solicitation, by which a confessor abuses the sacrament of penance for a base sin.

V. Observation. He who induces a sacred person to a sin of lust contracts the malice of sacrilege by reason of the object; on the contrary, this is not so of a sacred person who, without his own pleasure, induces another to some sin of lust not to be exercised with a sacred person.

Question Four: Concerning Lust Consummated against Nature

I. Lust against nature is so called because it altogether repugns the natural ordering or destination of the venereal act, while it impedes generation. There are four species of it distinct by object. For the genital act, in order that offspring may be conceived, requires four things: a. the concubitus of two; b. of different sex; c. of the same specific nature; d. in a natural mode. Hence someone can act against nature in four ways:

1. if, without concubitus, pollution is procured for the sake of venereal pleasure: solitary sin;

2. if concubitus is done toward the same sex, for example male with male or female with female: sodomy properly so called;

3. if concubitus is done with a thing of a different species: bestiality;

4. if the natural mode of lying together is not preserved, either by seeking an undue vessel or organ: sodomy improperly so called, or another undue mode in such a way, however, that

generation is thereby impeded: onanism.

These differ in species according to a diverse repugnance toward nature and reason.[1]

[1] Saint Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 11. Hence proposition 24 was condemned by Alexander VII: "Softness, sodomy, and bestiality are sins of the same lowest species; and therefore it suffices to say in confession that one has procured pollution."

II. Lust against nature, according to itself and other things being equal, is the gravest in the genus of lust, because it transgresses that which has been determined by nature itself concerning the use of the genitals as to their primary end. But the other sins of lust transgress only that which is further determined by reason. The first is more fundamental, because reason cannot determine certain things except according to those things which have first been determined by nature.

After this, however, is incest, which is also against a secondary natural inclination, namely against the natural reverence which we owe to persons joined to us. Adultery is graver than stuprum, because the injury is greater if someone abuses a person subject to the power of another for the use of generation than for guardianship alone; and simple fornication, which is committed without injury to another person, is least among the species of complete lust. By raptus and sacrilege, however, the aforesaid things can be aggravated.[2]

[2] Ibid., a. 12.

All these things are to be understood:

1. according to themselves, that is, according to their proper and distinct species; for per accidens several, indeed all, species of lust according to nature can concur in one act, so that in that act there is greater gravity than in one sin against nature;

2. formally, or in the genus of lust, without attending to the malice of another species. For in another genus, by reason of an added circumstance, other sins can become simply graver, for example adultery by reason of injustice is absolutely graver than pollution, and sacrilege by reason of irreligion; but pollution in the genus of lust is graver than both;

3. other things being equal, so that in equal circumstances a sin against nature is greater, and so that the greatest sin against nature is greater than the greatest according to nature.

Nevertheless nothing prevents some sin according to nature from being graver on the part of the agent, for instance because it is done from special malice or with greater audacity.

III. Among sins against nature, gravity is attended from the greater abuse rather than from the mere omission of due use. Hence bestiality is graver, because it recedes most of all from the rule of nature, since even the due species is not preserved; then sodomy properly so called, in which the due sex is not preserved; then sodomy improperly so called, or the undue mode of lying together, in which the due organ is not preserved; then onanism, or unnatural concubitus from the mode alone impeding generation. The lowest place is held by solitary sin, which is in the omission alone of concubitus toward another (ibid., a. 4).

Concerning these we must now speak in particular.

Article I: Concerning Solitary Sin, or Pollution

I. The sin which, from the ordinary circumstance of the agent, is called solitary; from the liquid secretion emitted in it, pollution (*immunditia*, *zelfbevlekking*); from the weakness of soul which it manifests, softness; from the more frequent mode by which it is committed, masturbation (*manus-turbatio*), is defined: the separated complete use of the genitals and consequently of satiative venereal pleasure without concubitus. There is indicated:

A. the genus: complete use, and so forth. For thus it is distinguished from immodesty or the imperfect acts of lust, which are nothing but the beginning and preparation of complete lust; and from these it differs in species as the mere beginning of a work and the consummation, beginning and term, means and end, and as an incomplete species from a complete species.[1]

[1] Saint Thomas, I-II, q. 72, a. 7.

B. the difference: without concubitus, because if it is done in natural concubitus, it will be fornication or another species according to nature; if in unnatural concubitus, or in an undue organ, it will be another species against nature. Therefore, from the fact that it is a solitary vice, pollution differs in species from the other consummated sins according to and against nature.

Therefore it is badly defined as: a. perfect satiative venereal pleasure outside concubitus. For pleasure is for the sake of the act and is essentially joined to the act as its consequence, and therefore it would not be evil unless the act itself were disordered. Hence, although complete pleasure outside legitimate concubitus is evil, nevertheless it is not the principal and specifically distinctive malice of pollution;[2]

[2] Hence a certain more recent author writes inconsiderately: "According to Saint Thomas the malice of lust does not consist, not even partially, as some have wished, in the frustration of semen, but is wholly situated in the pleasure which is proper to seminal emission," alleging Disputed Question *De Veritate* XV, a. 4, ad 3. For the holy Doctor does not say that the inordination is from the pleasure, but on the contrary that this pleasure is from the inordination of the act: "The whole inordination of fornication, from whatever source it occurs, redounds into the pleasure which is caused by it."

b. the fruitless effusion of semen, or the voluntary effusion outside concubitus.[3] For its fundamental malice is not in the loss of semen, although in men this is an acceding gravity, because in them semen is specifically necessary for generation and therefore the complete use of the generative faculty of itself expels semen. But the malice is in this, that separately and solely for the individual good someone enjoys an operation which can be loved and sought only for the sake of the species.

[3] Thus also Billuart: "Pollution or softness is the voluntary emission of human semen outside concubitus," and he attributes the definition to Saint Thomas, art. 11. But the holy Doctor does not say precisely this, but this: "that without any concubitus, for the sake of venereal pleasure, pollution is procured."

Hence the sin of pollution, just as in men, so also exists and does not differ in species:

1. in women: although in them there is no effusion of semen, nevertheless there is the complete use of the genital organs, distinct from imperfect use, from the movement and contraction of the female genital canal with satiative pleasure, which is usually accompanied by an abundant distillation of liquid of the female canal which contributes nothing directly to generation but assists copulation and the act of generation;[4]

[4] Aristotle already denied that the seed of woman is true seed. Saint Thomas holds it as imperfect and not necessary for generation: "Such seed is not the matter which is required of necessity for conception" (III, q. 31, a. 5, ad 3). Afterwards

many scholastics doubted whether there is seed in woman. Nevertheless all constantly taught that in the female there is a solitary sin distinct in species from incomplete lust, nor did they affirm this from a false assimilation of humor to seed properly so called. Hence one or another modern author who contradicts or doubts concerning this is not to be heard. Thus Noldin; but Father Schmitt, in more recent editions of the same work, has now amended this.

2. in youths and old men, because they are capable of copulation and have the complete use of the genitals, namely perfect erection and motion of the genital member, which ejaculation of semen is apt to follow, even if this is not always ejaculated, or is not always prolific, for example because of the absence of zoospermata;

3. in the impubescent who do not have semen, provided that they have the complete satiative use of the genital organ, namely are capable of perfect erection and copulation, or are able to effect intromission into the female genital canal;

4. likewise in those who have undergone vasectomy (*zaadleiders-afsnijding*), because they remain capable of copulation and satiative pleasure, indeed they preserve a perfect sexual appetite and semen, although they cannot emit that semen;

5. in eunuchs, not indeed those who were born so or were made so before the seventh year, but those who were castrated at adult age and retained the virile member, as long as they remain capable of satiative erection and copulation, which usually endures for some time; on the contrary:

6. not in infants and boys, even if perhaps they emit some liquid in a solitary act, because they are not capable of perfect erection and copulation; whence their act is always the imperfect and begun use of the genital organ. Likewise, not in those eunuchs who do not have perfect erection.

II. Pollution is either active or voluntary, or passive or involuntary.

A. Active pollution per se is an act essentially, and indeed gravely, evil, prohibited by the law of nature.

It is proved: 1. from the Scriptures, which say that the soft, the unclean, and the immodest will not obtain the kingdom of heaven: I Cor. VI, 10; Gal. V, 19; Eph. V, 3. This also regards the gentiles, since the newly converted are said to have been washed from it, who hitherto had been subject only to the natural law.

2. From the condemnation of proposition 49 by Innocent XI.[5]

[5] "Softness is not prohibited by the law of nature. Hence, if God had not forbidden it, it would often be good and sometimes obligatory under mortal sin."

3. By reason: pollution is an act by which the complete use of the genitals and the pleasure attached to it are sought outside marriage and are ordered to the individual good, whereas they are destined solely to the social good, the generation of offspring. But this is a perversion of order, by which the act is frustrated of its primary end intended by nature; it is a grave

inordination, because it is directly against the greatest good necessary to human society: its conservation and propagation. Therefore pollution is a grave perversion of order.

Confirmation: a. if pollution were not prohibited, or were prohibited only under light sin, many, content with this pleasure, would bid farewell to the burdens of marriage with the greatest detriment to society. Thus too the end intended by nature would be frustrated.

b. If simple fornication according to nature is gravely illicit, although it is against the education of offspring alone, a fortiori a sin against nature, which is much graver, as being against propagation itself.

Hence pollution is mortal sin:

a. if it is voluntary in itself;

b. if it is voluntary in a cause which is placed without sufficient reason and per se proximately and gravely influences it; otherwise, if it influences lightly, because then it is venial.[6] But it should be noted that every cause which per se and gravely influences a carnal motion does not for that reason gravely and per se influence pollution itself; thus, for example, an instantaneous consent to carnal pleasure.

[6] Compare above, Question II, nn. VI and VII.

B. Passive pollution according to itself is only an effect physically evil, the emission of humor. This evil of itself is not grave nor altogether to be avoided, even for men, because of itself it is gravely harmful to no one. For semen does not have to be conserved with special solicitude, both because nature itself sometimes expels it, and because it pours it forth and prepares it more abundantly than is needed for the conservation of the species. Hence:

a. merely to permit such a foreseen effect, while it could be impeded, without sufficient reason, is only a venial sin: an inordinate motion of concupiscence admitted without reason; unless per accidens there is present a proximate danger of consent;

b. not to repress an arisen pollution by a positive effort is no sin, because it is judged too difficult.

III. Merely natural pollution, proceeding from nature alone disburdening itself, which ordinarily is nocturnal,[7] is in itself in no way evil nor worthy of any reprehension. Hence it is licit with a simple inefficacious affection to desire it on account of the advantages which follow and to rejoice over it after it has followed, provided one guards against a present excitation of lust or consent. Nevertheless it is not licit to procure it or assist it or do something so that it may happen, because then it would not be merely natural, but voluntary.

[7] Not every passive pollution is merely natural: that one can arise from various causes, even external, which someone undergoes involuntarily; this one is from the physical disposition of nature, or from nature alone disburdening itself. In some, pollution occurs once; in others, twice in a week; in others, scarcely once in a month. It also sometimes succeeds itself immediately two or three times. But if it is accustomed to occur more frequently, there is reason to have recourse to a physician.

Father Vermeersch, however, judges that a man who experiences nocturnal emissions with greater difficulty and more rarely, and therefore is ill-affected nervously during the day, can take a remedy not directly to obtain pollution, but directly so that the body may be well tempered and composed, such

that nature can act regularly, from which then a more frequent pollution will further follow naturally. Thus, provided the good composition of the body does not come from the pollution itself.

In the case in which nocturnal pollution is voluntary, the principles explained in the preceding number and in Question Two, number VII, come to be applied. Hence:

1. it is mortally evil if it is willed in itself and directly sought, for example if someone drinks much or lies down in a certain posture precisely so that he may suffer pollution;

2. likewise it is mortally evil if it is voluntary in a cause per se proximately and gravely influencing it, from which it is foreseen to follow, for example if it comes from impure thoughts, pleasures, or desires voluntarily and for a long time nourished before sleep while awake,[8] a fortiori if from external acts which greatly dispose to it;

[8] For an instantaneous consent to carnal pleasure does not gravely influence pollution. But lest nocturnal pollution be judged voluntary in the cause because more or less dishonorable phantasms provoke and accompany it: for, as Saint Thomas says, II-II, q. 154, a. 5, this also can occur naturally: "when seminal humor superabounds in the body or when a release of humor has occurred, ... the sleeper dreams those things which pertain to the expulsion of this kind of abundant or released humor." Hence a threefold cause of nocturnal pollution is distinguished by the holy Doctor: 1. one bodily, concerning which the things said hold; 2. another animal and interior, or preceding thoughts and pleasures while awake; 3. spiritual, namely the action of the demon. In the first case pollution does not have the notion of fault, except sometimes from its cause, if the abundance or release of humor is from a culpable cause, for example from excess in food or drink. But a cause of this kind is a cause per accidens which of itself influences remotely and lightly. In the second case, it is voluntary in the cause; and it has the notion of fault if the cause is culpable; indeed it is a fault more or less grave according to the gravity of the cause and of its influence. In the third case, it is not sin; nevertheless sometimes it is with preceding sin, namely negligence in preparing oneself against the illusions of the demon.

3. it is venially evil if it is voluntary in a cause lightly and remotely influencing it, or in a cause per accidens, from which it is foreseen to follow, for example if it comes from drunkenness or more abundant food;

4. it is no sin if there is a sufficient reason for placing the cause on account of necessity or utility.

IV. Every voluntary pollution of itself is a sin of the same species in whatever mode it is procured, whether namely by the mind, imagination, or sight; by the touch of the hand; by the use of some instrument; or by contact with a physical thing, or an animal, or an unaware living person, provided affection toward the person or toward concubitus is absent and pollution alone is intended. This is also verified in women, among whom pollution, whether clitoral or of the female canal, for example by the insertion of a finger, candle, carrot, and so forth, or by the use of an artificial virile member, that is, an instrument which imitates the virile member, or procured by another touch in a less honorable part, for example around the external pudendum, on the thighs, in the pubic region, by compression of the thighs, on the mammary papillae of the breasts, and so forth, are of the same notion.

Per accidens it can contract specifically diverse malice when certain circumstances accede, which therefore must be declared in confession, qualified pollution, and indeed:

1. from the circumstance of the agent; and thus the pollutions of an unmarried person, of one bound by vow, and of a married person differ;

2. from the circumstance of internal intention or affection; pollution from simple affection differs from that which is done from fornicary, sodomitical, bestial, adulterous, incestuous, or sacrilegious affection, whether someone intends these sins by absolute desire, or whether he precisely takes complacency in them as such;

3. from the circumstance of the special mode by which it is carried out, namely by touches of another person conscious of this matter, either because of scandal and complicity if the person consents, or because of unjust violence if the person resists. But if the person is married, bound by vow, or related by blood, a diverse species is contracted.

V. Observations. 1. Whoever has sought in vain the complete use of the genitals in such a way that he has not tasted satiative pleasure, which is the sign of complete use, has committed the sin of pollution by affection, but effectively he is not guilty of consummated lust.

2. Similarly, he who, after a chance pollution has been experienced involuntarily, consents to the pleasure, because the pollution is only willed, not voluntary, unless he wished to augment the arisen pollution. Nevertheless it is gravely sinful, because thus he wills the pleasure which has been ordered by God solely to conjugal copulation, by which generation is apt to occur in the due mode. Hence Saint Thomas has these things concerning nocturnal pollution: "It can happen that in the very awakening sin arises, if indeed, on account of the pleasure, what happened is pleasing. This will be a venial sin if such pleasure is by surreption, but mortal if it is with deliberating consent, and especially with appetite for the future. That pleasure does not make the past pollution a sin, because it is not its cause, but it is a sin in itself.[9] But if it is pleasing as an exoneration and alleviation of nature, it is not believed to be a sin."

[9] Saint Thomas, on IV Sent., d. 9, q. 1, a. 4, qc. 1, ad 5. Recently this was denied, or called into doubt, even by Antonelli, *Medicina Pastoralis*, in the most recent edition, t. II, c. XIII. Against this is what Vermeersch wrote in *Periodica*, XXII, p. 122: "Concerning the harmful passing over, in the matter of chastity, of Saint Thomas's principle concerning pleasure"; likewise in *Th. M.*, 3rd ed., IV, n. 101. Consequently Antonelli's work was prohibited in universities, seminaries, and other houses of studies.

3. Active pollution, because essentially evil, cannot be licitly procured even for preserving life, because the active use of the genitals is not licit except on account of the good of the species, and because semen pertains to the species, whence the individual man does not have dominion over it. Nevertheless someone could take a medicine which would immediately procure health and at the same time expel semen, because it would be to place a cause with a twofold effect, of which the good is intended and the evil permitted. Yet it is not licit to procure health by means of the emission of semen.

Billuart gives the testimony of the Thomistic school, diss. 6, a. 11: "Semen is not a part of the body nor instituted for the good of the individual but of the whole species; whence we cannot use it except in the mode by which it can serve generation.... Semen is not a part of the body nor for its good, but for generation alone."[10]

[10] Similarly Sporer exhibits to us the doctrine of the Franciscan school, *Theol. sacr.*, p. 4, n. 641: "It is altogether licit for preserving life and the whole suppositum for a man to cut off some member ... but truly semen by its nature is ordered principally, by no means to the use or conservation of this suppositum in the individual, but to the generation, propagation,

and conservation of the whole species; whence nature in no way allows it to be cast away for the sake of preserving the individual, and thus to neglect the species by reason of the individual." Lessius gives the testimony of the Society of Jesus, o. c., l. 4, c. 3, d. 14, n. 96: The testes "are a part of the body, whence concerning them, as concerning other parts of the body, we can determine. But semen is not a part of the body, nor was it instituted for its good, but for the sake of offspring, as its rudiment." And although Thomas Sanchez, *De Matrimonio*, l. 9, d. 17, n. 16, opposes certain restrictions and tries to correct the argumentation according to his own sense, nevertheless he is compelled to testify that this is the opinion which they commonly hand down.

4. Hence it is gravely illicit for a man to expel semen by pollution and collect it and introduce it by art into the female genital canal or uterus of his wife, so that by that artificial process she may be fertilized, as the Holy Office decreed on March 24, 1897; or directly to procure pollution so that sperm may be obtained by which a contagious disease may be scientifically detected and, as far as possible, cured, as it decreed on July 24, 1929. And in the same way it seems gravely illicit, whatever some have said, to extract semen from the testicles by a certain puncture, whether to institute a chemical analysis or even to fertilize one's own wife.

For man does not have dominion over semen: for just as he does not have dominion over human life, so neither over that which is nothing but the principle of human life, or that which is man in potency, and human life in proximate potency.[11] Namely, he has over this not dominion except useful dominion or use, and only in order to generation to be procured by the natural means of conjugal copulation.

[11] Thus Saint Thomas, Disputed Question *De Malo* XV, a. 2.

Or also: semen, the whole of what it is, exists solely for generation. Therefore any use whatever of semen for another end and impeding generation is illicit, because it is essentially against the very nature of semen, which is only for generation.

And so every direct taking or expulsion of semen is illicit outside that which is done in conjugal copulation. Hence, in the case, even if the semen is employed to fertilize the wife: the action by which it is expelled or extracted from the testicles, so far as concerns itself, from its own nature and from the mode by which it is done, emits semen in such a way that generation is naturally impeded; even if per accidens, from another consequent action, this defect is remedied so that the semen contributes to generation in an artificial mode. This nevertheless is insufficient for restoring rectitude in the prior action.

Nor does it stand in the way that the emission, in the case of puncture, is done without pleasure; for no act is evil according to itself because it has pleasure attached, but on the contrary the accompanying pleasure is good or evil according to the nature of the act. Hence pollution is not evil because it is done with pleasure, but the pleasure is evil because it is done in an act emitting semen outside conjugal copulation. But if semen could licitly be taken in this way for scientific analysis or for the artificial fertilization of the wife, why would it not be licit to take it for this end by the ordinary and easier way which nature indicates, and to permit the pleasure? For it would be a cause with a twofold effect, which it is licit to place for a proportionate reason. Why, namely, this would not be licit escapes us. Indeed, in the concession made by the adversaries, there would seem no longer to be any reason why pollution would be an act against natural right: for an action is specified by its term, not the term by the action. The term of the action is not evil because it proceeds from such an action, but rather the action according to species is evil because it has an illicit term. Hence the

emission of semen is not so much evil because it is done by the undue use of the genital organ outside conjugal copulation, but on the contrary the use of the genital organ in a man is undue and evil because of itself it is terminated in the emission of semen outside copulation.

5. Any motion or impulse of the body deliberately employed without sufficient reason, by which the effect of pollution follows, is evil. Nevertheless, from deliberate motions there are to be distinguished instinctive motions or impulses, which arise spontaneously in the body by force of nature disburdening itself so that the effect of pollution may be completed.

6. It is licit, even with danger of pollution, to drive away itching in the dishonorable parts by touch or rubbing, unless it comes from libido. Concerning this it should be noted:

a. generally it is better to tolerate itching, if it is slight or easily tolerable;

b. if the itching is not venereal, but arises from some inflammation or acrimony of the blood, it is licit to drive it away, because a true utility is present, provided the danger of consenting to venereal pleasure is absent;

c. if it is venereal in such a way that it arises solely from abundance of semen or the ardor of libido by which it tends into pollution, it is illicit to drive it away with danger of pollution, because it is directly to excite pollution; for the touch tends to quieting the trouble not by rubbing, but by pollution; but it is not licit to use evil as a means to an end even good;

d. natural itching is distinguished from venereal itching in that the former is alleviated by mere rubbing and sometimes without pleasure, the latter by pollution alone;

e. in doubt the itching is supposed not venereal, until it is certain that it is provoked solely by libido;

f. girls who are accustomed to pollute themselves by touches should not easily be believed under the pretext of such ardor.

7. From the solitary sin of pollution there are to be distinguished:

a. in men, simple distillation, namely the emission of flowing humor without ejaculation and complete pleasure. This nevertheless can be gravely evil, like incomplete lust, if venereal pleasure is directly sought in it, or if without sufficient reason a cause is voluntarily placed which per se gravely influences a great distillation which occurs with notable commotion and venereal pleasure;

b. in women, both spontaneous ovulation, or the discharge of the ovum each month, and menstruation. For these are no sin, but occur merely physiologically, nor is any venereal pleasure joined to them.

VI. Warning. As to questions in confession, let it be noted:

1. boys or girls are not to be asked whether an effusion of semen or humor was present;

2. nor women, except indirectly, whether they have satisfied passion, felt complete satisfaction (*zelfvoldoening*), vehement pleasure;

3. but others, confessing touches, are to be asked whether pollution followed;

4. on the contrary, those polluting themselves are to be asked also about immodest touches separated from pollution and are to be warned concerning their gravity;

5. but if someone is ignorant, even invincibly, that pollution is a sin, he is altogether to be instructed lest he acquire an evil habit.

Article II: Concerning Sodomy

I. Sodomy (*sodomieterij*) properly so called is concubitus toward an undue sex, that is, of two persons of the same sex, namely male with male, or female with female. Hence:

1. in order that true sodomy be present, a simple touch is not sufficient, even mutual, even with pollution, and even pollution procured by one another, whether exercised by hand, foot, mouth, or arm upon the genitals of the other; but concubitus is required, and therefore on at least one side the application of the genital member to the body of another, and indeed to some vessel of the body. Therefore for men there is required intromission of the virile member into the posterior vessel, or even into the mouth if it is done with one lying upon the other; for women, the application of the genital organ of one to the other or to the posterior vessel, namely of external pudendum to external pudendum or to the posterior vessel. But if the application is made to another part of the body, even with emission of semen, it will be pollution procured by touch of another person, not sodomy; unless inchoatively and in affection, if there is affection toward an undue sex, pollution with sodomitical affection, and the partner is not considered as a mere means of procuring pollution;

2. in order that sodomy be altogether perfect and fully consummated in the notion of sodomy, there is moreover required the complete use of the genitals, and therefore not only the intromission of the posterior vessel by the virile member, or the application of the anterior vessel, or external pudendum, to the anterior or posterior female vessel; but also the emission of semen or humor of the female canal, not only into the mouth, for then it is called irrumation, but into the vessel indicated above, so that it receives the semen or humor.[1] Hence, where sodomy is a reserved sin, it ought to be consummated in this sense, unless otherwise expressly noted. This happens more easily among males; concerning females it is understood with difficulty and generally is judged impossible, as is to be supposed in practice, because they are not to be questioned concerning these minute and scandalous circumstances. Ferraris notes, however, that according to some, women can by means of a certain diabolical instrument transmit distillation of the female canal and receive it into themselves.

[1] From the emission of semen the sin is consummated in the notion of lust, but not in the notion of sodomy unless the semen is emitted into the undue vessel.

II. Sodomy is a most grave and execrable sin, as is clear:

1. from its nature, both in itself, because it most gravely disturbs order and therefore is most of all against nature, and by reason of cooperation, because both sodomites give scandal to one another and each concurs in the most grave sin of the other;

2. from the graver penalties inflicted by ancient law or by God himself (Gen. XIX);

3. from the doctrine of the Apostle in Rom. I, 26-28.

III. Observations. 1. Several more recent authors often seem to place the very essence or specific notion of sodomy, as also of bestiality, and the essential distinction, in affection toward a person of the same sex, or toward an animal, or in the special pleasure thence arising. Yet this does not seem to agree with the general principles in moral matter; for pleasure is not evil unless the action from which it follows is evil, whence it does not constitute the very essence of the sinful act. But internal affection can be a circumstance on the part of the agent which adds to the external sin an internal malice specifically distinct, sodomy in affection; yet it cannot change the nature of the external sin itself or constitute its specific difference. This is essentially in the special perverse use of the genital organ; whence for effective sodomy there is required intromission or the use of an undue organ, as being of the same sex.

2. Let it not be thought that the aforesaid sin of sodomy is committed more rarely: sometimes it exists under the form of pederasty (*knapenschending*); in great cities there are also brothels of men; in the army, especially among cavalrymen, and in ships among sailors, it is frequent enough. Similarly in history certain more celebrated women are known who approached other women in true congress,[2] although one perfectly consummated perhaps must be judged impossible.

[2] Compare above, p. 10, note 3.

3. It does not have to be explained who was the agent, who the patient, because that circumstance does not change the species. Nevertheless it must be declared whether pollution occurred, and especially if it did not occur.

4. Concubitus in a vessel, especially as to women, easily has the malice of fornication as companion: for the female patient, while provoking the acting female, is accustomed to say: "Do with me as a man," indeed sometimes the acting female not only lies together, but uses some instrument, as if a virile member. Therefore the confessor will be able prudently to inquire, rather than concerning base modes or circumstances, concerning this malice of fornication.

5. Likewise the circumstances of consanguinity, affinity, marriage, vow, and so forth, add malice to sodomy.

Article III: Concerning Bestiality

I. Bestiality (*beestachtigheid*) is concubitus with a brute animal. In order that it be perfectly consummated in the notion of bestiality, there must be present an effusion of semen into some vessel, and indeed a natural one, or one destined for coitus. Hence where it is a reserved sin, it is to be understood in this way, unless otherwise expressly noted.

II. Bestiality per se, as a distinct species, is the gravest of all sins of lust, because it most of all disturbs the order of nature, and through it man is compared to beasts of burden, so that he becomes one flesh with them. See Lev. XX, 15-16.

Its species is not changed whatever the genus or sex of the animal may be.

III. To bestiality is reduced:

1. concubitus with a succubus or incubus demon, appearing under human form, because the demon is of a diverse species from man. This sin adds to bestiality a species against religion, namely the malice of superstition; besides, other malices can be added according to the form of the joined person, religious, of the same or a different sex, under which the demon shows itself. Rarely does the demon truly appear; ordinarily it happens from a certain vehement hallucination that someone really judges himself to have concubitus with a demon.

2. Likewise necrophilia, or copulation with a dead female, which is sometimes committed by guardians of the dead and shows an altogether depraved sense. This sin according to the thing participates in the malice of pollution, because semen is cast into an inanimate thing; of fornication, because of the external form of a female; and of bestiality, because of the diversity of species. But this last is not always perceived by the sinner, and therefore according to affection the species of the sin depends on the apprehension and intention of the one acting, for example effective pollution and affective fornication.

IV. Observations. 1. This crime is committed especially by country-dwellers and keepers of livestock, and by certain women who use dogs for fulfilling libido.

2. Immodest touches with an animal, whether the genitals of the animal are touched, or one's own genitals are handed over to the animal so that it may touch or lick them, or one's own genitals are applied to it so that by its help, as by an instrument, venereal pleasure may be procured, are not properly and effectively bestiality; nor do they have its malice affectively unless they are done from affection of bestiality, but they can lead to it. Indeed, touches of the genitals of an animal are not necessarily mortal sin; nevertheless they often provoke pollution, in which case they are gravely sinful, but not bestiality.

3. Bestiality exercised with an animal of the same sex, although per se it does not differ in species, can sometimes be done from sodomitical affection toward an undue sex or toward an unnatural vessel.

Article IV: Concerning Unnatural Concubitus with a Woman

I. Unnatural concubitus with a woman (*tegennatuurlijke vrouwenbeslaping*) is that which does not preserve the mode indicated by nature, in such a way that the possibility of generation is thereby impeded. Hence by that very fact it is against nature and gravely sinful, because it is directly opposed to the natural end of the genital act.

It can be against nature in two ways:

1. on the part of the organ in which copulation is had, while it is not exercised in the natural vessel, that is, the female genital canal, but in an unnatural vessel and undue organ, namely in the posterior vessel or in the mouth. It is called sodomy improperly so called, because it imitates true sodomy;

2. on the part of the mode alone, if copulation is exercised in the natural vessel and due organ, the female genital canal, but in such a way that, from the very mode by which the action is carried out, generation is impeded: either because the man withdraws himself before insemination and pours out semen outside the female genital canal, or because he himself or the woman employs instruments or other means by which the semen is impeded from passing to the uterus. It is called onanism, from the deed narrated concerning Onan (Gen. XXXVIII, 9). For if only the natural and due mode in situation, place, or time is not preserved, yet in such a way that generation is not impeded, the mode is only beside nature (*ongepaste* or *ongewone wijze*), not against nature, nor evil of itself gravely.

II. Onanism can be done in various ways:

1. on the part of the man: a. if he begins copulation in the female genital canal but withdraws himself before insemination and pours out semen outside the female genital canal; b. if he clothes the virile member or only its glans with some thin covering or sheath, a condom,[1] *capote anglaise*, within which the emitted semen is retained;

[1] It is so called because it had Doctor Condom as inventor.

2. on the part of the woman: a. if she uses an occlusive pessary (*sterilet*), that is, a certain thing introduced into the lowest part of the female genital canal for closing the mouth of the uterus, for example a metallic barrier, sponge, cotton, threads of linen, and so forth; b. if she uses a pseudo-vagina, that is, a thin membrane arranged within the whole female genital canal in which semen is emitted.

Besides these unnatural modes of lying together, there are other modes by which, after the action has been completed, conception is impeded, for example washing of the female canal by which, by means of a syringe or irrigator after copulation, semen is expelled by water or an antiseptic substance; or, immediately before or after copulation, the sprinkling of a chemical substance, for example anticonceptional powder, or the injection of an acidic liquid by which semen is killed. But these modes are rather against justice, to which they are opposed per se, than against chastity, to which they are opposed per accidens because of the intention of the agent. Besides, there are several unjust modes by which offspring already conceived is impeded from being born or living, for example abortion or craniotomy.

III. Observations. 1. Pollution done between the arms, legs, breasts, and so forth, of a woman is not imperfect sodomy; neither is it so in affection unless there is affection toward an undue organ. It is pollution with affection of fornication.

2. In sodomy improperly so called, it must be expressed whether pollution was present; for it is consummated by the emission of semen.

Question Five: Concerning Imperfect Lust, or Impudicity

I. Impudicity (*schaamteloosheid*, *oneerbaarheid*), or imperfect lust, is that which externally begins perfect lust, without the exterior act being brought to its natural term or highest degree of pleasure. In other

words, these are those external acts which are apt to surround the act of consummated lust and constitute its beginning and, as it were, a part or circumstance of it. Hence it is not to be confused:

1. with internal lust, which is perfected in the mind and will alone and is a depraved affection, whether it be pleasure or desire;

2. with an external occasion, which is not a preparation or beginning of the consummated act, but a mere occasion or danger, with scandal more or less proximate, of internal or external lust, for example dances and spectacles.

The imperfect acts are usually numbered as several: looks, touches, kisses, embraces, speeches, songs, readings. But the last three are mere occasions, and indeed of internal lust, to which they are reduced; they are the same sins as the thoughts and desires which are fostered within while the words are uttered. Kisses and embraces, however, are easily reduced to touches. Hence we must inquire only concerning looks and touches, and these still per se are one and the same sin.

II. External acts which are of themselves apt to excite imperfect carnal pleasure and thus provide matter for impudicity:

1. According to themselves they are not lustful and evil, because in them venereal pleasure is not found per se; rather, they are indifferent. Otherwise they would never be licit, although they can be exercised from a good or evil end, for example a touch for healing, a look for investigating, and can produce a twofold effect, good or evil. Hence of themselves, that is, with intention and the force of exciting lust set aside, they are not evil nor impudicious; indeed, exercised from an honorable end and for a proportionate reason, they are licit.

2. They can be evil and impudicious, especially if they are done outside marriage, which is the only hypothesis we are considering in the present matter:

a. from the intention of the agent, by reason of the intended end, which can be mortally evil if someone seeks venereal pleasure itself; on the contrary, the end is venially evil if they are done exclusively from curiosity, levity, joking, or on account of merely sensible pleasure; the end is good if someone acts from some necessity or utility;

b. from the nature of the act, by reason of influence upon venereal commotion and pleasure. For by nature they are apt to provoke base motions and excite pleasure; and therefore, unless a just proportionate cause is present for permitting the pleasure, it is illicit, gravely or lightly, to exercise them from this alone, that they gravely or lightly influence venereal pleasure, even without evil intention or danger of consent. Hence if in someone very dishonorable and repeated acts were done without danger of venereal motion, for that person they would not be a sin against chastity;

c. from the condition of the person, by reason of danger. For sometimes, even if of themselves they lightly influence venereal motion, because of man's frailty they can be a danger of consent for him, or of grave scandal for others.[1]

[1] Compare Saint Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 4.

And so according to their external species they are not evil nor impudicious, but indifferent; and yet, as impudicious, they are intrinsically evil because of venereal pleasure voluntarily sought or caused. Therefore there is no opposition between the present assertion, that these acts according to species are indifferent, and the fundamental doctrine in the matter of lust, that all lust directly and in itself voluntary is gravely evil. For, as Cajetan declares in this place, kisses, embraces, and touches are not mortal sins from their genus, but only from the intention of the one acting; and nevertheless, as he himself adds, kisses, embraces, and touches had on account of the pleasure to be perceived from them are from their genus mortal sins on account of the end of the work, because according to themselves they are ordered to the pleasure of concubitus.

III. Impudicity in this mode differs in species from pollution and consummated lust as an imperfect species from a perfect one. This is to be understood if one stops in it; for if it is done from the intention of a perfect act and is joined with it, they are one sin in complete species and in number.

Mere impudicity, however, of itself is a sin of one and the same species; for every venereal motion of itself, and unless special circumstances accede, is of the same species, in whatever mode it has arisen, by look, reading, touch, and so forth, because the venereal pleasure which is found in all acts is of the same nature.[2] Hence in confession it suffices to say: I exercised imperfect lust, or I voluntarily had carnal motions and procured, experienced, admitted venereal pleasure, and so forth.

[2] Nor is it divided on the part of the external act into according to and against nature; for of itself it says nothing such, but abstracts from this, although from the end of the agent or on the part of affection it can be estimated in this way.

Nevertheless per accidens a malice diverse in species can be added because of certain circumstances, which therefore are to be declared in confession:

1. from the circumstance of the person acting, and thus the circumstance of vow is to be declared;

2. from the circumstance of internal intention or affection, various malices can be added according as the acts are done with fornicary, sodomitical, bestial, stupratory, adulterous, incestuous, or sacrilegious affection, in the same mode as was said concerning pollution;

3. from the circumstance of the special mode in which they are carried out, namely if they are done with another person; for then scandal and blameworthy complicity intervene. But if the external acts according to themselves are the preparation and beginning of a complete act with that person, they participate in the specific malice of this complete act. This last is valid concerning touches, embraces, and kisses, concerning which therefore the circumstance of the other person is to be declared even if this person was unwilling. It is not valid concerning looks, which, unless desire accedes, are not the beginning of a complete act exercised with the person, and therefore it suffices to declare the use of another person, with the circumstance of vow added, however, if that person is bound by vow and consented.

IV. In order that the doctrine handed down may be applied more easily in practice to concrete cases, theologians are accustomed:

a. to distinguish, in the body, honorable parts, which according to the custom of the country are shown to all without offense to modesty, as among us the face, hands, feet; less honorable parts, which by received usage and just custom have been accustomed to be covered, as among us the chest,

back, arms in part, legs; dishonorable or base parts, which everywhere among cultivated nations are covered with garments from natural modesty: these are the genitals and the parts near them which possess a nervous affinity (*innervation connexe*) with them. They are called dishonorable not according to themselves - nothing created by God is dishonorable - but because, as the object of look or touch, they are generally apt to terminate dishonorable acts.

b. likewise, to hand down general rules founded on experience, which ordinarily are valid for the cultivated regions of Europe, and there for the more frequent cases. These rules, however, for the most part are only presumptions, and therefore they admit several exceptions, whether because of a cold or warm individual temperament, or because of special education or habituation, or because of manners and public usages, and so forth. And therefore sometimes presumption yields to truth, and those more particular rules yield to the wholly universal rules handed down under number II, which are applied everywhere and always and in all cases.

The rules customarily handed down are the following:

A. As to touches.

1. To touch one's own body or the body of others from a libidinous intention or venereal affection is always mortal.

2. To touch the genital parts of others, especially of a different sex, even mediately over clothing, except in a case of necessity, as happens with doctors, surgeons, and others having care of the sick, is ordinarily mortal, because it easily provokes libido and shows depraved affection. Likewise, to touch lingeringly the breasts of a woman and especially the mammary papillae, because they are seats of voluptuous excitation, which is accustomed to carry with it even vehement commotion of the genitals. An exception is made if the aforesaid parts are touched from the cause of levity alone and only in passing, as among nurses touching the organs of small children, or impubescent persons of the same sex touching one another.

3. To touch the genitals of brute animals from curiosity or sensuality generally does not exceed venial sin, especially if it is done in passing, because it does not gravely move toward libido. But if it is done for a long time or up to the pollution of the brute, it easily induces danger of one's own pollution.

4. To touch the less honorable parts of a person of the same or different sex, not from venereal affection nor from utility, but from curiosity, sensuality, or sensible love, is generally only venial, especially if it is done in passing, from joking or levity. But if it is lingering and with grave commotion of the genital organs, especially if it concerns a person of a different sex, it will easily be mortal because of the proximate danger of consenting to venereal pleasure.

5. To touch oneself in the dishonorable parts for the sake of necessity or utility, for example to drive away itching, to wipe off filth, to treat an infirmity, is not sin, provided consent to venereal pleasure which can arise from it is excluded. To do this without just cause, from levity or curiosity and without venereal affection, is venial sin, unless the touches gravely influence vehement carnal motions or bring in a proximate danger of consent.

B. As to kisses and embraces.

1. Those done from venereal affection are mortal.

2. Those done on dishonorable parts, or on less honorable parts such as the breasts, are ordinarily mortal, because they generally excite grave carnal motions and are accustomed to indicate venereal affection, unless perhaps they are done in passing and from levity alone.

3. Those done on honorable parts, without a reasonable cause, but on account of sensible love and from levity, joking, or sensuality, are venial, unless there is a proximate danger of consent to venereal pleasure, as easily happens if they are lingering, or repeated rather often, or impressed with great affection between persons of different sex, especially the dove-like kiss by which the tongue is introduced into the mouth of the other.

4. Kisses, embraces, and handlings of hands according to the custom of the country, for the sake of urbanity, friendship, or kinship, are licit, even if per accidens carnal motions are excited, provided the danger of consent is absent.

C. As to looks, which are carefully to be distinguished from mere sight, and which move to libido less than touches do, because they are less material, yet therefore are dangerous:

1. Without necessity, to look lingeringly and deliberately either at the genitals of the other sex, or even the breasts of a woman altogether naked or covered with a transparent veil, or at a man and woman exercising copulation or immodest acts upon one another, or at persons polluting themselves, is ordinarily mortal, because it gravely moves to venereal pleasure. Make exception if it is done in passing or very remotely, or if the one looking is a cold old man or an infant.

2. Without just cause, to look at the less honorable parts of a person of different sex or at the coitus of animals, from curiosity or levity and without venereal affection, is ordinarily venial, especially if it is done in passing.

3. Without cause, to look at one's own genitals, from curiosity or levity and without venereal affection, is venial, especially if it is done in passing; likewise to look in this mode at the genitals of a person of the same sex, unless one were prone to sodomy, or unless a very beautiful adolescent were looked at lingeringly.

V. Corollaries.

1. In order to avoid cooperation in the sin of another, it is generally illicit to admit touches or kisses, even honorable ones, which are known to arise from libidinous affection, unless there is a just cause of avoiding harm to oneself or to the agent. And indeed:

a. if the touches are in themselves dishonorable and are done without necessity, it is illicit by reason of cooperation, had without just cause, in another's sin;

b. if it concerns a kiss or touch in itself honorable before others who are ignorant of the depraved intention of the other, it can be admitted lest the other be defamed, yet with the danger of one's own

consent set aside. If it is done secretly, so that it can be prevented without grave inconvenience, it cannot be permitted, because it is illicit without grave cause to cooperate in another's mortal sin.

2. To look at images or paintings or statues truly obscene, representing a person of different sex, not in passing but lingeringly, is a sin whose gravity depends on the danger itself, more or less great, of exciting venereal pleasure or of consenting to it, unless it is done from just cause, for example on account of the study of anatomical science, and the danger of consent is absent. Generally, however, it is illicit to make such images or statues, unless for the sake of anatomical science, to scatter them, to sell them indiscriminately to all, and to expose them publicly to the eyes of all, because these things are not done without grave scandal to many.

Obscene images, however, are either those which intend to exhibit the altogether dishonorable parts of an adult person naked or covered only by a thin veil, or represent gravely immodest acts, or altogether lascivious forms and those commonly inciting to libido. On the contrary, artistic images are judged to be those in looking at which the viewers are moved chiefly by the artistic mode of representation or by the idea represented rather than by the nudity. On this matter one may read Father Vermeersch, *De Castitate*, n. 181.[3]

[3] "It will be worthwhile first of all that we know how an obscene little picture or statue differs from a merely nude image. Nudity can be one thing in occasion, another in intention. Moreover, nudity is either expressly sought for its own sake, or is chosen as a means to obtain some end, for example, if we take an example from art, so that the beautiful harmony of the whole human body may appear. There is also simple nudity, which does not wish to capture attention, and nudity affected for alluring libido. But it can be affected from an accompanying gesture, from the expression of the face, or from the very display. But affected nudity, and, in the present condition of the human race after sin, also nudity sought for its own sake, are to be judged obscene.

3. In most academies of painting or sculpture, naked persons are proposed as models, because they say that studies upon the nude body are necessary for the perfection of art. Now:

a. this is not licit for painting or sculpting obscene things, which are an occasion of sin to many, unless for the sake of anatomical or medical science;

b. if, in certain circumstances, it is judged necessary for the perfection of art, it can be admitted, yet with cautions employed lest inordinations follow. Therefore persons of different sex should not be exhibited together, they should not take off their garments before the painters, they should have the genitals covered to affirm modesty, and if it is done privately, a witness of the same sex should be present;

c. young men who are learning art have an excusing reason provided they are cautious; but honorable girls, by reason of danger, are with difficulty excused from sin if they of their own accord and without necessity exhibit themselves in these academies. But those who have already been accustomed to these things are in less danger and can be excused if some necessity is present.

4. Concerning visiting museums Father Vermeersch teaches, o. c., n. 183:

"1. It is altogether to be disapproved that anyone enter museums for the sake of seeing nude images or pictures.

"2. Visits made from futile curiosity are sometimes to be tolerated, by which someone, without any notion of art or intention of cultivating it, lightly surveys the halls. Visits of this kind are not positively to be approved or commended, because it is scarcely done that in looking at these voluptuary things nothing is granted to sensuality; but the danger is compensated by no gain. Nevertheless they will meanwhile have to be tolerated, because, since the intention is not perverse and the danger of fully assenting to venereal satisfaction is not proximate, there is no place for a grave prohibition, and the very custom of visiting these things, sufficiently received, brings some reason or excuse. Those going in are to be warned not to fix their eyes upon obscene things.

"3. We shall plainly approve only those reasons for going to museums which manifest a noble intention, for example if someone, in order to exercise aesthetic sense, should wish attentively to consider a few things made with admirable art.

"Hence today it seems very commendable that everywhere, in schools, this aesthetic sense be cultivated in some way. For while students learn to judge concerning artifacts, they become accustomed to turn over higher thoughts, and not at once to explore what food is offered to the senses. They also learn to be honorably indignant if at some time a base image, made without art and care, seems to tempt them in a brutal manner. The same is advised by R. P. Gillet, O.P., *Innocence et ignorance*, p. 210."

VI. Observations. To estimate immodest acts more rightly, it is useful to note:

1. The influence of causes partially depends on the intention of the will: namely, intention, or consent to carnal motion or pleasure, is accustomed to increase the influence toward a further motion and a complete act; on the contrary, a just cause or a reason rendering the act honorable is accustomed to lessen it.

2. Where in carnal motions no effect or other end is perceived besides pleasure, he who admits them is convicted of acting at least virtually and implicitly on account of that pleasure.

3. Because of the very great proclivity of corrupt nature, there is an imminent great danger lest graver things be gradually admitted. Hence the danger of self-deception easily occurs; for those who admit actions lightly influencing themselves easily persuade themselves that in admitting them they are led only by curiosity or urbanity or friendship, but in reality they are impelled to them by the heat of libido: masked lust. And so in these things one must altogether beware of lingeringness or excessive adherence or frequent repetition, even when some cause is present; all these things are accustomed to indicate excessive affection or even a libidinous mind.

VII. Warning. Touches, especially while they are lying in bed, are to be severely forbidden to boys on account of the ruinous consequences. Likewise boys and girls uncovering their genitals to one another from levity or curiosity are to be gravely rebuked; although at this age this per se is not mortal, it lessens chaste modesty and disposes and leads to further things.

"Therefore the boy is not obscene who, where usage bears it, whether alone or before others, takes off his clothes to wash the body, or who shows himself to a physician to be treated. But he is obscene who has exhibited the parts to persons met along the way. Nor will the image of Saint Agnes the martyr be called obscene if made by a painter who wished to represent the martyrdom according to

the narrative. Indeed it is not repugnant that a nude image bear in the face modesty or holy affections which draw attention away from the body and command chaste shame. On the contrary, a certain manner of clothing which seems to indicate or illuminate the shameful parts rather than cover them can make an incompletely nude image obscene. Likewise, for historical truth, what was nude will be able to be commemorated; but speech becomes obscene which seems to linger with pleasure in describing lascivious matters.

"Therefore, the more a thing or narration is stripped of a nobler idea and draws attention to shameful or dishonorable things, or the more there accedes as it were a formal invitation to looking at or mentally turning over base things, so much the more narrations or paintings or statues must be called obscene.

"Thus the obscene can be described as: a base manifestation of mind or solicitation in nudity. The common usage agrees, by which the alluring nude (*nu provoquant*) is called obscene.

"It is certain, therefore, that obscene things are not to be looked at; and this both from a certain sense of offended dignity and, for the security or at least the sweet polish (*delicatesse*) of chastity, while prudence, already ancient, warns that temptations of this kind are conquered by fleeing rather than by directly attacking them." See also Father Sertillanges, "La Morale a nos expositions de peinture," in *Rev. Thomiste*, III, 1895, p. 208.

Question Six: Concerning Internal Lust

I. There are three internal sins of lust: morose delectation, desire, and joy. The first regards the present time, because it is concerned with the object insofar as it is present to us here and now by cognition; desire regards the future, because it is an act of the will wishing for an evil thing; joy regards the past, and is complacency or approval of an evil work formerly perpetrated by oneself or by others. In other words, morose delectation is consent to the thought present pleasure alone, not to the act itself; if the act were present, lust would already be external. Desire is also consent to an act future and to be posited; joy is consent to an act past and posited.

II. Lustful morose delectation (*complaisance impure*, *onkuisch behagen*) is nothing other than consent to pleasure concerning a lustful or immodest work; whence it is defined: simple love or voluntary complacency concerning a venereal work exhibited by cognition as present, without the will of carrying it out. For he who takes pleasure feigns to himself the action of sin as present, for example fornication, and concerning it, by deliberate consent, takes pleasure as if he were actually carrying it out and fornicating, yet without desire of carrying it out.

It is called delectation, because the mere thought of an evil thing is not sin, unless per accidens insofar as it includes danger of sinning, but the pleasure concerning a lustful thing thought of is sin. It is called morose, not because it requires a delay of time, for it can be perfected in a single moment, but because deliberating reason, rather than repelling the pleasure, dwells about it insofar as the venereal thing is grateful and pleasant to it.

Lustful morose delectation is sin, and indeed mortal sin. For no one takes pleasure except in that which seems good to him and conformable to his nature; therefore he who takes pleasure in a lustful thing has it as good for himself, and accordingly his affection tends into an evil thing. But since all

external lust that is in itself and directly voluntary is mortally evil, voluntary pleasure concerning it is also mortal. For that someone deliberately choose that his affection be conformed to a work which of itself is mortal is already mortal sin. Thus Saint Thomas, I-II, q. 74, a. 8.

This certainly is to be understood of fully voluntary complacency in venereal pleasure, and in acts of true lust, and indeed those gravely evil from their nature; not, however, of complacency in merely sensible pleasure, or in acts of lust from their nature lightly evil, as being voluntary only indirectly or in a cause influencing little, or in mere immodesty, as in the touch and look of the genitals had only from curiosity or levity. This is clear from the general principles explained above, and from the whole course of the argumentation.

III. Morose delectation, although it is less evil than the evil work itself or the proposal of it, nevertheless because it tends to the same thought object, has the specific malice of the work, provided and insofar as that work is thought of as pleasurable or moves to pleasure. Thus delectation concerning sodomy, concerning adultery as adultery, concerning fornication, differ in species. Nevertheless morose delectation does not contract the malice of circumstances which reason represents, but from which in the delectation it abstracts, and about which the delectation is not concerned, or by whose delectability the appetite is not moved. For delectation tends into the object, not as it exists really, but as it exists in the intellect, and accordingly does not tend into circumstances which reason does not represent as pleasurable and which are not the motive of the pleasure. Hence:

1. if the imagined object pleases only as a cause of carnal pleasure in general, only the malice of impudicity or imperfect lust is contracted and is to be accused, unless, however, pollution follows;

2. but if delectation is had concerning a special circumstance, for example concerning an act to be exercised precisely as solitary, or with a woman, with a married woman, with a sacred person, or with a male, and so forth, affection toward this special malice is contracted and one will have to be accused of solitary sin, or fornication, adultery, sacrilege, sodomy, and so forth;

3. if someone takes pleasure concerning a married or sacred person, not insofar as married or sacred, but insofar as beautiful, only the specific malice of fornication, not of adultery or sacrilege, is contracted.

IV. Absolute lustful desire (*onkuische begeerte*) and joy (*onkuisch verheugen*) have the same species and gravity of malice which the work has about which they are concerned, to be posited or already posited, with all known circumstances (Matt. V, 28). For desire tends into a work really to be posited, and accordingly not as it is represented abstractly in the intellect as pleasurable, but as it is on the part of the thing; and joy is concerning a past work as it was. Each tends into all the circumstances which are in the work and are not separable from it in the concrete.

On the contrary, in conditioned desire, if the condition excludes all or partial malice of the object, that malice is totally or partially not contracted, for example: I would have copulation with her if she were mine; I would sin with her unless she were married.[1] But if the condition does not exclude the malice, the whole malice is contracted, for example: I would fornicate if it were licit or if I could.

[1] Yet in practice this can be dangerous, as will be said on the following page.

V. Corollaries. Let morose delectation concerning a thought lustful work not be confused:

1. with delectation concerning the very thought itself, which can be good, for example to take pleasure in theological science concerning base things;

2. with delectation concerning the mode by which the lustful thing is done. For this is good, venially evil, or mortally evil, according as the mode itself is good or lightly or gravely evil. Examples are: to take pleasure in an ingenious or new mode of perpetrating lust, in matrimonial copulation had beside the natural mode, in a mode of exercising lust against nature;

3. with delectation concerning only the good effect following from lust, for example concerning offspring conceived from fornication or concerning concupiscence calmed from pollution. This is licit, provided it is not also had concerning the lustful work itself on account of the good effect;

4. with delectation concerning a work as licit at another time or in another state. For this is licit, not indeed if it is done concerning the work absolutely and as concerning the present, for example for the betrothed concerning copulation now to be had, but if it is done under the condition of the time or state in which it will be licit, because this condition removes the malice from the work, for example concerning copulation to be had in future marriage. This is to be understood of the delectation of the rational appetite, which can tend to the object as proposed by reason, and accordingly under a condition concerning the future or concerning the past and thus abstracted from malice; it is not valid of the delectation of the sensitive appetite, which tends into the object proposed by sense, and accordingly always absolutely and as concerning the present. Hence for practice:

a. by rational appetite, but not carnal appetite, the betrothed can take pleasure concerning future copulation and desire it; likewise widowers and widows can take pleasure concerning past copulation and rejoice in it;

b. but for other unmarried persons, although the same of itself is not illicit, ordinarily it is illicit per accidens, because it will not happen without motions of concupiscence, which they cannot excite, and for permitting which they can have no reason;

c. on the contrary, spouses, even when the partner is absent, can take pleasure carnally concerning copulation had or to be had, provided it is not done principally on account of pleasure but on account of an honorable end, and there is no danger of pollution, because here and now copulation is licit for them, although per accidens it is impossible.

It should be noted, however, that all the aforesaid delectations in practice are to be avoided, both because they are often idle and therefore venial sins, and because they are very dangerous, since a transition easily occurs to delectation concerning the lustful work itself. Nevertheless, in this matter, there will be greater liberty for married persons.

VI. Observation. The cause or occasion of internal lust is base conversations and writings, and the hearings and readings of them. Concerning these, let it be noted:

1. When someone speaks base things from libidinous affection, to excite venereal pleasure either in himself or in others, it is always mortal sin. The same must be said when someone, by speaking base things, exposes himself or another by such speech to the proximate occasion of mortal sin.

Hence they easily sin gravely:

a. who mingle conversations concerning the conjugal act, concerning things licit and illicit between spouses, concerning modes of impeding generation, of procuring pollution, or concerning young men and girls, especially if this is done among younger persons of different sex;

b. who out of boasting recount their own base sins, both because they often give great scandal and because they easily take complacency in the sins perpetrated;

c. who say base things because of pleasure taken from those things thought of, or with danger of such pleasure, or with danger of grave scandal.

2. To speak base things from levity or curiosity or for mere recreation, in such a way that the pleasure does not pass to the things which are expressed by the words, but stops in the artifice of the words, provided scandal is absent and the danger of the speaker falling into mortal sin is absent, is not mortal sin; for the affection of the will is not borne into lust. Thus often among the uneducated and workers, or among women gathered together. Yet because this recreation is inordinate, there is venial sin.

3. The same is to be said, as in the two prior principles, concerning the hearing, reading, and singing of base things.

4. To write base things on account of doctrine, on account of history, on account of informing superiors or due reprehension, is no sin. The same is to be said in the same cases concerning speech, hearing, and reading.

5. To write base things for the pleasure to be taken by oneself or to be provoked in others is mortal sin. Likewise to write such things without this intention, but with at least confused foresight of this effect, unless, however, some necessity or utility excuses.

6. To write base things out of levity or pleasantness, without danger of scandal even of the little ones, is only venial sin.

7. In words or writings, by invitation or counsel or approval, to induce another to a sin of lust is mortal sin, which participates in all the specific malices of the work advised.

VII. Warning. In order that in practice it may more easily be discerned whether someone has voluntarily admitted internal sins of lust, it is better in temptation to distinguish three stages:

The first is suggestion, or the mere representation of evil in the imagination;

the second is sensible and organic delectation, or pleasure in the sensitive appetite, arising from the suggestion if it was vivid: it is the feeling of temptation;

the third is voluntary complacency, or consent of the will to the delectation, after advertence of reason.

In the last alone is sin present. Hence they are accustomed to say: to feel temptation is not sin, but to consent is; not the feeling or pleasure, but the consent and complacency.

Question Seven: Concerning the Causes and Remedies of Lust

I. The principal cause is the very natural propensity or instinct of man toward the propagation of the species; after original sin this is inordinate, as not subject to reason but rebellious. Deliberately adhering reason and the will freely consenting and taking pleasure in it perfect the very sin of lust.

But various causes can excite and increase the aforesaid instinct, and thus move and lead reason and will. All of these can be reduced to a threefold genus:

1. Some directly influence the body itself, as the constant and copious use of drugs; crustaceans, fish, oysters, strong-smelling celery, stronger coffee or chocolate, sulphurous thermal waters; abundant alcoholic drinks; exciting foods which are stronger and copious, especially meat and game, or very hot and seasoned, in one word: the sin of gluttony; but especially the cantharides fly,[1] and medical potions specially prepared for exciting, remedies against impotence, for example hashish, distillation from the pistils of hemp. Likewise great heats and more fervid days; likewise various exercises of riding or dancing; the use of little carriages, wheels or bicycles, carriages for women, the sewing machine; a soft bed; garments too silken or too warming, or adhering to the legs, or compressing the genitals; prolonged sittings, lying on the back; defect of bodily care, especially of the genitals; filling of the urinary bladder, constriction of the belly or constipation.

[1] The cantharides, a beetle of gold and azure; the Spanish fly.

2. Others influence the senses. Some of these are external: soft and effeminate education, luxury, idleness; bad examples of others; the counsel of impious physicians to pollute oneself at least once in a week, for health, or to go to women, for diminishing inclination; mothers, nurses, maidservants who, to quiet infants, excite venereal feeling by handling their genital members.

Others are internal: the peculiar state of the organism, such as a sanguine and nervous temperament; illnesses which affect the nervous system, such as pulmonary phthisis and hysteria. There accede the great pleasure which this vice brings, and the ease by which it can be hidden.

3. Others are external occasions which move the soul. They are sensual, vain, and illicit loves, founded in organic sympathy alone, which are nourished by readings, spectacles, and dances. Such love can exist toward persons of different sex, as are flirts, or toward persons of the same sex, whether from petulance for the sake of laughing, or from sensual or carnal affection. But if it is toward a person of different sex or toward a young man, it will easily be an occasion of

grave scandal in a clerical or religious person; likewise, even platonic love of a married person toward an unmarried person of different sex.

II. The effects of this vice are some physical, some psychological, some moral.

1. Physical. Young persons addicted to this vice easily contract a habit altogether tyrannical, which greatly weakens their strength: the frequency of immodest acts disturbs the whole nervous system and brain; hence grave irritations of the nervous system, weakness and general fatigue, headaches, diminished appetite for food, convulsions of the limbs, weakening of sight, hearing, and memory; then involuntary or passive pollutions accede, vehement palpitations of the heart, disturbance of circulation; sometimes also, but more rarely, incurable diseases: phthisis, dropsy, epilepsy, tabes dorsalis, phthisis of the spinal marrow, and among women, inflammation of the uterus, hysteria. Often also by frequent masturbation the potency of coeundi and generating is lost.

2. Psychological effects are: arrogance, melancholy, hypochondria, seeking of solitude, neurasthenia, and dementia.

3. Moral effects are depression of soul, enervation of will, inability for labors, especially intellectual ones: namely, the acuteness of the intellect and the energy of the will are weakened to such a point that they can scarcely abstain from sin. For the mind, infected with obscene images, can scarcely think of other things; soon noble ideas and pure affections vanish, and insane egoism prevails.

Nevertheless, not all these effects are always produced, nor in the same degree in all. For there are men of so robust a constitution of body that from this vice they suffer only slight injuries to health and light disturbances of the nerves. Therefore those who try to deter lustful young persons from vice by setting forth its evil effects must beware of exaggerations. Yet the danger is present lest an inveterate and almost incurable habit be contracted, from which the aforesaid effects more or less follow.

III. Remedies. 1. Some are natural or hygienic as to the body: wholesome diet, frugal nourishment, sufficient, not consisting too much in meat and sweets, but rather comprising light foods, of easy digestion, not exciting, which in small volume provide sufficient nutrition; abstinence from very alcoholic drinks and in the evening from meats; a hard bed, not softer bedding; clothing not warmer, adhering to the legs, compressing the genitals, which renders the body too delicate; lying not on the back: since the dorsal position excites the genital nerves, lying should be lateral, and indeed on the right side; an ordered life, with a determined hour for rising and lying down; bodily labor or the intellectual labor of intense study; cleanliness of the body, especially of the genitals, especially in a girl, from frequent cold washing, for example morning and evening; honorable games by which the body is exercised even to fatigue, so that sleep immediately rushes in and the imagination does not excite dreams; evacuation of the urinary bladder before lying down. There are besides medicines and drugs by which nervous erections, if they are very frequent, vehement, and abnormal, are repressed by the counsel of a physician, for example pills from lupulin, hyoscine and bromide, camphor, adalin for treating masturbators; likewise sometimes hypnotism; likewise for girls, partial amputation of the clitoral organ,[2] which nevertheless is held illicit by some, because such amputation, which these call

notable, can be done only for the direct good of the whole body. In infants sometimes worms infect the anus, which are the cause of nervous excitation, against which a medicinal remedy is usually employed.

[2] Antonelli, o. c., tom. I, n. 614-618, notes: "A twofold remedy can be provided, that is, hygienic and mechanical. The principal hygienic rule is: to distract the mind and exercise the body even to fatigue; hence frequent, indeed daily prolonged walks, gymnastics, journeys, cold baths of the sea in summer time and daily very brief washing of the whole body with common water, to imbue mind and spirit with the best ideas. When the body is tired in the evening, sleep invades quickly until morning. Let the bed be hard; sleep should not be taken lying on the back; first thing in the morning, scarcely has sleep been shaken off, it is necessary to rise quickly; in the evening partial cold baths, hip-baths, contribute much; before they go to bed, let them take a cup from whey of milk or from a decoction of barley. If nervous excitation brings on vehement erections, washings of camphorated oil around the genitals or a sponge or compress of cold water with vinegar over the genitals provide very good effects. To all these things there must be added the continued vigilance of parents or institutions and the will in young persons of this kind of correcting themselves from this vice.

2. Others are psychological as to the senses: to distract the mind, to nourish excellent ideas; to struggle against passions; to restrain the imagination; not to confuse pleasure with happiness; to avoid depraved companions as well as solitude; in the morning, once sleep has been shaken off, to rise at once; to mortify the senses, for example by moderate subtraction of food or sleep, indeed by chastisement of the body and scourges, provided they are not prolonged for a long time and do not excite concupiscence more, as easily happens if they are applied to the thighs or loins, a fortiori if to the genitals.

3. Others are moral as to the soul. a. Remote ones are: a generous spirit which removes egoism and prefers urbanity to one's own convenience; cultivation of sincerity; confidence in parents, confessor, superiors; magnanimity in the noble destination of life; modesty of eyes and gesture; humility and piety toward God present, Christ suffering, the Blessed Virgin, the Guardian Angel, and so forth; frequent reception of the sacraments and immediate confession after a fall; great esteem for purity and horror of vice, for inculcating which the vigor of the chaste and the sadness of the impure can be effective.

b. Proximate ones are either negative: flight from occasions, namely to avoid vain loves, frivolous readings, spectacles, excessive contact and immoderate frequentations with persons of the other sex, and dances;

or positive: to strengthen the will so that, pleasure having been despised, apt remedies are strenuously employed; frequently to renew the resolution of living chastely; with firm and tranquil soul to propose the rejection of temptation and flight from every relapse; to trust in the divine help of grace; to resist immediately and strongly. Sometimes marriage is an efficacious remedy.[3]

[3] Compare Saint Francis de Sales, *Introduction a la Vie Devote*, p. III, c. XVI and XVIII.

IV. Especially as to education. Since the younger, like soft wax, receive any distinct impressions, it is of the greatest interest that already from tender years they learn how highly they ought to value purity of body and soul, and therefore with how great a horror they ought to flee whatever smells of impurity. Therefore let them be taught with how great reverence they ought to treat their own body, which is the instrument of the soul in acting, and belongs to the proper dominion of the whole Trinity, as created by the Father, the supreme Lord; redeemed by the Son and joined to him as a member; consecrated by the Holy Spirit as his temple. Therefore let them be conscious that they

cannot use according to whim a body over which they do not have dominion, but only according to God's good pleasure, and therefore that sensual looks and touches are to be avoided, and nothing is to be done privately which they would be ashamed to do before parents and honorable persons. Therefore let nothing be said or done before them which can excite morbid and dangerous curiosity; for they attend to these things while they seem distracted by other things; what they see they desire to imitate; what excites curiosity they carefully investigate. Yet not all things should be mysteriously kept silent from false shame, or explained by fictitious interpretations, as if those things which are honorable were sins. Thus, for example, even to the younger let it be said that God gives children to parents as the blessing or fruit of their union.

Especially:

a. In tender age, care must be taken lest nurses, servants, and others conversing with children say or do anything indecorous which can cast an impure thought into their minds; for some still innocent have been corrupted by the depraved conversations or examples of servants. Boys and girls should not sleep in the same room, and especially not in the same bed, unless perhaps they are very little; indeed each one should have a separate bed. They should learn to lie down with hands placed upon the sheets or under the head, or even joined in the form of a cross. Chastity should be said to be required of them by natural decency, since the genitals serve, or are found nearer, the lower functions, whence nature for both inspires the same care of bodily purity; yet let it be added that this is pleasing to God. Defects and sins should be corrected immediately without exaggeration of culpability.

b. When they have become pubescent and have experienced depraved motions in themselves, it seems opportune that the parents themselves prudently and decently explain what the younger legitimately desire to know concerning these matters, lest perhaps they ask this from companions who by depraved counsels and depraved examples can lead them to dishonorable things. To young men let it be said that nocturnal pollution is natural, but is not to be procured lest strength be lost, and that this is prohibited by God. To girls who suffer menstruation let the cause of the phenomenon be explained. But parents will opportunely accommodate their responses to the disposition of the children, not explaining all things at once, but instructing them little by little and by degrees, adding that they are ready to answer their honorable questions whenever they have noticed something unaccustomed. To all, it can rather easily be revealed without inconvenience what the maternal function is, namely procreation from the flesh of the mother, the long time during which not without cares and inconveniences the offspring is borne in the womb, at the end of which it must be brought forth by laborious birth and nourished by maternal milk. For this does not excite the imagination and provides a sufficiently adequate explanation, indeed also confers utility for increasing the affection of piety toward the mother, while the father can be regarded more as head and providence and guardian of mother and offspring. On the contrary, the function of the father in generation itself and conjugal copulation does not seem to be revealed, unless a special opportunity or necessity is given. But if parents fail in this matter, it pertains to teachers and rectors, and if these fail, to the confessor, for young men, to instruct them, not collectively together, but each one privately according to various necessity. Yet all these should place the moral and supernatural aspect in the light, and at the same time propose efficacious remedies for resisting temptations; for knowledge does not suffice for cultivating virtue, but the supernatural motive and the grace of God.

c. When they have become older, for example finishing humanistic studies, or exposed to the dangers of a great city, let them learn all things as to substance, not by collective instruction in schools, which cannot be adapted to the necessities and varieties of individuals, but privately and diversely. Then it will also be opportune to teach them about venereal diseases and the harmful effects of lust. Ignorance concerning a determined point is to be dispelled when, for someone, it is more dangerous or worse than knowledge; on the contrary, if knowledge would harm more, he will generally be left in ignorance.

And so instruction concerning the transmission of life should be done not publicly but privately, not collectively but individually, not at once completely but by degrees:[4] let it be brief, dignified, and simple, not with apparatus and solemnity, or a form which would suggest less chaste phantasms; nor should it be held merely natural and intellectual, as if the very knowledge of things sufficed for preserving from vice, but it must be first of all moral and supernatural. And let it always be inculcated how well all things have been directed by nature and by the Creator to the end of the creation of souls.

[4] Conformably to the Provincial Council of Mechlin, n. 56.

Explanations will be opportune which anticipate the revelations of evil counselors; which prevent the soul in the young person from being excessively disturbed by physiological phenomena; which turn the more exposed and more mature away from illicit commerce; which call marriageable girls back from dissipation and dangers; which join parents and children by a stronger bond of confidence and love; which render conscious virtue stronger; and which procure a better understanding of the dignity of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the benefit of the Incarnation.[5]

[5] Thus Vermeersch, o. c., n. 201.

We do not append a specimen of instruction, because according to diverse circumstances it must be infinitely varied.[6]

[6] Concerning these things these deserve to be inspected: Knoch, *L'Education de la Chastete*; Fonsagrives, *Conseils aux parents et maitres sur l'education de la purete*; Surbled, *La Vie de jeune homme*; *La Vie de jeune fille*; *La Vie a deux*, for spouses; Stahl, *What a young boy ought to know*; *What a young girl ought to know*; Ernst, *Elternpflicht*; Foerster, *Jugendlehre*; *Sexualethik and Sexualpadagogik*, translated into Dutch; Lacordaire, *Lettres a un jeune homme*; Dr Stephane (Lefebvre), *Lettres posthumes a un jeune homme*; Kraus and Gatterer, *Die Erziehung zur Keuschheit*; Guibert, *La Purete*; Gillet, *Innocence et Ignorance: education de la purete*; P. Guitton, *De la Chastete*; Francoise Harmel, *Une grave question de l'education des jeunes filles. La Chastete*; Hardy Schilgen, *Im Dienst des Schopfers*, translated into Dutch by Dieben; Jos. Konn, *Auf dem Wege zur Ehe*, for girls; Herman Muckermann, various little works, translated into Dutch by Henri Deshayes; Dr Deelen, *Het sexueele in den mensch*; and for parents these two, published by *Katholische Schulorganisation* in Dusseldorf: *Die Erziehung des Jungen (des Madchens) zur zittlichen Reinheit*; Hoornaert, *Le Combat pour la purete*; Vermeersch, o. c., n. 186 and following.

V. In the whole of education, however, let the excellence of chastity be extolled, whose special brightness and beauty shines forth in this, that the animal faculties and pleasures most rebellious to reason are subjected to reason (Eccli. XXVI, 19-20; Sap. IV, 1); and its importance shines forth from its necessity for human good. For:

1. it promotes the good of society, which consists in the propagation and good education of the human race. Now the immoderation of libido is what, from weakness of the nerves, renders people weak and impotent; it causes a tyrannical passion which in spouses generates onanism,

and in those who have commerce with prostitutes, syphilitic disease. Besides, parents who are addicted to libido are found little apt for educating offspring;

2. it promotes the good of the family. For unless young persons remain chaste and spouses preserve fidelity, there will be no peace in the family. The bridegroom generally intends a virgin; if he finds her already corrupted, there will be place for indignation, which not rarely brings divorce. But if, infected with disease, he contaminates the bride, love is turned into contempt, and nothing will remain except a miserable life, with danger of transmitting syphilitic disease to descendants. When, moreover, adulterous loves or other base things are fostered, dissensions arise, jealousies, quarrels, indeed crimes and suicides. Besides, unless children are instructed chastely, soon they too slip into vice and bring shame together with sadness to their parents. But how will they remain chaste unless chaste education and good example in this matter are provided for them?

3. it contributes very greatly to individual good. In order that man may order his life rightly according to the principles of reason, he must tame the passions. But this passion of lust is especially tyrannical, blinding the mind and so invading, dragging, and absorbing the whole soul that we sacrifice all things to it. Therefore chastity, by which it is subdued, is especially necessary to each one.

When the lower powers, says Saint Thomas,[7] are vehemently affected toward their objects, the higher powers are impeded in their acts and disordered. Through the vice of lust the lower appetite is especially intent upon its object. Therefore the higher powers are disordered through lust. Hence in the intellect there arise: blindness of mind, precipitation, inconsideration, inconstancy; in the will: love of self as to the pleasure of concupiscence which it inordinately desires, hatred of God forbidding the pleasure of concupiscence, affection for the present age in which it rejoices in pleasure, and despair of the future age, because while it is too much detained by carnal pleasures, it disdains spiritual ones. "The animal man does not perceive the things that are of the Spirit of God."[8]

[7] II-II, q. 153, a. 5.

[8] I Cor. II, 14.

Nor are those to be heard who say that chastity in every way harms, and advise pollution or sometimes fornication, asserting that semen sometimes must be poured out for the sake of health. This is wholly false: for part of the semen is reabsorbed in the body, which it strengthens and renders firmer in vigor; another part is naturally poured out in sleep without any disturbance of the nerves.[9] Nor is atrophy of the genital organs to be feared from the fact that we do not use them; for without any effort they unceasingly continue to secrete semen, nor do they ever lose their function except by chance accident.

[9] Hence Dr Forel: "The man who cannot procure for himself a normal state ought to be content with nocturnal pollutions, and the woman with voluptuous dreams, both abstaining from active and voluntary excitations," *La Question sexuelle*, p. 251. Compare Dr A. Scremin, *La purita non e dannosa alla salute, testimonianza di medici*.

VI. Let the confessor use the greatest prudence in the direction of penitents, lest he be a scandal to them. This could happen in two ways: either a. by teaching a mode of perpetrating sins unknown to the penitents; or b. by proposing useless questions, from which penitents would judge the confessor

to be too curious or too versed in those things. For thus confession would become hateful if it were an occasion of scandal or temptation. Hence theologians hold the principle: in these matters it is better to be deficient than to abound.

In particular:

1. in questioning, all things are to be avoided which can probably scandalize the penitent. The material integrity of confession is prescribed only by positive divine law, while scandal must be avoided by natural law. Hence the first prescription of confessing integrally ceases to oblige when scandal is feared. Hence:

a. First of all, let the confessor permit the penitent to declare that by which his conscience is burdened, promising, however, if it seems necessary, that afterwards he will help him.

b. As to the impubescent, it suffices to ask whether and how often they have heard, said, or done anything against modesty, decency, purity: whether alone or with others. He would act imprudently if he inquired concerning the mode by which the sin was committed, whether with hands employed or in another mode. Nor should he begin speech concerning the effect or concerning complete pleasure. It is better to suggest that those actions, which they would blush to perpetrate before their parents, are seen by God from whom nothing is hidden, are very displeasing to him, and are punished by him even in this life, but especially in the other; besides, how one must act in temptations is to be told to them.

c. As to younger pubescent persons who are beginning sexual life and therefore are ignorant of several things concerning it: if they say that they have dishonorably touched themselves, not from necessity but because of pleasure, ordinarily it can be inferred, without a further question, that pollution was committed. Wherefore boys are not to be asked whether they have experienced some effect or have procured for themselves an emission of humor or semen, which could excite their curiosity; similarly girls are not to be asked whether they have suffered a certain distillation. Rather, only whether they have experienced dishonorable motions with pleasure and have fully consented to them or voluntarily admitted them, without inquiring concerning the mode; in which case the greatest horror of this offense should be instilled into them. As to the pubescent who are altogether developed or who certainly are sufficiently instructed, as also as to adults, one can ask: of males, concerning effusion of semen, for example concerning the evil effect that followed; of girls, concerning complete satisfaction procured, whether they satisfied themselves, whether they fulfilled passion.

d. Those who confess immodest touches upon their own body can be asked whether the touches were necessary; if they deny this, whether they were lasting or lingering; if they deny this, nothing further is to be inquired; if they affirm it, one must inquire further concerning pleasure, and if they are sufficiently developed, also concerning the complete act, as was said under c.

e. On the contrary, those polluting themselves are to be questioned also concerning immodest touches separated from pollution, and are to be warned that they are mortal sins by reason of the proximate danger of exciting or seeking venereal pleasure.

f. When they accuse certain external lustful acts, saying nothing concerning thoughts or desires, one must ask from them whether beforehand they voluntarily thought of or desired to commit those acts,

whether they wished to perpetrate other acts, whether they desired something base and what it was, and it should be said to them that this is mortal sin. On the contrary, some accuse depraved thoughts, while they do not dare to declare external acts. These can be asked whether they gave consent to those imaginings not only internally, but by some exterior act, for example whether they had depraved sensations and consented to them. For adults, if they accuse themselves of having sinned against chastity, it is often better, in questioning, to begin from graver things, especially if they are more uneducated; for others one should begin from lesser things.

g. If an evolved penitent accuses dishonorable familiarities with companions, it must be asked whether with persons of the same or the other sex. If with persons of the same sex, whether up to pollution, if it concerns males; up to full pleasure, if it concerns females; whether they did anything more base. If with a person of the other sex, whether they attempted what spouses do, or altogether consummated the evil action; in this case one must ask concerning the effect that followed or did not follow, and concerning the cause of its not following. Afterwards one can ask concerning the quality of the person, so that it may be known whether adultery, incest, sacrilege was committed.

If the sin was not consummated, one must ask concerning touches, looks, kisses, and so forth. But if the penitent is guilty of only light pleasure, let the confessor say that in this matter there is always danger of passing to graver things, and let him warn prudence. And if the penitent accuses himself of having exposed himself to danger, or of having had carnal motions, one must ask concerning the cause and concerning necessity.

h. As to those habituated, let the confessor explore from what time they have been addicted to this vice, their bodily temperament, the circumstances of the sins, namely at what time, in what place, on what occasion, in what circumstances of things the fall is accustomed to occur, even if they institute confession with someone for the first time. Care must be taken that they always return to the same confessor, and institute confession soon after the fall; let them pray daily to obtain chastity and emit or renew a firm resolution.

i. Finally, for judging the gravity of this sin, it can be asked of the penitent, which would not be so valid for other sins: whether he judges that he has sinned gravely.

2. As to instruction: ordinarily those who commit a sin of lust from ignorance are to be instructed, because ignorance is harmful to them or to others, at least by generating a vicious habit.

3. In judging sins, one must proceed cautiously: for rash condemnation leads the penitent to despair, improvident hesitation to anxiety, and inconsiderate excusing to ruinous audacity. Therefore let the confessor quiet the anxious and scrupulous by firm responses; but let him generally induce others to proceed by the safer way with paternal severity, so that he shows benevolence toward persons but wards off all rashness in actions. He will usefully provide these counsels to the penitent:

a. that he flee whatever things are strange and unaccustomed in these matters;

b. that if there is a grave cause of seeing, reading, handling, touching something, he preserve a simple and secure mode of acting, not an anxious one;

c. that except for a just cause he do nothing and avoid specious pretexts;

d. that in necessary actions he study to avoid a less pure affection and motions of the flesh;

e. that he always proceed with perfect sincerity and strength of soul;

f. that he be mindful of human and Christian dignity, and foster more sublime pursuits.

4. In judging the dispositions of the penitent, the confessor must carefully attend lest he immediately, from the frequency of relapses, accuse the penitent of a depraved disposition of will. Let him examine attentively whether the relapses have as their cause malice, corruption, affection toward sin, lack of firm resolution, or on the contrary only the frailty of the penitent and the violence of temptation. No one fails to see that one must act with the penitent in one way or another according to the case. In the first case, after some warnings and exhortations, absolution is generally to be deferred, according to the rules which are handed down concerning the relapsed; but in the last case, the more frequent one, not only is absolution to be given, but with the greatest affection of heart and industry of soul the confessor will sustain those poor souls.

5. Absolution is never to be denied or deferred to these last penitents unless they are certainly indisposed or the confessor knows that a brief delay of absolution will turn to the good of the penitent.

6. As to sacramental satisfactions, especially in the present case let them be medicinal, for example daily morning and evening to elicit an act of contrition and firm resolution, not in any sort of way, but in a reflective and plainly deliberate mode; to approach Holy Communion frequently; attentively sometimes to recollect the Passion of Christ, the presence of God in temptation, and so forth. It is best to exhort the penitent earnestly that after a relapse he approach the sacrament of Penance without delay, and that he impose upon himself a salutary penance, such as, for example, flight from occasions, to which moreover by another law he is already bound.

VII. For a better understanding of sins against nature, a few things must be treated concerning abnormal sexual appetite, which deflects from the common norm; here there come to be considered: a. hypersexuality; b. sexual perversion.

Concerning hypersexuality Noldin notes, o. c., n. 46:

"1. Sensual affection in different men, as far as vehemence is concerned, is diverse; in men it is more vehement than in women. But even among persons of the same sex, some have obtained one more vehement than others; sometimes it reaches an extraordinarily great vehemence. A sexual appetite of this kind, more vehement, is found both in those who labor under a psychic defect, and in those who are not psychopathic.

"2. The cause of this matter is partly a disposition acquired by heredity, partly an illness of the nerves, partly abuse of alcoholic drink. There accede sexual excesses, which increase both the illness of the soul and the sexual affection; for repeated excesses generate a depraved habit, which sometimes

grows so enormously that libido is excited from any, even the slightest, cause, and then almost mechanically, by physical necessity, drives to pollution.

"3. The signs from which it is known that sexual appetite has been increased beyond measure, pathologically, are these: if libido, scarcely satisfied, is soon excited again; if libido is excited from the sight of things indifferent in the genus of lust; if sexual affection so occupies a man that he thinks and speaks almost only of this matter and seeks means of satisfying the affection.

"Now: a. those who are of sound mind can and must repress and moderate sexual affection, even a more vehement one, nor do they suffer any injury to health from the fact that they do not satisfy sexual appetite, even the most vehement. Therefore sins committed against chastity are fully imputable to them.

"b. Indeed even those who labor under psychic defect sin voluntarily and culpably, unless the defect is of a greater degree. Namely, sexual excesses will be less voluntary and culpable the greater and more intense the illness of soul is.

"c. They are fully involuntary for those who are sick in mind or fully psychopathic."

VIII. Concerning sexual perversion, Noldin takes the following from Capellmann-Bergmann, o. c., n. 47:

"1. Sexual perversion consists in this, that the sexual appetite and sexual actions are abnormal in this, that libido is excited not by internal and external acts pertaining to venereal matters, as ordinarily happens, but by others altogether foreign to sexual life.

"2. It can indeed happen that a sexual disposition, at the beginning not alien from the common norm, has been made abnormal by sins of lust against nature committed for a long time; ordinarily, however, the abnormal disposition has been transmitted by heredity from the parents, together with a morbid affection of the nervous system.

"3. Four diverse forms of perverse sexual disposition are distinguished: sadism, masochism, fetishism, contrary sexuality.

"a. Sadism is so called if venereal pleasure is excited by imaginings which contain cruelty and violence, of which kind are: to strangle, to prick with a knife, to strike, to scourge, to slaughter, lust-murder.[10]

[10] The name is drawn from the Marquis de Sade, who was affected by this perversity and exhibits, as it were, its prototype.

"These actions are not carried out to obtain copulation from the person to whom force is inflicted, but to excite and quiet and fulfill libido through them. This perversion is frequently found in men, scarcely ever in women; for since the man in sexual life is the active and, if it is permitted so to speak, aggressive principle, it seems to have arisen from the degeneration of the office which in sexual functions naturally belongs to the man.

"b. Masochism is so called if venereal pleasure is excited by this, that someone suffers violence and torments, of which kind are to be struck, kicked, beaten, scourged, pricked even to the effusion of blood, and so forth.[11]

[11] The name is taken from Sacher-Masoch, who especially describes this perversion in his fictitious narratives, *Romans*.

"This perversion is found especially in women, which is easily understood from the things said above, since the woman bears herself more passively in sexual functions. They do not indeed lack the sense of pain while they suffer force, but by the sense of venereal pleasure the pain is abundantly compensated.

"c. Fetishism is so called if libido is excited by imaginings or actions which do not pertain to venereal things and therefore otherwise are not apt to excite pleasure.

"The things or parts of the body whose imagining or handling excites venereal feeling are the hand, foot, eye, hair, garment, shoes, feathers, cloths, rags, and so forth. For the most part these things or parts of the body have relation to a determinate person loved with inordinate affection; but it can happen that, even independently from relation to a certain person, they provoke venereal pleasure and pollution.

"d. Contrary sexuality, or homosexuality, is so called if sexual appetite tends toward a person of the same sex. Venereal feeling therefore is provoked not from the imagining, sight, or touch of a person of different sex, but of the same sex.

"The sins which are committed by those who labor under this perversion are pollutions provoked by touches and sodomitical concubituses. If the perverse inclination is borne toward boys, it is called pederasty; ordinarily, however, it tends toward men. This perversion is also found in women, in whom it is called Lesbian or Sapphic love and induces to mutual pollutions and sodomitical sins which women commit among themselves.

"Now: a. Sexual perversion is not a sign of a sick mind: perversions are also found in those who labor under no psychic defect. Yet this seems able to be affirmed, that perversions are more frequently had in men of sick mind than of sound mind.

"b. Not only those who are of sound mind but also those who labor under psychic defect can repress perverse sexual appetites; and therefore sins, or perversities, are imputable to them, unless the psychic defect has reached a greater degree. It becomes ineluctable when to psychic defect there accedes a great vehemence of sexual appetite, whether ordinary or perverse....

"Note: the confessor ought to know that certain traces of perverse sexual disposition are sometimes found even in those whose sexual life otherwise does not depart from the common norm. For not a few are met who are basely excited by imaginings or actions which scarcely refer at all to venereal matters, as by the chastisement of boys represented by imagination, by reading of the torments which the martyrs suffered, by the imagining or touch of hair gathered into a knot, and so forth. Against temptations arisen from imaginings or actions of this kind they must fight equally as against other temptations attacking chastity. Those whose sexual perversion is perfect are excited only by abnormal means, but by base means not at all or only a little."

"The greatest attention must be employed in choosing foods; the manner of alimentation ought to consist in tonic foods, least of all exciting. According to Doctor Fournier all who must be corrected of this vice ought to use light foods and those of easy digestion, those which in small volume contain sufficient force of nutrition, namely eggs, milk, tender and roasted meats, birds, light fish, tender roots, chicory; they ought to avoid acrid and irritating foods, starchy foods which dilate the intestines, fruits which weaken and burden the stomach, and swine meats. In the evening it would be

better to abstain from meats; chocolate is not good since it is too nourishing, nor do crustaceans help, since they are excitants of the nervous system. Likewise alcoholic drinks, very alcoholic wines, beer, tea, and so forth, are forbidden. The best drink is water mixed with old wine. Likewise garments ought not be too warming, nor compress the genitals.

"But if all these things do not suffice, some medicines must be attended to, such as potassium bromide and especially camphor, lupulin, and so forth; hydrated chloral for insomnia.

"Sometimes besides it happens that all these things profit nothing, because of disease of the brain or spinal marrow, by which boys and girls unknowingly devote themselves to masturbation. Then mechanical means are to be employed. There are very many of these; but those judged of better effect are: the use of a garment which joins the arms and retains them before the chest; a binding in like manner of the hands to the neck so that they can never touch the genitals; the use of gloves made from metal for the hands, and of some apparatuses, likewise made from metal or caoutchouc, which are of various form according as they serve boys or girls, which are applied to the genitals day and night, and which have often brought very good effects.

"But if all these things still do not suffice for tearing out the lethal vice, one must have recourse to amputation of the clitoral organ, clitoridectomy, in women even adult. This operation is very easy and altogether harmless.... But if, the clitoral organ having been removed, masturbation of the external pudenda is substituted, then it is necessary to carry out cauterization of the internal face of the external pudendum, because any attempt in these parts excites pains which impede masturbation." Compare also Debreyne, *Moechialogie*, p. 53-61.

Question Eight: Concerning Spouses in the Use of Marriage

Up to this point we have spoken of lust outside marriage; it remains to speak of chastity and lust in the matrimonial state. In this state the conjugal act, or carnal copulation per se apt for generation, is licit if it is done on account of the due end and with due circumstances; indeed it is an act of the virtue itself of chastity. Hence we shall speak:

1. concerning the essence and end of conjugal copulation,

2. concerning the circumstances of conjugal copulation,

3. concerning accessory acts connected with conjugal copulation,

4. concerning excess in the use of marriage,

5. concerning the conjugal debt and concerning defect in the use of marriage.

Article I: Concerning the Essence and End of Conjugal Copulation

I. Conjugal copulation is that which per se is apt for generation; for this three things are required: intromission into the female genital canal, effusion of semen within the female genital canal, retention of semen by the woman, so namely that it can be drawn into the uterus.[1] Hence he sins

gravely who knowingly and willingly does not preserve one of these three things or voluntarily exposes himself to the proximate danger of this.

[1] The hypothesis which some have posited concerning a woman who would not be able to retain semen seems in no way to be attended to; for naturally it cannot happen that she reject all the semen once received.

Hence:

a. Although conception absolutely can occur without intromission, by pouring out semen at the mouth of the female genital canal, because it is not impossible for sperm to enter by its own vital motion and by the attraction of the uterus, nevertheless, because this is altogether rare and per accidens, it does not suffice for copulation such as nature instituted, nor is it an honorable mode of perfecting copulation even if it is done for a good end, for example to avoid the contagion of disease; rather, it is gravely illicit. For then in reality no copulation is present, but only two simultaneous pollutions.

b. Yet to effect slight intromission into the female genital canal suffices, although one acting thus can sin by affection, at least venially, if without proportionate cause he acts in this way, of which certainly the sole fear of procreating offspring is not one, as if someone wishes in this way to avoid conception or render it notably more difficult, and wishes to avoid the mode more apt for generation;[2] mortally, if he thinks and intends that generation is thus totally impeded.

[2] This at minimum must be concluded from the response of the Holy Office, November 23-December 1, 1922, approving the decree of the bishops of the Netherlands. The question concerned copulation, as they say, half-completed, which was considered by several confessors as an apt remedy to be proposed to onanists. Now the bishops of the Netherlands condemned that practice of confessors who advised or permitted inveterate onanists half-completed copulation so that they would no longer sin gravely; moreover, this was gravely scandalous and rather was apt to prepare the way to onanism. The bishops, however, sought the approval of the Holy Office, which gave the following response:

A proportionate cause, for example, is if the woman, recently from childbirth or infirm in the sexual parts, cannot suffer perfect coitus.

c. Nevertheless it would not suffice to effect slight intromission at the external pudendum and deposit semen between the lips, because thus it would be deposited only at the mouth, in no way in the female genital canal itself; and thus it would not be copulation.

d. Since intromission into the female genital canal is an essential condition altogether required, therefore he who certainly could not effect intromission and perfect the act in the due mode is in reality impotent. But if impotence is doubtful, a married person could attempt copulation in this way as long as there is some hope of intromission and of arriving at perfect copulation; otherwise, if there is no hope, because the mere possibility of generation does not suffice, but a probable possibility of copulation is required.

II. Every carnal copulation of itself apt for generation is also per se licit, provided it is instituted on account of a right end; hence it is necessary that on the part of the one acting the end be conformed to the end of the work.

But the one proper and principal end from the nature of the work is the generation of offspring, to which two secondary ends are joined, but merely subordinated in such a way that they are true means by which the principal end is more securely obtained: the enjoyment of pleasure or the calming of concupiscence, and mutual solace, or mutual love to be fostered and preserved.

Hence spouses can seek copulation either on account of the principal end, or also on account of a secondary end, but insofar as of itself it is subordinated to and serves the principal end.

Indeed copulation can also be exacted by either spouse, and indeed from justice, so that per se and generally the partner is bound to render it; wherefore it is called the conjugal debt, concerning which the Apostle speaks, I Cor. VII, 3-5. Hence for rendering copulation, the legitimate end is to render to the partner what is owed to him or her from justice; yet this end always supposes the primary end of the act itself or work, namely the generation of offspring.

III. Corollaries. From this the following conclusions follow:

1. He who exercises copulation sins if he positively excludes the primary end, and indeed gravely if he intends to impede it, or employs means for this.

2. Therefore he who, in perfecting copulation, intends only or chiefly a secondary end, for example pleasure, in such a way that the principal end is positively excluded or postponed, sins venially; for it is an inversion of order, namely the inordinate use of a licit thing. Compare proposition 9 condemned by Innocent XI.[3]

[3] "The work of marriage exercised on account of pleasure alone is altogether without all fault and venial defect." Compare Saint Thomas, Supplement, q. 49, a. 5 and 6.

3. Yet he who explicitly intends a secondary end, for example the calming of concupiscence, and only abstracts from the primary end, acts licitly, because he implicitly intends the principal end toward which, from its nature, the act tends, which, the whole of what it is, exists only for generation.

4. Likewise he who intends to avoid incontinence in himself or in the consort: for he acts directly from a motive of virtue for preserving continence. On the contrary, he who seeks pleasure alone acts directly from love of pleasure. Nor does it stand in the way that the danger of incontinence implies defect of virtue and therefore sin: this defect is evil, but rather is presupposed to the copulation; yet, this defect standing, to provide an apt remedy to it by conjugal copulation rightly exercised is not evil but good.

5. Nor does he sin who, on account of poverty, infirm health, or another honorable end, by an inefficacious desire only wishes that offspring not be conceived, provided he uses no illegitimate means for impeding generation, nor positively excludes it in the act, and the act posited is apt for generation.

6. But he sins, and indeed mortally, who with an adulterous mind approaches his own spouse, thinking of another person as present, or desiring to have copulation with that person; not, however, he who, without depraved affection, while thinking of another person, adorns his own wife with the beauty of another so that he may excite himself to the conjugal act, although this is dangerous. In a similar mode one must speak for the wife thinking of another man or of his qualities or vigor.

7. The use of marriage is licit also for the sterile and the old, even if sterility is certain, provided they can perfect the act or have hope of perfecting it, because the act by its nature is ordered to generation, and if generation does not follow, this happens per accidens. Hence the Church blesses their marriages.

8. Likewise the conjugal act is licit even if it is foreseen that from fertilization the woman will suffer abortion or will bring forth dead offspring into the light, because such an effect occurs per accidens and can be permitted on account of some honorable end of the act itself.

Article II: Concerning the Circumstances of Conjugal Copulation

I. The use of marriage, whether consummated or begun, licit of itself, can per accidens be illicit by reason of circumstances, and indeed not only on the part of the end; but also on the part of the person, by reason of impotence, as has already been said, or of vow, or of marriage doubtfully valid; from the circumstance of mode, by reason of position; from the circumstance of place, by reason of scandal; from the circumstance of time, by reason of danger or harm.

II. From the circumstance of the person, the use of marriage is illicit:

1. From impotence:

a. The man who certainly cannot effect intromission, or does not have semen, or cannot emit it, or cannot deposit it in the female genital canal, cannot exercise copulation, nor can the wife with such a man.

b. If impotence is doubtful, they can attempt copulation, if there is hope of perfecting it.

c. But if impotence is altogether certain but temporal, they are bound to abstain during this time.

2. From vow:

a. The spouse who has made a vow of chastity is prohibited under grave sin, from religion, from seeking the debt; nevertheless he or she can and must render it to the one who has the right and justly exacts, because one person is not deprived of right because of the deed of another. Nevertheless such a spouse could also seek, if he or she were to notice that the partner is placed in danger of incontinence and does not dare to seek, which can happen especially in the wife because of shame; for thus the spouse is rather rendering to one tacitly seeking than seeking.

b. If each has vowed separately, even with the partner knowing and approving, neither can seek, because they have freely deprived themselves of the use of the debt; but if in fact one seeks, the other is bound to render from justice, because the right of seeking always remains. The one seeking does indeed seek illicitly, but seeks with right, and therefore sins against religion, not against chastity.

c. But if each has vowed together by mutual consent and by the same pact, each is prohibited both from rendering and from seeking, because by the pact each intends freely to renounce mutually his or her right of seeking, as to exercise.[1]

[1] The wife can indirectly irritate the vow of the husband, insofar as it is contrary to her rights; the husband can irritate the vow of the wife, perhaps even directly. But not if they vowed by mutual pact, because then they renounced this right of irritation.

3. From doubt concerning the validity of marriage:

a. Doubt concerning the validity of marriage, if it is on each side, simply prohibits use until due inquiry has been made.

b. If doubt remains after due inquiry, use is licit, because in doubt one must stand for the validity of marriage.

c. If only one doubts, during the doubt that one is prohibited from seeking, but is bound to render, because he or she cannot expose himself or herself to the danger of injuring justice, nor is the other deprived of his or her right because of the doubt of the partner; if doubt remains after due inquiry, he or she can seek and render.[2]

[2] Thus it is certain if the marriage was entered in good faith. But whether one who in bad faith contracted marriage in doubt can seek the debt, and especially if the marriage is doubtful because of the impediment of ligamen, or the bond of a prior marriage perhaps enduring, which would be in possession, can be disputed. Practically, however, there are authors who think this licit, because they hold it probable, even in the last case, that the principle of can. 1014 can be applied: "in doubt one must stand for the validity of marriage until the contrary is proved."

III. Likewise from the circumstance of mode or position. The position is indicated by nature, according to which it is fitting that the man be lying upon, the woman lying beneath, turned face to face: for that position generally is more apt for a more intimate intromission of bodies and for the infusion of virile semen and due reception of it, and it befits human beings, who ought to exercise the act of generation not in the manner of brutes, but from rational love, by seeing and speaking to one another and by communicating themselves and their senses and affections. Hence:

1. he sins who without reason changes the natural position, because it is an inversion of the order of nature; yet in whatever mode the thing is done, standing, sitting, from the side, from behind, with the man beneath, and so forth, it is not grave, provided the conjugal act can rightly be perfected as apt for generation, because this alone is essential and the position is something accessory: the change of position of itself does not pervert the substance of the act;

2. indeed, if sufficient reason is present that another position than the natural be chosen, there is no sin. This can happen sometimes in the time of pregnancy lest there be danger of abortion; or because of frigidity, if in an unnatural position a frigid person excites himself or herself more easily; or because of some difficulty of copulating otherwise, for example from curvature or hernia of the man, fatigue of the woman, fetid breath of either; or if thus there would be greater hope of fertilization.

It should be noted, however, according to physicians, that to exercise copulation habitually either lying beneath or especially standing can induce diseases for the man.

IV. From the circumstance of place: copulation can be illicit, even gravely, if it is done in a public or not secret place, namely by reason of scandal. Hence, when a person unexpectedly arrives, copulation can be broken off even if perhaps semen is poured out outside the female genital canal; for this happens beyond the intention in order to avoid a greater moral evil.[3]

[3] For this reason spouses are to be warned not to allow children who have the use of reason, nor even before, to lie with them in bed or in the bedroom. But if poverty compels this, let them beware lest the children discover anything; in bed let them keep boys at the father's side, girls at the mother's side.

V. From the circumstance of time. Per se the conjugal act is prohibited at no time by reason of time itself, because no law excludes any time. Thus it is licitly exercised on more solemn feast days, on fast days, before Communion, and so forth, although by counsel one should abstain at these times. Nevertheless, per accidens, if in some determined time there exists a cause of some sufficiently grave danger, it can be illicit, but as long as that cause exists. Thus:

1. In time of illness, if there is a grave and proximate danger of life, for example from contagion: since no one is master of human life, copulation will be gravely illicit, so that the spouse cannot seek it nor render it without at least warning the partner concerning the danger. Yet this partner, a just reason acceding, such as avoiding incontinence, preserving domestic peace, avoiding the adultery of the partner, and so forth, could admit copulation from charity, unless death is imminent. Likewise, if there is grave danger to health, for example from phthisis, copulation is illicit without a just cause, such as avoiding incontinence in oneself or in the partner; wherefore at least the use is to be moderated.[4]

[4] Phthisis is not so much a contagious disease, but rather hereditary, at least in the sense that offspring receives by heredity the greatest disposition for contracting this disease.

"This is the natural order," says Saint Thomas, "that first something be perfected in itself, and afterwards communicate to another from its perfection; and this is also the order of charity, which perfects nature. And therefore since the wife does not have power over the man except as to the generative power, but not as to those things which are ordered to the conservation of the individual, the man is bound to render the debt to the wife in those things which look to the generation of offspring, yet with the safety of the person first preserved.... The wife does not have power over the body of the man except with the consistency of the person himself preserved.... Hence if she exacts beyond this, it is not a petition of the debt but an unjust exaction, and on this account the man is not bound to satisfy her."[5]

[5] Supplement, q. 64, a. 1 in corpus and ad 2.

Hence:

a. for the one who is infected with syphilitic or venereal disease, copulation is illicit in those stages of disease in which there exists a morally certain danger of infecting the partner;

b. nevertheless, the partner can from charity admit copulation;

c. it is not illicit because of danger of infecting offspring or leaving offspring in want, because "it is better to be thus than not to be" (Saint Thomas, Supplement, q. 64, a. 1, ad 4), especially on account of the beatific vision for which the soul is destined.

2. It is illicit in the time of pregnancy if there is danger of abortion from copulation, which nevertheless rarely happens, unless perhaps copulation is carried out rather often and rather vehemently.

3. Likewise in the time of puerperal purification, especially at its beginning, if grave harm threatens the wife from it, which in the first days, two or eight or sometimes more, can easily happen;[6] in these matters account must be had of the condition of each person, and in doubt a physician is to be consulted.

[6] Nevertheless it is better to abstain for fifteen days.

4. On the contrary, in the time of puerperal purification as it advances or approaches the end, likewise in the time of lactation,[7] after a copious meal, bath, or bloodletting, it is not illicit, whatever some once said; nor even per se during the ordinary menstrual flow, or even extraordinary flow, unless per accidens if some disease were thereby greatly aggravated.[8]

[7] In the time of lactation conception rarely occurs. But if it occurs, the milk is diminished or even ceases, but the offspring can be nourished otherwise, or even by artificial lactation.

[8] In the Old Testament it was prohibited in the time of menstruation under penalty of death (Lev. XX, 16), but the reason can be that in the hottest regions of Asia women suffer a copious flow, and often part of the blood already altogether corrupted remains in the female genital canal; whence there could arise danger lest men contract a grave disease in the genitals. Eschbach, o. c., p. 122.

VI. Observation concerning venereal diseases, from which danger can threaten.

1. Syphilis, also the so-called French disease, because it raged among the troops of France under Charles VIII besieging Naples (1490), is a venereal disease most properly so called. At the beginning, circumscribed in a definite place, it then pervades the whole body and corrupts it in many ways. It has its origin from a certain microbe, which is called *treponema pallidum* (*spirille pale*). A threefold stage will be observed in its process, preceded by the time of incubation, through ten to forty days, after the microbe has been deposited in an ulceration of the glans or skin; sometimes, however, there is malignant syphilis (*galoppante*) when from the beginning it manifests itself. In the first stage, a certain hard ulcer is formed in the place where the microbe lay hidden, which is easily broken because of frictions and is gradually extended, and invades the blood of the whole body, ten to eleven weeks. In the second stage, after infection of the blood, external signs of corruption appear, namely fever, insomnia, anemia, cutaneous eruptions, red and round spots which grow more in number and bring pain, and sometimes concomitant diseases. In the third stage, the palate is perforated by an ulcer, the face and mouth are deformed, sometimes caries of the bones accedes, atrophy of the testicles and impotence. The third phase is not always had; many are made strong before it. In the first and second stage syphilis is contagious and brings great danger of infection for others, which can last for three or four years; in the third stage, almost none. Syphilis is transmitted from a diseased mother to a healthy fetus, from an infected fetus to the mother, very often by coitus had with a syphilitic person, also by kisses, lactation, use of things employed by the syphilitic, and by heredity. It is curable, although cure is not always altogether certain; practically, however, it can be called morally certain, so that almost no danger of infection remains. It is treated by remedies made from mercury and arsenic; the best known are those designated by numbers 606, 914, and 1116. Cure lasts from fifteen to eighteen up to twenty-four months; more, however, when the disease is graver. Preservative means have also been discovered, namely ointments with which the virile member is anointed soon before or after coitus.

2. Blennorrhagia, or gonorrhea from the microbe called gonococcus, is a disease by which the urethra is inflamed in a purulent manner because of the microbe; if it is long-lasting or chronic, it is called the military drop. It easily passes to nearer organs. After withdrawal it sometimes lies hidden secretly and is seriously contagious. In a woman it easily invades the

peritoneum, whence contagion of the genitals and sterility. It is easily cured in a shorter time, but not without pain, by an electrolytic method. Copulation is the means of contagion; the disease is not hereditary, but infection is easily handed on in birth: namely, the offspring is afflicted with ophthalmia to the detriment of the faculty of sight.

3. A soft ulcer is less pernicious and less frequent. It is a great ulcer in the genital organs, but it does not extend to other things. Once it has been brought to a scar, it heals.

On the contrary, leucorrhea or white flux, with which pregnant women often labor, is not harmful.

1. It cannot be tolerated that confessors of their own accord teach the practice of half-completed copulation and advise it indiscriminately to all penitents who fear lest more numerous offspring be born;

2. The confessor is to be censured who, after all remedies for turning the penitent abusing marriage away from this evil have been tried in vain, teaches him to exercise half-completed copulation for preventing mortal sins;

3. Likewise the confessor is to be censured who in the said circumstances advises half-completed copulation already known to the penitent, or to a penitent asking whether this mode is licit, responds simply that it is licit without any restriction or explanation.

Concerning these things Father Damen, *Th. M.*, II, n. 896, observes: "The reason of the first response is because it is licit for no one, and much less for a confessor, to advise sin, whether mortal or even venial. The reason of the second response is because such a mode of acting involves scandal, since half-completed copulation easily paves the way to worse things and so in fact, as to the diminution of offspring, produces the same effect as neo-Malthusianism and therefore cannot be advised as a lesser evil. The reason of the third response is because the advice is scandalous and the response of the confessor would be false, since it declares that which is illicit to be licit."

But half-completed copulation is not if semen is deposited at the orifice or between the lips, because thus there is no copulation, not even half-completed, but if semen is poured out at the entrance of the female genital canal and entering it, although a little.

Article III: Concerning Accessory Acts Connected with Conjugal Copulation

I. Besides copulation itself, there are also acts more or less connected with it, which occur between spouses in carnal commerce, which can be recalled to a threefold species:

a. acts ordered to exciting nature toward the conjugal act, or to moving the flesh;

b. acts harmful to the conjugal act, or against the ordering of nature, as pollution voluntary in itself or in the cause, and sodomy improperly so called, or a proximate occasion to these;

c. acts which are neither ordered to conjugal copulation nor harmful, and are said to be beside generation, for example to act for pleasure alone, to touch oneself uselessly.

Hence three principles:

A. Whatever is done according to the due end and generation, or is necessary or useful for the conjugal act, is licit.

B. Whatever is done beside the end, not against generation, does not exceed venial sin.

C. Whatever is against the due end, the generation of offspring, is gravely illicit, and participates in the malice of adultery or violated fidelity.

From these principles it can be judged how spouses can sin through excess, and the following conclusions are already understood.

II. Concerning imperfect venereal acts between spouses present:

1. Imperfect or impudicious acts, looks, touches, kisses, embraces, likewise conversations, even altogether base, exercised between spouses present in order to copulation now to be had, are licit, insofar as they conduce to carrying out that copulation more perfectly, more pleasurably, and more easily. For they are the preparation and beginning of this act as of an end; but if the end is honorable, so too are the means naturally ordered to it. Provided diligence is employed lest semen be emitted outside the female genital canal, and consent is not given to pollution that may arise by chance.

2. Likewise they are licit, with a certain restriction, for fostering or preserving mutual love, which is necessary to marriage and copulation, especially if here and now there is some grave and proportionate reason, for example grave suspicion of infidelity or of propensity toward another person to be avoided, necessity of providing a special sign of love, cutting off the beginning of adulterous libido, the altogether urgent petition of the partner, and so forth. This reason must be graver to the extent that the danger of pollution is greater. But the restriction is this: provided the act is not per se and altogether proximately provoking satiative pleasure or pollution, or equivalent to pollution itself, and there is no danger of consenting to it if at some time it follows. Therefore where spouses notice that the danger of pollution is proximately present, they must cease from the acts.

3. But if here and now there is no reason, so that spouses here and now cannot or do not wish to perfect copulation, yet seek those acts for themselves and intend pleasure alone, they are illicit because in the intention of the agent they are deprived of their natural and due end, but only venially, because there is only the excessive or inordinate use of a licit thing; indeed also gravely if there is proximate danger of pollution or complete venereal pleasure.[1]

[1] In the preceding things the question concerns truly impudicious touches; for modest and honorable ones are licit even with danger of pollution, provided some reason is present and the danger of consent is absent. On the contrary, truly base touches exercised with a third person are gravely illicit.

III. Concerning solitary imperfect venereal acts when the partner is absent:

1. Solitary imperfect acts, exercised when the partner is absent, are illicit, because they are done for pleasure alone, unless perhaps in certain circumstances they are useful for preparing future copulation, nourishing sexual appetite, obtaining heat, and so forth. Therefore per se they are illicit: mortally if there is proximate danger of pollution or satiative pleasure, or consent to it; otherwise at least venially, because, according to several, they are not opposed to the essential

order of marriage but, by reason of the matrimonial state, of themselves are naturally referred to licit matrimonial copulation, which nevertheless here and now is excluded. According to many others, on the contrary, they are always mortal, because, since spouses per se do not have right over their own body, those acts are of themselves the beginning of pollution,[2] and do not bespeak an order to copulation except sometimes by reason of special circumstances. Saint Alphonsus says that this last opinion is to be advised, not imposed, in practice.

[2] Yet it may be permitted to observe that imperfect acts of themselves are not against nature nor according to nature, because of themselves they say nothing such. Compare p. 70. Hence in the case it is the same as if spouses present exercised those acts and did not wish to perfect copulation. Nor should you say: if in spouses imperfect acts and incomplete pleasure are only venial, also in others they are only venially evil. The response: for spouses complete pleasure itself is licit in conjugal copulation, and accordingly also incomplete pleasure. Hence in the case, the thing which is sought by them is not undue, but only the mode in which it is sought is undue. On the contrary, for the unmarried the pleasure itself is undue, as reserved to marriage.

2. Morose delectation concerning copulation with one's own spouse had or to be had, or desire of it, because they concern a licit thing, are not sins, unless danger of pollution were present; for then they are mortal sin. Or unless someone adhered to them altogether uselessly and idly; for then they are venial. Delectation or desire concerning acts venially evil is a light sin; concerning acts prohibited under grave sin it is mortal.

IV. Concerning certain acts preparatory to copulation or accompanying it:

1. To begin copulation in an undue vessel, for example in the posterior vessel or in the mouth, with the intention of consummating it in the female genital canal; likewise to touch the posterior vessel with the genitals or to lick them with the mouth, is not mortal sin, provided the pouring forth of semen is guarded against and sodomitical affection is excluded, which nevertheless will easily be present if the aforesaid things are not done in passing but last for some time. Indeed, if they are sought as the sole means and preparation of the due act and a sufficient reason is present, for example because otherwise someone cannot be excited, they are not sin.[3]

[3] For the incomplete act of itself is not against nature nor according to nature, but abstracts from both, as was said.

2. The woman can by touches, either her own or those of the husband, excite herself to having satiative and perfect pleasure, and thus complete copulation, if the man has previously inseminated within the female genital canal. On the contrary, this would be illicit if the man had inseminated outside the female genital canal in an onanistic mode, because then there would be no copulation apt for generation and accordingly no common act to be completed; whence, if it were done, there would be solitary sin.

3. Likewise, the wife could seek perfect pleasure immediately before the insemination of the man, at least if the man effects intromission before she is calmed. This will be done without mortal sin, and when reason is present, even without venial sin, if because of lesser heat she cannot be moved in the very congress and otherwise experience complete pleasure, or if the man himself is scarcely excited otherwise than by seeing the excitation of the wife and can perfect copulation. For it seems to suffice that in the conjugal act both spouses morally together

experience the heat of pleasure. Nevertheless one must try that there also be physical simultaneity, because it is more fitting to nature and health, and fosters pleasure and love more.

4. Nevertheless it would not be licit for the man to continue the act if the wife has withdrawn herself, because it would be nothing but useless pollution.

5. The wife does not sin, at least mortally, who deliberately restrains commotion, distillation, and complete pleasure, because they are not necessary for copulation and generation, and therefore she is not the cause that the semen of the man is prodigally deprived of its end. Yet she would be reprehensible if she did this from anger or aversion toward the husband, and she should be exhorted that also in this she show herself easy so that she may please the man and foster the union of love.

V. Warning. Imperfect acts, since from their nature they are not licit except in order to copulation, are illicit for those for whom seeking or even rendering copulation is absolutely prohibited: thus, for example, by reason of vow, or permanent impotence.

This, however, is not to be understood of all touches, looks, or kisses; for such acts are of themselves licit in marriage, because it belongs to the spouse to exercise them upon the body of the consort, which is his or hers; nor are they of themselves and necessarily venereal, but only when venereal pleasure is sought in them, or they include danger of this kind. In this way, however, they are prohibited for those for whom copulation is altogether prohibited.

Article IV: Concerning Excess in the Use of Marriage

I. Excess in the use of marriage can be:

a. by reason of the end, as if it is done exclusively on account of pleasure;

b. by reason of an undue circumstance, for example position, if the act is done in a mode beside that which nature indicates;

c. especially by reason of a mode against nature, if it is done in such a way that generation itself is thereby impeded, for example in a sodomitical mode, in an unnatural vessel and undue organ, namely in the posterior vessel or in the mouth.

Now the mode of sinning by excess against nature very frequent in modern times is onanism.[1] It is copulation in the female canal sought in that mode by which generation is positively impeded and cannot follow from the effusion of semen; this can be done in various modes described above.[2] It is mortal sin, as directly contrary to the primary end of marriage and opposed to conjugal fidelity, a mere abuse of the genital organs against the order instituted by God, by which they pervert a most noble thing into the basest act of a passion of ignominy. For it lacks order to the natural end of semen and to the good of the species. Hence the malice is intrinsic to the act, to such an extent that no cause, however urgent, can render it honorable.

[1] That practice is often called neo-Malthusianism. For economic reasons Malthus (1798) had proposed the limitation of conception, but by licit means, namely by abstaining from the conjugal act. Now, however, neo-Malthusians promote illicit means.

[2] Question IV, article 4, nn. 1 and 2. Yet none is altogether certain. For the preservative garment, condom or pseudo-vagina, can be torn; the occlusive pessary can be badly adapted or, during copulation, moved from its place; simple withdrawal or washing of the female canal do not always impede some sperm from being ejaculated before withdrawal, or already passing into the uterus before washing; a chemical substance sprinkled through the whole female genital canal before copulation does not always have perfect efficacy.

This is the doctrine of the Church, which shines forth from proposition 49 condemned by Innocent XI and from the many and repeated declarations of the Holy Office (May 20, 1851; April 19, 1853; March 26, 1897; November 23, 1922) and of the Sacred Penitentiary (twelve times from November 15, 1816 to June 3, 1916), most recently from the encyclical *Casti Connubii*, in which Pius XI did not hesitate to declare that this is the very Christian doctrine handed down from the beginning and always: "Since therefore certain persons, manifestly departing from Christian doctrine handed down from the very beginning and never interrupted, have lately judged that another doctrine concerning this manner of acting should be solemnly preached, the Catholic Church, to whom God himself has committed the teaching and defense of integrity and honesty of morals, placed in the midst of this ruin of morals, in order to preserve the chastity of the nuptial covenant immune from this base stain, in sign of her divine legation, lifts up her voice aloud through our mouth and promulgates anew: any use whatever of marriage in the exercise of which, by the industry of men, it is deprived of its natural power of procreating life, infringes the law of God and of nature, and those who have committed such a thing are stained with the blot of grave fault." Here three things are affirmed: the use of marriage which by industry is deprived of its power of generating, 1. is against divine law; 2. is against the law of nature; and 3. is grave sin.

II. Hence concerning onanism the following conclusions are established:

1. The onanist man cannot be absolved unless he repents and resolves; likewise the woman formally cooperating or consenting, or who tries to expel semen by washings. Indeed, he who uses a preservative means is bound to destroy it as an occasion of sin before absolution; this per se and regularly must be urged by the confessor.

2. The wife does not sin if for a moderately grave cause she renders the debt to an onanist husband withdrawing himself before insemination, or even seeks it from him; but the cause is grave if otherwise she incurs grave evils, for example dissensions in marriage, blows, adultery of the husband, her own incontinence or long abstinence from the use of marriage,[3] and so forth. The reason is that the action begins in the due mode, in such a way that of itself it is apt for generation; but if it is terminated unduly, the whole guilt stands on the part of the man, and on the part of the woman there is only material and mediate cooperation, which can be offered to the sin of another because of a grave motive. For this, says Pius XI, is to suffer sin rather than to perpetrate it. This is to be understood provided the wife does not consent to the mode itself of acting against nature, but detests it and bears herself merely passively toward it; otherwise there would be formal cooperation. Nevertheless she could actively cooperate, by exciting herself immediately before copulation and during it, and rejoice in pleasure, even perfect, as long as the action is done in the due mode; likewise she may rejoice in the good effect of such copulation, for example in preservation from the troubles and labors of pregnancy or childbirth, although this is dangerous.[4]

[3] Hence she can seek copulation from the man withdrawing himself, and only sometimes, namely once or another time, is she bound to abstain by reason of charity; not more often, because this would already be a grave inconvenience, while charity nevertheless does not oblige with grave inconvenience for avoiding merely passive scandal.

[4] The same holds theoretically for the man, when before insemination the woman withdraws herself; but in practice ordinarily there is not a grave sufficient reason on the part of the man, because he can rather easily impede the withdrawal of the woman, even by physical force.

Yet even then, because of charity, the woman is bound to warn the man and show her own repugnance, and this not once or another time but often, not however inopportunely but opportunely. Indeed, if she can, she should deter the man from this crime by blandishments, prayers, and other testimonies of affection (Sacred Penitentiary, November 15, 1816), even by denial of the debt if she thus hopes to procure the amendment of the husband.

3. But the wife cannot render the debt to an onanist husband employing a preservative instrument, whether he himself puts on a covering or imposes an occlusive covering upon the wife, because it is immediate participation in an intrinsically evil action. For then there is not present copulation of itself apt for generation. Namely, such congress admitted on each side is vitiated from the beginning and intrinsically evil; whence cooperation, even merely passive, is altogether illicit. Therefore the wife is bound positively to resist according to her strength, for example by moving herself or by using her hands, and she cannot yield except to prevailing force, after the manner of an oppressed woman, in which case, from such a most grave cause, as to that which she cannot impede, she can bear herself merely permissively, provided she excludes every consent to pleasure (Sacred Penitentiary, April 16, 1853 and June 3, 1916; Provincial Council of Mechlin, n. 84).

4. Likewise the wife would sin gravely if she induced the man to onanism either directly or indirectly, for example by producing insistent complaints concerning more numerous offspring, concerning the pains of childbirth, concerning the inconveniences of gestation, and so forth.

5. When the wife uses an occlusive pessary or other means impeding generation, the man must by marital authority prohibit it and remove her from these things; indeed, if it can be done, he must take away and destroy the means and instruments. But if nothing profits and grave inconveniences are to be feared, some judge that the man can even seek the debt and perfect copulation, provided he bears himself merely materially and passively as to the impediment of generation. Now:

a. It would certainly be illicit if the wife used a pseudo-vagina, because then from the beginning the act would be intrinsically evil.

b. On the contrary, it is probably licit if, with the husband contradicting, she uses anticonceptional powder or a medicine by which semen is killed, at least if it is done after the act, or if by washing of the female canal she tries to expel it; because then both the act and the genital organ of the woman remain substantially the same. For the act itself is done well and semen is deposited in the due vessel, but the vice is not from the mode of acting, but exists independently from the act and is posterior to it and is to be attributed to the wife alone.

c. But if she uses a sponge or occlusive pessary, whether the same reasoning is valid, we ourselves would not dare to decide, but let the wiser see.[5] The matter is not so clear, whether in the case the copulation itself is vitiated from the beginning, although from the beginning and during copulation there is present an impediment to conception from occlusion of the uterus; because the mouth of the uterus is not an organ which, like the virile member, has a part in copulation, but copulation is perfected in the due mode if semen is deposited in the natural female genital canal. In the case this happens, although the action of nature to be continued after copulation is impeded, but by the woman. Hence in practice, until the Church pronounces, the husband will be able to be absolved, provided he is prepared to stand by the mandates of the Holy See.

[5] Father Vermeersch in the first edition of his work affirmed this, but afterwards retracted himself (compare *Periodica de re canonica*, 1925, f. II; and *Th. M.*, t. IV, 69). The act now seems to him evil from the beginning, because the female genital canal is already substantially vitiated: for this is essentially a canal leading to the uterus; but since in the case it is occluded, it also ceases to be a canal. Hence a woman who has a naturally occluded female genital canal is impotent. The argument, saving better judgment, does not seem certain. For natural occlusion is one thing, merely artificial occlusion another; an organ occluded by reason of its structure is one thing, an organ aptly constructed but occluded because of an accidental impediment placed upon it from outside, which leaves the female genital canal perfectly integral, is another. It is also useful to note that in this mode only the passage of semen into the uterus and thus to the ovum is impeded. Now if the uterus has been removed, or the oviduct interrupted, and passage to the ovum has already been made impossible, nevertheless the conjugal act remains licit; likewise during pregnancy, while passage into the uterus is impeded because it is closed.

Nor does it stand in the way: if it is illicit for the woman to cooperate with the man using a preservative instrument, by equal right it must be illicit for the man to cooperate with the woman who uses a similar instrument. For although the rights are equal, nevertheless the parts of the man and the woman in the conjugal act are not the same, but are greater in the man; and therefore the man will be able more easily to cooperate with the wife than she with the man.

III. Corollaries. 1. From the principles enunciated one can respond to the question whether the wife could cooperate in sodomitical copulation, which is also opposed to the natural end of copulation and to conjugal fidelity demanding that spouses use the body only in a mode apt for generation; for neither has right over the body of the other against nature. Now, one must respond as for artificial onanism: to such copulation, as intrinsically evil and vitiated from the beginning, it is never licit to cooperate positively or actively, nor even merely passively; but it is necessary that the wife try to impede the sodomitical concubitus of the man by resisting positively as much as she can, for example by movement and by hands, and if, unwilling, she nevertheless is compelled to yield to prevailing force, that she never consent to the venereal pleasure perhaps arising from it. For if to cooperate in artificial onanism is never licit, a fortiori this is valid concerning the sodomitical mode, which is more perverse (compare Sacred Penitentiary, April 3, 1916).

2. From onanism and sodomy improperly so called there must be distinguished the act by which spouses come together in the manner of animals, yet in such a way that copulation is done in the female genital canal. In this case some say that they came together backwards or from behind. Then the confessor must ask whether in this mode generation was possible; if they respond that it was possible, it is inferred that the act was not against nature but only inordinate in position, beside nature; this sin does not exceed venial. Of his own accord the confessor should never have speech concerning the position to be had in copulation.

3. From onanism differs altogether the practice of having copulation only in the time of agenesis, during which time conception in no way or more rarely, namely, occurs; whence by this practice generation is made little probable. For such a manner of acting of itself is not sinful, since spouses can contain themselves as long as they wish, and otherwise do nothing against the end of marriage in the time in which they come together (Sacred Penitentiary, June 16, 1889), provided this is done from a right intention or just motive and with due circumstances preserved. Nevertheless, the bishops of Belgium rightly warn: "lest, however, the time of agenesis be proposed to the spouses as if through it generation were certainly avoided."[6]

[6] The time of agenesis was formerly established by the physician Capellmann and others thus: from ten or fourteen days after the beginning up to three or four days before the new menstruation; for they thought ovulation, and accordingly fertility, to coincide with menstruation, so that during the month the woman would be:

4. Nor must onanism be confused with the interruption of copulation. For this can be licit because of a grave reason, for example to avoid scandal when a person unexpectedly arrives, because of a spasm arisen in the calves, because of a sudden infirmity. Then copulation is broken off not now so that semen may be poured out externally, but for another end, whence the effusion of semen occurring beyond the intention is equated with involuntary pollution. If grave reason is lacking, this, speaking per se, is not mortal, provided the spouses consent in this and there is no danger of inseminating outside the vessel; for that intromission of the female vessel is then judged after the manner of an impudicious touch, which is permitted between spouses or at least is not mortal, with danger of pollution set aside. We have said:

a. if both consent, for if one withdraws without the consent of the other, he or she certainly sins gravely against the obligation of rendering the debt, as will be more evident from the following article;

b. speaking per se, for often it is mortal because the danger is frequently present from such withdrawal of pouring out semen, unless the spouses have experienced the opposite, in which case, nevertheless, ordinarily they cannot be excused from venial sin;

c. if there is no danger of pollution; whence the husband sins gravely who, without just cause, restrains insemination after the wife has experienced complete pleasure or is proximately prepared for it, because thus he is the cause that the action of the wife is deprived of its end and is mere pollution.

5. On the contrary, that cannot be admitted which some have said: that spouses who do not wish to multiply offspring can, for fostering mutual love, calming concupiscence, or compensating for the use of marriage, exercise the beginning of copulation, even through intromission into the female genital canal, in the manner of an imperfect act which they do not wish to bring to consummation; and indeed licitly, even if pollution arises from it not only rarely but even frequently, provided they do not consent to it.

Against this:

a. an imperfect touch, if the primary end, the generation of offspring, is positively excluded, is venial sin, even if there is no danger of pollution from it;

b. but if the act is prolonged for a long time or even frequently repeated, so that there is proximate danger of pollution, it will be gravely evil, because it is to place a cause per se and gravely influencing pollution. And if it were licit, spouses could practice material onanism with impunity; for such a practice is equivalent to onanism, from which it differs by explicit intention alone, since in the formal onanist pollution is voluntary in itself, but here only voluntary in a proximate cause. And therefore each is equally prohibited under grave sin.

6. Women sin gravely in intention who by an inefficacious reason, by a vain remedy, by restraining distillation, by rising to urinate, have wished to render copulation sterile. Nor can they obey a husband ordering such things unless first they have warned him concerning his error.

But if they voluntarily employ a means by which received semen is expelled or killed, they are guilty of an exterior gravely sinful act; hence women regularly ought not irrigate the female genital canal immediately, but only some hours after copulation.[7]

[7] Father Vermeersch, who in the first edition of his work *De Castitate*, n. 264, more severely required six hours, recently judges more benignly and holds washing after an hour licit. For "in individual effusions, nemaspermata are contained in an immense number, which they estimate at 250,000,000 to 260,000,000. If the man has perfectly effected intromission into the female genital canal, already in the very act of copulation many nemaspermata enter the uterus. But their motion is such that they traverse a hundredth part of a meter in ten moments. The beginning of the female genital canal is distant from the mouth of the uterus by 2 1/2 to 3 centimeters; but 10 centimeters from the Fallopian tubes ... where fertilization usually occurs.... When all things proceed optimally, fertilization already has place after an hour and a half from copulation done" (*Th. M.*, IV, n. 7). From this he concludes: "Washing of the female canal after an hour from copulation cannot in itself be called illicit, since then it no longer morally impedes generation," for "so many nemaspermata have been received in the uterus that such hope of fertilization has been made as morally no better can be expected" (ad n. 71).

Therefore under no pretext can it be done earlier: of cleanliness, or custom, or influx of blood with itching, or white flux, or inflammation of the female canal, or health; which causes, moreover, are not proportionate. Indeed generally washing of the female canal is rather harmful to health.[8] Nevertheless washing immediately after copulation would be licit if it were a means here and now necessary for averting infection or a contagious disease, which certainly rarely occurs.

[8] Thus Dr. Schockaert, "Les dangers de l'avortement et du neo-malthusianisme pour l'organe feminin," in *Revue medicale de Louvain*, 1932.

IV. Besides the inordination against nature intrinsic to onanism, several other evil consequences also are apt to follow from it, as Tanquerey notes (Supplement to the treatise on Marriage, n. 41-43):

"a. The spouses themselves often suffer many evils from it; for just as children are a common good and common bond by which spouses are joined more firmly and closely, so on the contrary those who lack offspring dissent much more easily and are separated from one another. Nor should it be said that to attain this end one or another child suffices; for the more numerous the offspring, the firmer the union of the spouses. Otherwise, not rarely are onanists punished by the premature death of one or another child whom they had begotten; hence often the parents of an only child are pressed by anxieties and fears lest perhaps this child be taken from the living and the family name be wiped out. Besides, marital copulation which, legitimately performed, is a remedy of concupiscence, does not calm it but inflames it when it is perfected onanistically; especially the woman is not completely delighted and does not rest unless the uterus is irrigated by virile semen tempering her ardor. Hence

also physicians cry out with one voice that onanists are subject to many diseases, which arise especially from excitation of the nerves;[9] for the commotion which concubitus causes is not calmed except by the natural effusion and reception of virile sperm.

[9] Or even the woman from defective application of the various practices. Compare Eschbach, o. c., p. 573-574; Surbled, t. I, l. 2, ch. 11-12; Dr. Schockaert, in the cited article.

"b. The offspring also not rarely suffers some detriment from the onanism of parents, which the Council of Poitiers (1868) describes thus: it happens very often that that child is educated more indulgently, or at God's command briefly finishes life, or, having become worse with age, deprived of the sweet love and support of brothers and sisters, loving himself, not obeying parents, proud, ungrateful, without affection, afflicts his family with disgrace and grief.

"c. Nor does onanism harm society less. For if the chief strength and protection of society is situated in the number and virile education of citizens; now onanism, by impeding generation, diminishes the number of citizens, so that nations once flourishing gradually fail. Likewise it hinders the virile education of children: for where there is an only child, generally he is educated more indulgently, is devoted to pleasure rather than duty, and often becomes altogether useless to the fatherland."

V. Warning for confessors. Concerning onanism, the faithful are also to be questioned and warned in confession. Concerning this, see the Sacred Penitentiary, March 10, 1886; and the Instruction of the bishops of Belgium, 1909;[10] and the Provincial Council of Mechlin, n. 84-86. Indeed the Supreme Pontiff himself in the encyclical *Casti Connubii* does not hesitate to write: "Therefore priests who give their labor to hearing confessions, and others who have care of souls, by our supreme authority and care for the salvation of all souls, we admonish, lest they allow the faithful committed to them to err concerning this most grave law of God, and much more, that they keep themselves immune from opinions of this kind and in no way connive at them. But if any confessor or pastor of souls, may God avert it, has either himself led the faithful entrusted to him into these errors, or at least confirmed them in these either by approving or by deceitfully keeping silent, let him know that he will have to render a severe account to God the supreme judge concerning betrayal of his office, and let him judge that the words of Christ are said to him, Matt. XV, 14: They are blind, and leaders of the blind; but if the blind gives guidance to the blind, both fall into the pit."

[10] As a commentary upon this instruction one can have the little work of the author A. Knoch, *L'Onanisme conjugal et le tribunal de la Penitence*, Liege, 1910. Besides, these can usefully be compared: *Instructio pro confessariis de usu et abusu matrimonii*, Eichstaett, Seminary 1931; *Ami du Clerge*, 1931; Creusen, "L'Onanisme conjugal," in *N. R. Th.*, 1932.

For it concerns a most grave evil, spread everywhere and very harmful to the common good, concerning which good faith now can scarcely exist, whose practice among the good and pious will easily be harmful to others because of scandal, and which because of the silence of confessors will be judged able to be permitted or tolerated. With these things considered, the confessor:

1. Unless by positive judgment it appears that the penitent is immune from that vice, should regularly question unknown married persons at least by a general question: whether all things in marriage are rightly ordered, whether nothing concerning this troubles the conscience.

2. If an onanist is detected, he can never positively permit the vice, and regularly he must warn, not only if good faith is absent or there is probable hope of fruit, but also when these are lacking; indeed, the Sacred Penitentiary warns, March 10, 1886, "if he foresees that several are

to be disturbed from good faith, and many will abandon the sacraments": both generally, because if confessors generally were silent, they would harm the common good, and in the particular case if it is feared that the silence of the confessor may be divulged, or the example be a scandal to the faithful. "For in this matter," says the Provincial Council of Mechlin, n. 85, "it is better to use severity than to indulge laxity."

3. Only extraordinarily, in a rare case, if these inconveniences and the danger of scandal and of excessive abuse are absent, he will be able to leave the penitent in good faith, which can more easily exist in the wife while she is in grave illness, or leaves the whole matter to the husband.

4. But if the spouse, considering the mode by which the vice is committed, can legitimately begin copulation well or admit it when begun, he will instruct that spouse concerning this faculty, so that he or she may henceforth avoid formal sins.

5. Let him also provide remedies against the vice:

a. let him show the gravity of the sin, which is directly opposed to the primary end of the conjugal act and of marriage, and the grave obligation of abandoning it;

b. let him explain the harmful effects in offspring born, and in the parents, who weaken the nervous system;

c. if the penitent objects the difficulty of feeding and educating more numerous offspring, let him excite confidence in the providence of God and explain that more numerous families generally are happier than others and emerge by the energy of their members, and by greater union and virile love;

d. if death from a new childbirth is feared, let him insinuate that the danger is easily exaggerated by some physicians, that no one can in this matter predict the event with certainty, that nature moreover brings help to the pregnant woman, and that the medical art has so advanced that the danger can rather be averted;

e. finally, in a discreet mode he can advise that they contain themselves or come together more rarely, or cautiously insinuate to them that there is a time less apt for fertilization.

6. Finally, to the relapsed without amendment absolution is regularly to be deferred, unless he brings extraordinary signs.

7. Moreover, in order that spouses may be able to exercise conjugal chastity, it is necessary that spouses, endowed with virtue, dominate passion and be apt to preserve continence for a time, as is sometimes necessary during pregnancy, or at the time of childbirth and purification, or because of disease or infirmity. But if they can do this, they will also be able rather easily to avoid onanism.

fertile	**sterile**	**fertile**
from day 1 to 14	from 15 to 25	from 26 to 28

But it was found that menstruation does not coincide with ovulation, although it is a connected phenomenon, but has place between two ovulations. Thus Dr. Siegl established the woman to be fertile from day 5 to 20 from menstruation had, sterile from day 1 to 4, and from 21 to 28. Now,

however, according to the most recent experiments of Doctor Knaus, the woman would be fertile from day 11 to 17 from menstruation had, sterile from day 1 to 10 and from day 18 to 28. According to Doctor Ogino the woman would be fertile from day 12 to 19 before the following menstruation, exceptionally to day 24, but sterile through 11 days before the following menstruation and through 9 days, exceptionally only through 4, after menstruation had. This can be proposed schematically thus:

	sterile	**fertile**	**sterile**
According to Siegl	from day 1 to 4	from 5 to 20	from 21 to 28
According to Knaus	from day 1 to 10	from 11 to 17	from 18 to 28
According to Ogino	from day 1 to 9 (exceptionally from 1 to 4)	from 10 to 17 (exceptionally from 5 to 17)	from 18 to 28

Concerning these things it should be noted:

1. The computation is approximate, whence to avoid conception certainly, spouses would have to abstain from day 4 to day 19 or 20 after menstruation.

2. The experiments are not yet sufficiently certain, because: a. the time during which the ovum and sperm remain apt for fertilization is uncertain; for this seems to depend on the individual condition of the person, or even on the diverse medium in which the semen, for example, is preserved; b. the experiments are not sufficiently numerous for making certainty in every way; and c. several were done not in the human species but in animals, whence from them one can conclude only by analogy.

3. Early or later or supplementary ovulation is always possible, whence also in fact fertilizations have had place at other times.

4. Hence some say that, in this matter, no general law is given, but the matter depends on the diverse condition of the woman; others say that there is no time in which conception is not strictly possible.

From these things it is clear how cautiously the confessor must proceed in affirming or counseling in this matter; nor is this doctrine to be spread among the people, because it would harm the common good.

Especially: a. The practice of exercising copulation only in the time of agenesis, although of itself it is not illicit, nevertheless is ill-sounding and requires a reason rendering it honorable.

b. Therefore, in order that in a concrete case it be honorable, it is necessary that it be done from a good end, such as is not to avoid all offspring, or to indulge pleasure; otherwise it will be venial sin.

c. Even if a good end is present, it is further required that it be done in due circumstances, for example by mutual consent and without danger of incontinence; otherwise mortal sin would be present.

d. Hence such a practice is not to be publicly proposed, nor even privately positively advised, because this is apt to generate scandal, indeed to lead to onanism; for since there is the same effect of each

practice, is there not danger that they do not sufficiently perceive the difference of each, and finally will use the unnatural mode, easier and more secure?

e. But sometimes the confessor can cautiously suggest that practice: thus if there is sufficient reason for avoiding every conception and the penitent cannot preserve continence, the confessor could say that in this case this is not evil; or if an inveterate onanist is incorrigible, to whom such a mode of acting could be proposed as a lesser evil.

This is a sufficiently common doctrine among moralists.

Yet this conclusion does not appear founded. Passing over even the fact that perhaps the computation was not adequately instituted, since on the one hand the number of nemaspermata and their speed seem to be exaggerated, for it does not agree with those things which are ordinarily handed down by cultivators of the sciences, and on the other hand the distance of the beginning of the female genital canal to the mouth of the uterus is diminished; besides, it is permitted to observe these things. From the optimal mode, in which sometimes exceptionally fertilization could occur, he concludes to that which can be licitly done generally. Then, from the fact that fertilization is not radically impeded, how can it be affirmed that there is a hope such that a better morally cannot be expected? This truly escapes us. Moreover, it is gravely illicit "to do anything positively by which conception is impeded or made less probable," as Father Vermeersch himself says; and accordingly also to lose part of the semen, unless per accidens and beyond the intention of the agent: "Thus a man cannot, content with partial insemination, withdraw himself and deliberately waste the remaining semen outside the vessel" (n. 57). Therefore, by parity, washing is gravely illicit, which directly expels part of the semen.

Article V: Concerning the Conjugal Debt and Concerning Defect in the Use of Marriage

I. The conjugal act can also be obligatory; for copulation can be exacted from justice by either spouse, because each has power over the body of the partner (I Cor. VII, 2-3), and indeed from a bilateral onerous contract, so that per se and generally the partner is bound to render it; wherefore it is usually called the conjugal debt. Hence spouses can also sin by defect (can. 1111).

A. There is per se no obligation of seeking, because no one is bound to use his own right; per accidens, an obligation from charity and piety can exist, for example if a spouse judges, especially the man, that the partner placed in danger of incontinence does not dare to seek, or if the use of marriage appears necessary for fostering love or averting dissensions.

B. There exists a per se grave obligation of rendering from justice whenever one party reasonably, seriously, and legitimately seeks, whether expressly or tacitly, because in the matrimonial contract they mutually handed over their bodies for conjugal use; but to deny this of itself brings grave trouble to the other. Per accidens, however, it will be light, as if the debt is rarely denied, for example once in a month to one seeking rather often; if it is deferred for a brief time, for example from day to night, from night to morning; if the other seeks mildly, not urgently, and easily acquiesces to the one denying; provided that in these circumstances danger of incontinence or of another grave inconvenience is absent.

II. The obligation of rendering ceases in one when the right of seeking ceases in the other:

a. If the one seeking has admitted formal, certain, consummated adultery, sodomy properly so called, or bestiality; for fidelity is broken for the one breaking fidelity. Make exception if the other has sinned similarly, or was an accomplice of the sin, or, knowing and willing, condoned the sin (can. 1129).

b. If the person wholly lacks the use of reason or is in a state of perfect drunkenness, as long as the state lasts; for he who lacks the use of reason does not seek in a reasonable and human mode.[1]

[1] There can also be danger for offspring to be conceived from copulation instituted after much intoxicating drinking, namely lest the offspring be born foolish, or deaf-mute, or liable to drunkenness.

c. If copulation is the cause of grave extrinsic danger or inconvenience, either for the one rendering, or for the one seeking, or for offspring already conceived;[2] nevertheless, when sufficient reason accedes, for example dissensions or incontinence of oneself or the partner to be avoided, someone could from charity render to the partner and expose himself or herself to proper danger, unless, however, death threatened from copulation.[3]

[2] In particular there is grave inconvenience of denying: a. if the wife labors under incipient cancer of the uterus, so that after coitus she is subjected to copious emission of blood; b. if she undergoes coitus with very acute pain which is repeated in individual copulations; c. if she herself is gravely ill or if the partner labors under a contagious disease, such as leprosy or venereal disease, which either brings danger of swift infection, or moves insuperable horror; d. if either labors under organic defect of the heart, for then coitus not only harms greatly but can even produce sudden death; e. if the wife knows by experience or by the judgment of a physician that she undergoes grave danger of death in childbirth. Hence Father Vermeersch says, n. 225: "If a physician declares a new conception will certainly be fatal to the wife, the wife must decline copulation. But if death does not threaten in this way, the wife can bring herself into danger because of a grave cause. For since conception itself is doubtful, the danger does not seem to have arisen nor to be proximate. But concerning these things it is necessary to approach a physician both skilled and fearing God. For there are not lacking those who, because of slight indications, inconsiderately prohibit persons little continent from the honorable use of marriage. Wherefore Genicot judges that such danger from future childbirth very rarely is established, because of which there would be a grave obligation of abstaining from the use of marriage." Compare Dr. Ausems, *Het herhaalde moederschap*.

[3] That this is according to the mind of Saint Thomas is clear from his response ad 4, a. 1, q. 64 in the Supplement.

d. If the partner seeks immoderately, for example several times, three or four times, in the same night.[4]

[4] Men, and much less wives, are not accustomed to exceed the mode in seeking the debt except in the first months after contracting marriage; during which time the moral difficulty also will be slight, either because the man more rarely intends to press strict right, or because he will willingly agree to the wife modestly asking off. Genicot, *Th. M.*, II, n. 554.

e. If the partner seeks in a mode illicit not only on the part of the agent but on the part of the act itself, for example that it be done onanistically, sodomitically, with scandal of others, and so forth.

But a graver harm is required for denying the debt absolutely than for deferring or restricting the rendering of the same. Thus weakness of the wife or great fatigue, which does not suffice for denying copulation absolutely, can be a reason for delay of rendering or for denying it as frequently as is sought by the man. Hence:

1. Wives sin gravely who in rendering the debt show themselves difficult and lingering, with danger of incontinence or adultery in the man or with the intention of deterring him from petition; likewise if they concede the debt only when compelled, if they harshly and insultingly reproach the man for his petitions, indeed if they obstinately deny, even for one time, while he seriously and urgently seeks.

2. Men also sin gravely who, whether from avarice for avoiding offspring or from malevolence, rarely know their wives.

3. Spouses are bound to a common bed (can. 1128) because of the obligation of rendering; therefore per se it is illicit for one, without the consent of the other or with danger of incontinence, to be absent for a longer time, for this is equivalent to denial of the debt. Per accidens it is licit because of grave causes, for example a notable good of the republic or of the family.

4. Hence he is unjust who illicitly separates himself or seeks civil divorce.

5. It is illicit for spouses to render themselves incapable of copulation or generation by excessive labors, vigils, austerities, or a fortiori by pollutions, adulteries, or other illicit acts. Hence husbands are guilty of grave and special injustice who, with the wife unwilling, have admitted vasectomy or castration for this reason, that they may not be able to generate, or so weaken the body that they render themselves almost unequal to the conjugal act, or exercise neo-Malthusian arts. Likewise, on the contrary, wives who, without the husband's knowledge or with him unwilling, not from necessity of present infection but to obtain sterility or to avoid future pregnancy even dangerous, procure for themselves excision of the ovaries or interruption of the oviduct, or place an occlusive pessary at the mouth of the uterus, or use other neo-Malthusian means; likewise physicians who by their art exercise the aforesaid excisions or operations or cooperate with them in some way.

6. Spouses are not excused from the obligation of rendering because of inconveniences inherent to marriage, for example more numerous offspring, inconveniences of gestation, ordinary difficulties of childbirth, grave and unusual but brief pains, light pains although long-lasting, and so forth; because these burdens are attached to marriage and they undertook them by entering marriage.

7. Nevertheless the wife seems to be excused from rendering the debt if the man by his own fault leaves the wife in utmost want, or does not wish to feed the offspring, or has no care of the family.

III. Observations. 1. Ordinarily the confessor is not bound, nor does it befit him, to question wives, except in the most modest mode he can, whether they have rendered the debt, for example whether they obey the man in matters which pertain to marriage, or whether anything troubles the conscience concerning marriage; concerning the rest let him be silent unless he has been asked. Usually in this matter wives little fearing God are to be questioned, especially when they confess that they have been angry with their husbands. But this questioning is ordinarily to be omitted with wives of timorous conscience.[5]

[5] Aertnijs, *Th. Mor.*, II, n. 515, from Saint Alphonsus, *Praxis conf.*, n. 41 and 35.

2. When asked, the confessor can propose to married persons who are pressed by anxiety concerning the baser things which they do between themselves the threefold rule indicated above (article III, n. I, A, B, C.); let him generally abstain from further questions concerning

the nature of the deed; besides, let individual persons be instructed: a. the husband, that he not seek the debt at those times in which copulation can be gravely harmful to the wife, for example in the time of purification or of grave disease; b. the wife, that she is bound under grave sin to obey the man in rendering the debt, unless she is excused from a just cause, for example because of infirmity.

3. Let the confessor order a girl asking what is licit or prescribed for her in a marriage soon to be contracted to ask her mother or another female blood relative in whom she can trust; but if she has no woman of this kind at hand, let him teach in the more honorable mode and briefly. To send her simply to the husband, that she conform herself to all his desires, today generally does not seem expedient, since so many men now seek means against nature, unless in the case in which the honesty of the husband is beyond every exception.

4. Let the confessor beware lest he ask spouses untimely or excessive questions concerning the various modes of coeundi, as these not only are useless but can also generate scandal. Wherefore if the penitent introduces a prudent suspicion, it will be enough for the confessor to inquire whether something against nature or voluntary pollution was present; concerning the rest let him not speak unless asked.

5. In marriage, that things may proceed in a happier mode, let spouses attend that in the use of marriage they consult the satisfaction of the other rather than their own. Especially:

a. let the man: 1. begin to approach the wife not in a fierce but in a gentle mode; 2. use his right discreetly; and thus 3. foster and increase the affection of love in the wife;

b. similarly, let the wife provide to the husband: 1. easiness by which she is prepared in rendering the debt so that she may please the man; likewise 2. cleanliness; and 3. order and neatness of the home.

6. A twofold danger occurs to matrimonial chastity from a twofold vicious inclination: namely to adultery, and to onanism.

A. To impede the first, occasions come to be avoided. Therefore let not the husband be so imprudent that he fosters frequent society or friendship of the wife with other men; likewise the wife: 1. let her not introduce another younger woman to the husband or keep her at home, for example a sister or beautiful maidservant; 2. let her not permit to the husband separate theatrical or worldly frequentations; 3. let her not herself have a separate bed.

B. To avoid onanism it is necessary to repress the imagination together with egoism. Especially let spouses:

1. in true humility, content with their modest condition, not be tormented by desire of a higher one;

2. prefer to the accumulation of riches or idleness the labor of feeding numerous children;

3. in the spirit of Christian abnegation be willing to be deprived of various pleasures for the good instruction of offspring.

By these things, under the influence of divine charity, their union in procreating children for the kingdom of God will be fruitful, and thus a great sacrament in Christ and in the Church.

Index (as printed)

To the benevolent reader . . . 5

General Introduction . . . 7

QUESTION ONE. Physiological notions concerning the genital organs and generation . . . 9

QUESTION TWO. Theological principles concerning Chastity and Lust . . . 17

QUESTION THREE. Concerning Lust Consummated according to Nature . . . 37

Article I. Concerning Fornication . . . 38

Article II. Concerning Stuprum and Raptus . . . 42

Article III. Concerning Adultery . . . 46

Article IV. Concerning Incest . . . 47

Article V. Concerning Carnal Sacrilege . . . 50

QUESTION FOUR. Concerning Lust Consummated against Nature . . . 51

Article I. Concerning Solitary Sin, or Pollution . . . 53

Article II. Concerning Sodomy . . . 63

Article III. Concerning Bestiality . . . 65

Article IV. Concerning Unnatural Concubitus with a Woman . . . 67

QUESTION FIVE. Concerning Imperfect Lust, or Impudicity . . . 68

QUESTION SIX. Concerning Internal Lust . . . 77

QUESTION SEVEN. Concerning the Causes and Remedies of Lust . . . 82

QUESTION EIGHT. Concerning Spouses in the Use of Marriage . . . 98

Article I. Concerning the Essence and End of Conjugal Copulation . . . 98

Article II. Concerning the Circumstances of Conjugal Copulation . . . 102

Article III. Concerning Accessory Acts Connected with Copulation . . . 107

Article IV. Concerning Excess in the Use of Marriage . . . 111

Article V. Concerning the Conjugal Debt and Concerning Defect in the Use of Marriage . . . 123

Publisher's Notices

Little Works Published by R. P. Merkelbach, O.P.

The little works published by Rev. Father Merkelbach, O.P., in the collection *Quaestiones Pastorales*, have been universally received with gratitude and approved with many praises.

II. Concerning Embryology and the Ministration of Baptism: 2nd Edition

This volume brings together and develops, somewhat more than general treatises of morals do, the questions relating to abortion, surgical interventions, and the administration of baptism. In these matters, which give rise to so many anguishing cases of conscience, one will learn with great interest the opinion of the eminent professor, whose fineness of analysis and rigor of reasoning are well enough known. He solidly proves the severe solutions proposed by the Church; he very happily refuses to proclaim a certain obligation when it cannot be proved in a sufficient manner.

J. Salsmans, S.J., *Nouvelle Revue Theologique*.

The doctrine in general is safe, the exposition clear and ordered, the end intended by the Author excellent. The little work will certainly prove useful, especially to priests who exercise the care of souls. We gladly recommend it.

Felice M. Capello, S.J., *Gregorianum*.

III. Concerning Various Categories of Penitents: 2nd Edition

The doctrines are clearly set forth, the arguments summarily but solidly proposed, the solutions frankly given. And we shall open this work with the certainty that we shall find what we are seeking. For everything is there that ought to be there, and there is more than one believed one would find. All kinds of penitents are reviewed, from children, the simple, occasionaries, the relapsed, the habitual, the sick, and so forth, up to the abnormal, the devout, the contemplatives, and so forth. The author profits from these diverse questions to sketch little special treatises: concerning contemplation and its degrees, concerning the morality of dances and dress, absolution of the excommunicated, temperaments. How many instructive things professors of pastoral theology do not have time to develop before their students! Here this is done by a master. Let confessors consult it: they will not regret it.

G. Kiselstein, *Revue Ecclesiastique de Liege*.

A truly excellent pastoral-theological treatment concerning the administration of the Holy Sacrament of Penance is given to us by Father M.... Through his clear expositions and sound judgment this book receives a value of its own, of great use for every confessor.

Studien.

IV. Concerning the Minister of Penance and His Offices: 2nd Edition

Very Reverend Father,

It is with lively gratitude that I have received your book *De Poenitentiae Ministro*; thank you for having sent it to me, and thank you also for having published it. I am persuaded that it is worthy of your earlier works.

Your studies of pastoral theology will thus constitute a whole of the very first value. I wish for your books the broadest and most lasting influence.

- J. E. Cardinal Van Roey, Archbishop of Mechlin.

They are both pastoral treatises, and will be acceptable to all shepherds of souls. The former deals with the confessor's treatment of various classes of penitents, much as St. Alphonsus did so well in the *Homo Apostolicus*. Father Merkelbach has given us the benefit of wide reading and a long experience. The second monograph deals with the confessor himself, his powers, jurisdiction, reservation, the Seal, etc. Though the seminarist will hardly have time to read them with all his other work, the priest on the mission should find time to do so.

The Month.

V. Concerning the Parts of Penance and the Dispositions of the Penitent

Like the two volumes which preceded it, this one is a summary of dogmatic and moral doctrine, and at the same time a precious manual of pastoral theology. It is the fruit of numerous readings but also of long reflections. To everything that he touches the author gives a stamp of order and measure, and he does not declare himself satisfied until he has rendered it solid with ideas proposed, explained, defended, and coordinated. Too modestly he entitles his works *Quaestiones Pastorales*. Read the present work, and you will see that it lacks no aspect which could figure in an extended treatise, not even the historical apercus drawn from universally esteemed authors. Here one will find what regards the matter of the sacrament of Penance, remote matter and proximate matter, that is, the acts of the penitent: contrition, confession, and satisfaction, with the diverse questions which one is accustomed to treat concerning them.

G. Kiselstein, *Revue Ecclesiastique de Liege*.