

Summa of Moral Theology.

Adapted for the use of schools

by

H. Noldin, S.J.

Professor of Sacred Theology in the University of Innsbruck.

First Complement:

On the Sixth Precept and on the Use of Matrimony.

With the approval of the Bishop of Brixen and of the superiors of the order.

On the Sixth Precept

and

On the Use of Matrimony.

Adapted for the use of schools

by

H. Noldin, S.J.

Professor of Sacred Theology in the University of Innsbruck.

Twelfth edition

(6000 copies).

With the approval of the Bishop of Brixen and of the superiors of the order.

Innsbruck.

By the types and at the expense of Fel. Rauch (L. Pustet).

Regensburg, Rome, and New York,

at Frederick Pustet.

1911.

Table of Contents

- Book First. On the Sixth and Ninth Precepts (p. 3)
 - Question 1. On chastity and virginity (p. 3)
 - Question 2. On lust in general (p. 6)
 - Article 1. On the nature of lust (p. 6)
 - Article 2. On the malice of lust (p. 10)
 - Question 3. On consummated sins of lust (p. 14)
 - Article 1. On sins according to nature (p. 14)
 - Article 2. On sins against nature (p. 21)
 - § 1. On pollution (p. 21)
 - § 2. On sodomy (p. 30)
 - § 3. On bestiality (p. 31)
 - Question 4. On non-consummated sins of lust (p. 35)
 - Article 1. On carnal motions (p. 35)
 - Article 2. On external sins (p. 38)
 - Article 3. On internal sins (p. 45)
- Book Two. On the Use of Marriage (p. 48)
 - Question 1. On the liceity of the conjugal act in itself (p. 48)
 - Article 1. On the liceity itself (p. 48)
 - Article 2. On sodomy and onanism (p. 53)
 - Question 2. On the liceity of the conjugal act by reason of circumstances (p. 59)
 - § 1. On the end (p. 59)
 - § 2. On situation and place (p. 60)
 - § 3. On time (p. 61)
 - Question 3. On the obligation of the conjugal act (p. 64)
 - Question 4. On licit things in marriage (p. 69)
 - Question 5. On the impediments of the conjugal act (p. 72)
 - Appendix. Notes for confessors (p. 76)
- Index of Subjects (p. 78)
- Printed Analytical Index (p. 82)

Book First.

On the Sixth and Ninth Precepts of the Decalogue.¹

“Thou shalt not commit adultery.” Ex. 20, 14.

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife.” Ibid. 20, 17.

The sixth precept of the Decalogue explicitly indeed prohibits adultery, or moechia, but implicitly any external lust whatever; but the ninth precept prohibits internal lust, namely that committed by depraved thoughts and desires. Therefore these two precepts, insofar as they are negative, prohibit all lust, both external and internal; but insofar as they are affirmative, they prescribe that chastity be preserved, suitable to each one’s state.

In prohibiting moechia, this precept prohibits everything which is contrary to the ordered propagation of the human race: for all these things are reduced to moechia as to the principal act contrary to ordered propagation.

Question First.

On Chastity and Virginity.

1. Definition. Chastity is a moral virtue which excludes or moderates the appetite of venereal delectation.

- a. Chastity is a virtue annexed to temperance. Temperance, which is one of the cardinal virtues, moderates the sensible appetite in those things which especially allure, namely both in delectations of taste, abstinence and sobriety, and in delectations of touch or of the flesh, chastity. Therefore chastity, which is opposed to the vice of lust, is a special virtue, whose material object is concupiscence of venereal delectation. For just as the virtue of abstinence moderates the appetite which is borne toward delectations of foods, so the virtue of chastity excludes or moderates the appetite which is borne toward venereal delectations. The formal object of chastity consists in the natural honesty which is detected in moderating the pleasures of the flesh according to the norm of reason.
- b. Excludes or moderates: for according to the diverse state in which someone is found, the precept of chastity either prohibits and excludes every venereal delectation altogether, or prescribes only its moderation. The former has place in the youthful and widowed state, the latter in the matrimonial state.

2. Division. a. Chastity is distinguished into common chastity, which in any state of life abstains from illicit venereal delectation, and the proper chastity of a determined state, which abstains from venereal delectation according to the laws of the state.

- b. By reason of the state to which it ought to correspond, a threefold chastity is distinguished: a. youthful chastity, which abstains from venereal delectation for a time, namely up to the time of nuptials; b. conjugal chastity, which abstains from illicit venereal pleasures in marriage; c. widowed chastity, which after the licit use of venereal delectation abstains from it for the future during the time of life or until second nuptials.

Notes

1. St. Thomas II-II, q. 151-156. St. Alphonsus, l. 3, n. 412-485. Lessius, *De iustitia et iure*, etc., l. 4, c. 2, dub. 13-16. Sporer-Bierbaum, *Theologia moralis decalog. et sacram.*³ (Paderborn: Typogr. bonifac., 1905), III, tr. IV, n. 467-697. Holzmann, *Theologia moralis* II, n. 653-723. Reuter, *Theologia moralis* II, n. 188-221. Lehmkuhl, *Theologia moralis* (Freiburg: Herder, 1902), I, 860-883. Ballerini-Palmieri, *Opus theologicum morale*³ (Prato: Giachetti, 1898), II, n. 959-1049. Gopfert, *Moraltheologie*⁵ (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1906), II, n. 210 ff. Berardi, *Praxis confessoriorum*⁴ (Faenza: Novelli, 1898), I, n. 820-1073. E. Genicot, *Theologia moralis*⁶ (Louvain: Polleunis et Geuterick, 1909), I, n. 386-411. Sani, *De sexto decalogi praecepto* (Ravenna: Serantoni, 1904). Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis* (Rome: Pustet, 1908).

- c. By reason of the mode by which it is preserved, chastity is distinguished into imperfect chastity, which contains itself from illicit pleasures of the flesh, and perfect chastity, which contains itself from all delectations of the flesh, even those licit in marriage.

3. On Virginity. 1. Virginity, or virginal chastity, is defined as a firm purpose of the will of abstaining perpetually from all venereal delectations, both illicit and licit, in marriage, in a subject never corrupted.

- a. The name of virginity is taken in a twofold sense: for it signifies either integrity of the flesh alone, or also a firm purpose of abstaining perpetually from every venereal delectation. Virginity taken in the first sense is not a virtue, but a good of nature bestowed on all from birth; but virginity taken in the other sense is a virtue.² In the first sense a woman can be a virgin who has never had carnal intercourse, even if she had sinned against chastity by solitary internal or external acts, because that integrity of the flesh remains which is required and suffices for virginity taken in this sense. Nor does the Church require another, more perfect virginity from those who receive the veil of virginity in the consecration of virgins: for according to the Roman Pontifical, before consecration they are to be questioned concerning life, conscience, and integrity of the flesh.³
- b. Therefore two things are required for virginity taken in the full sense, one of which is in the mind, but the other in the body: a. the purpose of the will, which is the formal element of virginity, wherefore without the purpose of preserving chastity perpetually, actual virginity can indeed exist, but neither virtue properly nor the reward of virtue is had; b. integrity of the flesh, which is the material element of virginity. Therefore material virginity consists in integrity of the flesh alone, and consequently does not exclude consent to venereal delectation; formal virginity consists in the will of preserving chastity, even if the integrity of the flesh is injured against the will.
- c. Wherefore a virgin can be intact either in body alone, or in mind alone, or in mind and body at the same time. She who is intact in body alone has lost before God the merit and beauty of virginity, but in the face of the Church is held as a virgin and can be consecrated among virgins. She who is intact in mind alone indeed retains before God the merit and reward of virginity, but in the face of the Church has lost virginity.
- d. Virginity differs from perfect chastity in this, that virginity adds the signification that the subject has never been corrupted by lust; therefore it is perfect chastity joined with integrity of the flesh. Chastity, on the contrary, prescind from integrity of the flesh, so that he who has previously already been corrupted by lust can preserve perfect chastity.
- e. A vow is not required for virginity; but for the most part the purpose of the will of abstaining perpetually from every venereal delectation is strengthened by a vow. Therefore St. Thomas writes: "Virginity, according as it is a virtue, imports a purpose, strengthened by a vow, of preserving integrity perpetually."⁴ With this vow added, the state of virginity is had.

Notes

2. From these things the distinction between the vow of virginity and the vow of perfect chastity is understood. The vow of virginity taken in the first sense is the promise of abstaining from that act, namely the conjugal act, by which the integrity of the flesh is injured; the vow of virginity taken in the other sense differs from the vow of perfect chastity only in this, that this vow directly and formally does not contain the promise of preserving the integrity of the body uninjured; on the contrary, the vow of virginity directly and formally also involves this promise.

3. Cf. Lessius, *De iustitia et iure*, l. 4, c. 2, n. 120. Ballerini-Palmieri II, n. 1048.

4. *Summa* II-II, q. 152, a. 3, ad 4.

5. Cf. Apoc. 14, 4, where male virgins are praised.

- f. Virginity is common to each sex;⁵ nevertheless women alone are usually called virgins, because they alone have been endowed by nature with the seal of virginity.
2. Virginity is a special virtue, which differs from common chastity in this, that it abstains not only from illicit but from all venereal delectations, and that it adds to it the purpose of preserving youthful chastity perpetually. And this indeed is that virtue which is celebrated with so many praises by the holy Fathers of the Church and is adorned in heaven with a special reward, namely the aureole of virgins.
 - a. Pudicity according to St. Thomas is not a special virtue distinct from chastity, but is chastity itself insofar as it moderates certain less principal acts pertaining to concupiscence of the flesh, which precede and accompany the principal act, carnal intercourse, namely looks, touches, kisses, embraces, base conversations, etc. Therefore chastity includes two things: purity (*Reinigkeit*), or abstinence from illicit effusion of semen, and pudicity (*Schamhaftigkeit*), or abstinence from every action which induces to lust.
 - b. Pudicity is named from shame. Shame (*Schamgefühl*), which especially shrinks from the denudation of the body, arises neither from custom nor from education, but has been implanted by nature, so that it is found even in barbarous and uncultivated peoples, and indeed in women with greater intensity and perfection than in men. The end, however, on account of which it has been implanted by God is this, that it may be the guardian of innocence and may aid man in restraining the carnal appetite. For this reason, on the one hand care must be taken that shame be excited, cultivated, and preserved in adolescents, but on the other hand that all things be removed which can offend, diminish, and gradually extinguish pudicity entirely.

4. How virginity is lost. Virginity can be lost in many ways: formally or materially, reparably or irreparably.

- a. Formal virginity is lost: a. through any mortal sin, whether external or internal, committed against chastity; b. through the intention of marrying, i.e. through the will of entering and consummating marriage. But through marriage alone without the will of consummating it, virginity is not lost.
- b. Material virginity is lost through voluntary violation of the flesh; therefore in men through pollution, in women through breaking of the virginal enclosure. Through involuntary violation of the flesh, as happens in men through effusion of semen in sleep, it is not lost; but in women, through violent oppression, it indeed is not lost before God, but in the face of the Church virgins of this kind are judged corrupted.⁶

Therefore both forms of virginity are lost through a voluntary action which injures the integrity of the body; therefore in men through effusion of semen, whether solitary or with intercourse; and in women both through intercourse and through another voluntary violation of the virginal enclosure. Nevertheless, in the face of the Church, a woman remains a virgin as long as the enclosure of virginity has not been violated through intercourse, and a man remains a virgin as long as he has not known a woman carnally.

- c. Virginity is lost: a. irreparably through a voluntary act by which the integrity of the body is injured; therefore through voluntary intercourse and through voluntary pollution. For just as innocence is lost irreparably by one mortal sin, so by one act of consummated lust virginity is irreparably lost, which signifies integrity of the flesh never voluntarily injured; b. reparably through the will of marrying and of consummating marriage and through any mortal sin of non-consummated lust: for integrity of the flesh remains, but the virtue lost can be recovered either by retraction or by penance.

Notes

6. Cf. A. Eschbach, *Disputationes physiologico-theologicae*² (Rome: Desclee, 1901), disp. 5, c. 2, a. 2.

- d. They indeed dispute whether through immodest acts voluntarily admitted without effusion of semen virginity is lost reparably or irreparably. But with Lessius (n. 121) it seems it must be said that through touches of this kind virginity is not lost irreparably: for as long as integrity of the flesh is preserved, the virtue is not lost irreparably.
- e. Therefore virginity not irreparably lost can be recovered: a. through the purpose elicited anew of preserving virginity perpetually, if it was lost only by a change of purpose; b. through penance, if virginity, with integrity of the flesh preserved, has been lost only through mortal sin against chastity. But if integrity of the flesh has been lost, virginity can no longer be recovered.

Note. If a penitent who has sinned against chastity asks whether he has irreparably lost virginity, ordinarily it is preferable not to declare this openly, but prudently to dissemble, e.g. by saying that every sin can be repaired through penance, lest the penitent, becoming discouraged and afflicted, neglect care for preserving chastity.

Question Second.

On Lust in General.

Article First.

On the Nature of Lust.

5. Declarations. There is especially a twofold propensity implanted in man by the author of nature: a propensity toward the conservation of the individual and a propensity toward the conservation and propagation of the species. The means of conserving the individual is nutrition; the means of conserving and propagating the species is the commingling of the sexes in legitimate marriage. Just as the author of nature, in order more easily and more certainly to obtain the end of conservation, added the delectation of taste to nutrition, so in order more easily and more certainly to obtain the end of propagation, he added the venereal delectation of the flesh to the commingling of the sexes. Lust is the inordinate appetite or use of venereal delectation.

In this definition, by the words appetite or use, internal and external acts of lust are comprehended. It is inordinate because it is done against the end intended by nature, which is the generation of offspring, as happens, for example, in pollution. The venereal, or a venereal thing, is properly called that which proximately pertains to generation: intercourse, effusion of semen or pollution, and venereal delectation. If the venereal thing is taken more broadly, so that it comprehends the whole matter of lust, then to it also belong those things which dispose toward intercourse and pollution: obscene touches and looks and impure thoughts. Therefore, for declaring the nature of lust, it is preferable first to set forth a brief description, taken from the physiologists, both of the members and of the actions which serve generation.⁷

1. The organs which in the male serve for accomplishing generation are especially three: the testicles, the seminal vesicles, and the virile member or urinary canal, which is also called the rod. And indeed in the testicles, after puberty has begun, the virile semen or sperm is elaborated; once elaborated, it is transmitted into the vesicles, in which, as in two receptacles, it is preserved until the time of ejaculating or eliciting it has arrived; but it is elicited through the urinary canal or virile member. The semen itself is a viscous humor in which little bodies are contained, which are called spermatozoa. Through the spermatozoa which it contains, the semen becomes prolific.

Notes

7. Cf. Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*² (Freiburg: Herder, 1893), p. 8 f. Eschbach, l. c., disp. 1, c. 2-5. Antonelli I, n. 76-90.

2. The organs which in the female are destined for generating a man are likewise numbered as three: the ovaries, in which from the years of puberty onward each month an ovule or germ matures; the uterus or womb, into which the egg, now mature and separated from the ovary, slowly proceeds; and finally the vagina, or a certain canal, which extends from the uterus to the external surface of the body. Its mouth is closed by a thin little membrane, which they call the hymen, and this hymen is called the seal or enclosure of virginity.

6. The act of generation. 1. The origin of a new man requires that the female egg be fecundated by virile semen; wherefore without union and commingling of each sex, a man cannot naturally be generated. This union and commingling of the sexes is accomplished by carnal intercourse or concubitus; namely, the man must insert the virile member into the female vessel or into the vagina and pour out semen into the inner parts of the uterus. By this twofold action, penetration of the female vessel and virile insemination, intercourse on the part of the man is completed. Now if the sperm of the virile semen is joined with the female ovule and penetrates it, the egg is fecundated, so that the organism of a human individual can be formed and developed from it. But since the female vessel is closed by the hymen, it is clear that in the first concubitus the virginal seal is broken by the virile member and therefore the virgin is deflowered.

From these things the distinction between active and passive generation is clear. Active generation consists in carnal intercourse, or in that action by which the virile member is inserted into the vessel, the vagina, of the female and semen is poured out there. Passive generation consists in the union of the virile semen with the female ovule in the uterus of the woman, or in fecundation. Therefore the man concurs toward generation by providing semen; but the woman concurs by supplying the egg to be fecundated by virile semen. If at the time of intercourse the woman has a mature egg and the semen of the man poured out in the uterus meets the egg, the semen is joined with the ovule, and in this way the egg is fecundated, whence conception, or the generation of a human individual, occurs.

2. The separation of virile semen and its effusion through the rod, whether it happens in intercourse or outside intercourse, is accomplished with a vehement commotion of the genital members and a sense of pleasure. Likewise, while the female in carnal congress with the man receives the virile semen, she herself undergoes irritation and commotion of the genital members, which ordinarily is followed by secretion of vaginal humor, which is joined with the greatest sense of pleasure. And this secretion the older authors indeed called female insemination, which happens sometimes before, sometimes after the insemination of the man. Women can experience the same commotion of the members, secretion of vaginal humor, and carnal pleasure also solitarily outside intercourse, and this pleasurable effusion they call female pollution. But the separation of the ovules and their passage into the womb, with nature itself guiding, is accomplished spontaneously in women without a sense of delectation or pleasure.

To the acts by which the commingling of each sex for the generation of a new man is accomplished, the author of nature added the greatest pleasure and delectation of all, and at the same time inserted into human nature a vehement concupiscence for that delectation, so that he might allure man to a thing in itself foul and burdensome in its consequences. Hence through carnal intercourse a twofold end is obtained at the same time: the generation of a new man and the quieting of concupiscence. The former is the primary end of intercourse, the latter the secondary. Therefore God ordered this carnal pleasure to the generation of a human individual, and therefore to the conservation of the species, just as he ordered the pleasure of food and drink to the conservation of the individual.

7. Venereal delectation, which is also called carnal or libidinous, is delectation arisen from the commotion of the organs and humors serving generation. By its nature it is an act of the sensitive appetite, to which the pleasurable sense existing in the genital organs is pleasing; but the pleasurable sense itself can also be called venereal delectation.

Delectation is defined as the rest or complacency of the appetite in a present or possessed good. Therefore, by its nature, delectation is an act of the appetite which takes complacency for itself concerning some good. Man obtains his good through the diverse powers with which he has been equipped: spiritual good through the higher powers, sensible good through the lower powers. He obtains it in this, that a power attains the object suitable to itself and is occupied by its activity about it. Now indeed, as often as any human power whatever, whether rational or sensitive, is occupied in acting about its object, delectation arises in the appetite: in the will indeed, if the intellect possesses its object; in the sensitive appetite, if sense possesses its object. But the power itself also rests in the object as in its own good, and the intellectual powers indeed rest in it spiritually, but the sensitive powers sensibly, i.e. possession of the object is joined with a certain grateful affection and sense of the power. Now not only the complacency of the appetite, but also that grateful affection and sense by which the power enjoys its object, pertains to delectation and constitutes its object. Therefore, according to the diverse nature of the goods which man seeks and acquires and possesses by means of his powers, diverse delectation is distinguished in the appetite, whether higher or lower.

- a. Purely spiritual delectation is delectation which arises from knowledge of some thing, as when someone rejoices concerning knowledge, long sought, of some truth; or it arises from the thing known itself, as when someone rejoices concerning truth, whose beauty he considers with delectation. This delectation resides wholly in the will, to which the knowledge of truth or the known truth itself is pleasing, and morally it is good or evil according as that which is pleasing is good or evil.
- b. Sensible spiritual delectation, which arises from a more vivid representation, but especially from sight or touch, an embrace or kiss, of a person loved with a tender but honorable affection, chiefly on account of spiritual qualities. This delectation resides in the will, but nevertheless it is vehement, so that it also redounds into the sensitive appetite, and it is joined with a commotion of the heart and blood. Delectation of this kind is accustomed to accompany the love by which a mother follows her son, a betrothed man his betrothed woman, a friend his friend. It is separated from carnal delectation; therefore of itself it is morally indifferent.
- c. Sensible delectation is delectation arisen from the perception of a sensible object which is aptly proportioned to the sensitive power. By its nature this delectation is a grateful and pleasant affection which is perceived in the very organs of the senses, e.g. from the smell of a flower, from the sight of the sky, from the hearing of music, from the taste of sugar, from the touch of a smooth thing, etc.; and concerning this affection the sensitive appetite is delighted. Touch or sight in these things is pleasing, and indeed of itself without venereal commotion; therefore this delectation of itself is indifferent.

A twofold sensible delectation can be distinguished: purely sensible, which arises from an object which of itself is not apt for exciting the venereal sense, as delectation arisen from the smell of a flower, from the touch of a rose; and sensual, which others call sensible-carnal, which arises from an object which of itself is apt for provoking the venereal sense, as delectation arisen from the touch or kiss of the hand of a woman, boy, or girl. This also resides wholly in the sensitive appetite; it becomes more vehement if it arises from the sight, touch, embrace, or kiss of a person loved with tender affection, and it is joined with a certain commotion of the heart and blood; and although of itself it is not carnal, nevertheless it easily excites carnal commotion.

8. Distinction of venereal delectation. 1. Venereal delectation can be twofold: complete and incomplete. Complete delectation is that which satiates nature, namely which proceeds to the ultimate terminus which is possible in a venereal matter; incomplete delectation is that which does not satiate nature, namely which arises from base commotion without proceeding to the ultimate terminus.

- a. If the organs which serve generation are excited, venereal delectation is perceived from their irritation and commotion. But every commotion of the genital members tends to this, that the semen be resolved and elicited. Now in the resolution and effusion of semen, whether it happens with intercourse or without intercourse, complete delectation is perceived; but if the commotion does not proceed to this terminus of effusion, incomplete venereal delectation is had.
 - b. Although boys before puberty do not yet have virile semen, nevertheless they are capable of complete carnal delectation: for from base commotion increased up to the ultimate terminus this delectation is perceived and is joined with effusion of urethral humor.
 - c. In the same way women, who do not have true semen, can perceive complete venereal delectation from commotion of the genital members. Delectation which satiates nature in women is for the most part joined with the separation of a certain vaginal humor, which nevertheless rather often is diffused into the interior parts, into the uterus or womb. This secretion of female humor, if it happens in intercourse, is called insemination; if it is provoked outside intercourse, it is called female pollution.
2. Complete and incomplete venereal delectation do not differ in moral species, but specifically constitute the same sin: for in incomplete venereal delectation the whole essence of this sin is found, namely true venereal delectation, which in complete delectation is increased only as to degree, unless the frustration of semen is added.

Therefore if those before puberty, especially boys, accuse themselves of dishonest touches, they are not to be questioned further; for since they are not capable of pollution, in dishonest touches, or rather in the venereal delectation which follows them, whether it is complete or incomplete, the lowest species of sin is already had.

9. Lust is defined as the inordinate appetite or use of venereal delectation.

- a. The order of nature established by God is that the use of venereal delectation take place only in legitimate marriage and according to the laws of marriage: for delectation is for the sake of the act, and this delectation indeed is for the sake of the act of generation, which can licitly be accomplished only in legitimate marriage. Therefore lust consists in venereal delectation voluntarily admitted outside marriage, or indeed in marriage, but against the laws of marriage.
- b. Delectation properly is in the sensitive appetite and has for its object the venereal sense; but the venereal sense is perceived in the very members which serve generation. Nevertheless, for the most part this same sense of libido is called venereal delectation. The sin of lust consists in its voluntary appetite or use against the order of nature.
- c. Impudicity is voluntary occupation about those things which induce venereal delectation, whether by thought, or by sight, or by touch, kiss, embrace. Therefore in acts of impudicity venereal delectation is not contained, nor is it necessarily joined with them, but they bring on its danger and frequently in fact bring it on. Therefore lust, which is directly opposed to chastity, includes two things: impurity, or illicit effusion of semen, whether with intercourse or outside intercourse, and impudicity, or voluntary occupation about those things which induce to lust.

10. Division of lust. a. Some lust is consummated, in which effusion of semen intervenes; other lust is non-consummated, in which effusion of semen is not had.

- b. Consummated lust either is according to nature, if the effect of generation is of itself possible; or against nature, if the effect of generation is of itself impossible.

- c. Non-consummated lust either is complete, if it reaches the ultimate natural terminus; or non-complete, if it does not attain the ultimate natural terminus.
- d. Non-complete lust either is lust properly so called, in which venereal delectation itself is had, or impudicity, in which venereal delectation is not had.
- e. Impudicity either is interior, which consists in internal acts of the phantasy, intellect, and will provoking lust, or exterior, which consists in external acts provoking lust.
- f. Lust by reason of intention is one thing directly, another indirectly, willed. The former is had when venereal delectation is intended in itself; the latter is had when in itself something else is intended, e.g. sight, reading, from which carnal delectation is foreseen to arise beside the intention.

Article Second.

On the Malice of Lust.

11. Principles. The proper malice of lust consists in this, that man abuses venereal delectation and semen, which are ordered by the author of nature only to the due propagation of the human race, for pleasure or for another end.

- 1. Venereal delectation directly and in itself willed outside marriage is a grave sin. a. For it is gravely illicit in a grave matter to seek delectation against the order of nature; but he who seeks venereal delectation outside marriage does this, for venereal delectation has been instituted by nature for that act alone which serves generation; but this act, with nature itself requiring, is the conjugal act. b. Moreover, that is gravely illicit which, if it were not prohibited, would redound to the gravest harm of the human race; but if men could licitly enjoy venereal delectation and in this way quiet concupiscence outside marriage, most would refuse the burdens of marriage, with the gravest detriment to the human race. c. Therefore lust of any genus whatever is gravely prohibited by God, since it is numbered among the sins which exclude from the kingdom of God: The works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, lust ... those who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God.⁸ Every fornicator or unclean person ... has no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.⁹ Do not err: neither fornicators ... nor adulterers, nor the soft, nor those who lie with males ... shall possess the kingdom of God.¹⁰
- a. Although not all sins of lust are enumerated in these texts, nevertheless it is gathered from them that all are grave, both because the works of the flesh are generically exhibited as grave sins, and because the supreme species of lust, namely perfect acts, pollution, sodomy, fornication, and imperfect acts, uncleanness and immodesty, are exhibited as grave sins.¹¹
- b. Although the sin of lust is not judged among the graver mortal sins, nevertheless, if it is perpetrated by a Christian man, a certain peculiar foulness belongs to it which is not found in other sins, because this sin is committed in one's own body. For the body of a Christian, washed in the blood of Christ in baptism, has been made the temple of God through the indwelling Holy Spirit; but through the sin of lust this body, sanctified by the reception of the sacraments, especially of the Eucharist, is profaned and execrated, inasmuch as it becomes the object of sin.¹²

Notes

8. Gal. 5, 19 ff.

9. Eph. 5, 5.

10. 1 Cor. 6, 9 f.

11. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri II, n. 965.

12. Cf. 1 Cor. 6, 11-19.

2. Venereal delectation directly willed does not admit smallness of matter, and therefore always, however slight and brief, is a mortal sin. For that is a grave sin which exposes man to proximate danger of sinning gravely; but any venereal delectation directly sought or freely admitted is of this kind, although slight: for venereal delectation, once freely admitted or sought, naturally and necessarily snatches one toward complete delectation.¹³
 - a. Therefore any action whatever which is placed with this intention, that through it venereal pleasure may be excited and perceived, even if brief and slight, is a grave sin, whether this action in itself is honorable or dishonorable: for the depraved intention is gravely sinful. The reason why other sins which man commits against himself or against neighbor admit smallness of matter, but sins of lust do not admit it, is this: that the former, admitted in small matter, do not cast one into proximate danger of sinning gravely, but the latter, on account of the highest propensity of human nature toward delectations of the flesh, cast one into danger of this kind. Sacred Scripture also intimates this danger: for she has cast down many wounded, and the strongest have been slain by her.¹⁴
 - b. There are those who show even from the very nature of this vice that slight delectation deliberately sought contains grave injury of the moral order. For any venereal delectation, so they say, arises from commotion of semen, which commotion naturally causes pollution; indeed it must be called begun pollution. Therefore what is affirmed concerning the malice of pollution, namely that it is a grave sin, must be affirmed also concerning its natural cause and beginning. It is clear that this argument does not have universal value, since venereal delectation is perceived which is not begun pollution, namely in those who, as lacking semen, such as boys, eunuchs, the aged, and women, are not capable of pollution.
 - c. Authors are not lacking, especially among the older ones, who think that there is smallness of matter in venereal delectation directly sought or admitted. In the year 1612, the general superior of the Society of Jesus, Claudius Aquaviva, most severely prescribed that no one in the Society of Jesus should hold this opinion, not only as true or probable, but not even as tolerable. From that time this sentence, that there is no smallness of matter in venereal delectation directly sought, became most common among moralists. Nevertheless there are those who deny that the truth of this sentence is speculatively proved from the arguments brought forward. Whatever may be said concerning the theoretical reasons by which the opinion admitting smallness of matter is proved false and improbable, practically it is certainly false and not sufficiently safe.¹⁵
3. In venereal delectation only indirectly willed, smallness of matter must be admitted. For in this case the consent of the will is borne only toward the cause which provokes and excites delectation; therefore its malice must be taken from its influence upon venereal delectation. But there are causes which influence base commotion only lightly; therefore to will these causes constitutes only a light sin against chastity.

12. Principle concerning the gravity of venereal delectation willed in the cause. Venereal delectation indirectly, or in the cause, willed is only as much sin as the cause itself is in the genus of lust. Therefore if the cause is a grave sin in the genus of lust, the effect of base delectation is imputed as grave sin; if the cause in the genus of lust is a light sin, the effect of delectation is imputed as light sin. Now indeed, a grave

Notes

13. Proposition 40, condemned by Alexander VII: The opinion is probable which says that a kiss had on account of carnal and sensible delectation which arises from the kiss, with the danger of further consent and pollution excluded, is only venial. Authors indeed do not agree in explaining the sense of this proposition. According to Viva, it is false because it affirms that venereal delectation, for this is the carnal delectation of the proposition, sought from a kiss is venial if the danger of further consent and pollution has been excluded.

14. Prov. 7, 26.

15. Cf. Sporer-Bierbaum III, tr. 10, n. 690.

sin in the genus of lust is any action whatever which by its nature gravely influences the exciting of libido; a light sin in the genus of lust is an action which by its nature only lightly influences the exciting of libido.

- a. Venereal delectation willed in the cause is had by any deliberately placed action which is foreseen to cause base commotion and venereal delectation, whether incomplete or complete, without this effect being intended. Now the question is asked concerning the gravity of the sin of lust which is committed by him who places the cause exciting delectation, who, for example, reads obscene things or uses a bath, although he foresees that venereal commotion will follow. But the gravity of the sin of lust which one placing a cause of this kind commits is not taken from the degree of malice which is present of itself in the action causing base delectation, but from the gravity of the influence which this action exercises in exciting it. Therefore it can happen that an action causing delectation is in itself a grave sin, but by reason of lust only a light one. Thus if someone, making himself drunk, foresees that pollution will follow in drunkenness, the drunkenness is in itself a grave sin, but by reason of lust light, because it influences it only lightly.
- b. There are actions of which some cause a base motion of themselves, others cause it accidentally. Those actions cause it of themselves which by their nature are apt for exciting venereal delectation and therefore are ordered to generation, as a base look, touch, imagination. Those actions cause it accidentally which in no way pertain to generation. There are men who, from actions, imagination or sight, which are in no way referred to venereal matters, are vehemently excited by a hidden force. Of actions which cause a base motion of themselves, some by their nature proximately and notably influence that effect, namely those from which a base effect always or almost always follows; others by their nature influence a base motion only remotely and lightly, namely those from which an evil effect rarely arises. Actions which are outside the genus of lust and only accidentally excite a base motion, such as eating and drinking immoderately, riding, using a bath, sitting or lying in a certain position, etc., are counted among those actions which influence the base effect only remotely and lightly. But if at times they influence gravely, this proceeds not from the nature of the action but from the constitution of the subject.

Note 1. There are authors who distinguish accidentally influencing causes in such a way that they say that those which, from a special disposition of the subject, vehemently excite are gravely illicit if they are rare and can easily be avoided, but lightly illicit if they are frequent and therefore cannot be avoided without the greatest inconvenience. For example, there are those who are vehemently excited by the sight of a female foot; there are those who are vehemently excited by the sight of the slaughtering of animals. Those who without cause are delighted by the former sight sin lightly; those who are delighted by the latter, according to this sentence, sin gravely. But this distinction must be omitted, since the degree of malice which is present in actions of this kind must be taken not from the actual influence which they exercise in a particular case, but from the influence which by their nature they exercise. But of themselves and by their nature actions of this kind do not influence at all, or influence only lightly, and only accidentally in a determined individual do they produce a worse effect.

Note 2. As regards this proposition concerning the gravity of venereal delectation willed in the cause, these things must be admonished: a. It is supposed that there is no just cause for placing the action from which base commotion is foreseen to arise; for if a cause of this kind exists, it is licit to place the action. b. It is supposed that there is no consent to the delectation that occurs; for every consent of this kind is a grave sin. c. An action which, without cause, is placed and foreseen to cause carnal delectation is a sin, even if the depraved effect does not in fact follow; but if that effect follows, not only is the action sinful in itself, but also the depraved effect is imputed to the agent, and indeed under grave or light obligation according as the cause influences it gravely or lightly. d. What is established here concerning the cause of venereal delectation is valid also concerning the cause of pollution: for the same action which is foreseen to excite

venereal commotion can, in those who are capable of pollution, cause also pollution, or commotion joined with pollution.

13. Corollaries. Therefore venereal delectation, or pollution, willed in the cause is a grave sin if the cause itself of itself gravely influences base commotion. But it is established by experience that not all are moved in an equal way by one and the same action: for what vehemently excites a young or warm man moves an old or cold man little or not at all to libido. Hence for estimating the sin which is committed by indirectly voluntary delectation in a particular case, these things are to be noted:

- a. Actions which by their nature gravely excite are always a grave sin, and therefore must be guarded against under grave obligation, except in the sole case in which someone knows certainly by experience that he is not gravely moved by an action of this kind.

Actions gravely exciting, for example, are: “more vivid practical thought concerning venereal matters; touch exercised on the obscene parts of another person, unless perhaps it is done altogether transiently on a person of the same sex without depraved affection; voluntarily continued sight of a person of the other sex entirely naked; indeed also the sight of a man upon the naked breast of a woman, or the sight of an obscene picture, at least if it is continued when commotion has already arisen.”¹⁶

- b. Actions which by their nature move only lightly are never a grave sin, not even in him who perhaps knows that he is more vehemently excited on account of a subjective disposition; therefore no one is held under grave obligation to guard against them.

Actions lightly moving, for example, are: “touch or sight upon the dishonorable parts of one’s own body done in passing; a non-dishonorable and light touch of a woman done in passing; taking her hand; a light kiss from an honorable cause; vain conversation with a woman; a non-fixed sight of her breast, a fortiori other lighter looks.”¹⁷

Note 1. Below, where there is treatment of imperfect acts of lust, as much as can be done in this very arduous matter, it will be determined accurately what actions by their nature gravely influence venereal commotion and pollution, and what actions lightly influence them.

Note 2. Recent authors after St. Alphonsus,¹⁸ who followed the Salmanticenses,¹⁹ distinguish, besides actions gravely and lightly influencing, actions influencing moderately. But lest this matter, which in practice is most frequent, be entangled in greater difficulties than is fitting, it is preferable to return to the theory of those older authors who reduce actions causing venereal delectation to only two genera, to grave and light causes. For, as Berardi rightly notes,²⁰ those which are called middle causes by their nature are light causes, but they gravely influence the base effect either from the duration of the action or from the depraved affection of the agent, in which case they must be referred to grave causes. Thus among middle causes is numbered the sight of an obscene picture; but sight of this kind ordinarily of itself does not gravely move, unless it is prolonged rather long or is done with libidinous affection.²¹

Whether invincible ignorance is found concerning sins of lust. a. Invincible ignorance is more easily admitted as regards impure thoughts and depraved desires, if they are inefficacious. b. But as regards

Notes

16. Lehmkuhl I, n. 864.

17. Lehmkuhl, *ibid.*

18. Cf. I. 4, n. 484.

19. Cf. tr. 26, c. 7, n. 37.

20. Cf. *Praxis confessoriorum* 3 I, n. 876.

21. Cf. Genicot I, 399.

efficacious desires it is conceded with greater difficulty: for he who knows the malice of the external action and nevertheless proposes to execute it ought also to know that he wills an evil thing. Therefore in a particular case it must be investigated whether invincible ignorance was really present. c. Even as regards the malice of pollution, invincible ignorance can be found, especially in childhood. d. Indeed even as regards other sins, invincible ignorance can be found in those circumstances in which actions of this kind can seem licit; thus to the betrothed even less honorable kisses, and to spouses burdened with numerous offspring onanism, can seem licit.

Those who from invincible ignorance think that the depraved action which they exercise either is not a sin or is not mortal are altogether to be admonished and taught where ignorance harms them. But this happens if, not admonished, they are in danger of contracting a depraved custom of polluting themselves, which afterward they will correct with the greatest difficulty. But penitents who indeed know the gravity of the base sin to which they are accustomed, but are ignorant of its specific malice, are not to be admonished concerning this, because an admonition of this kind is scarcely of any utility and only brings it about that formal sins are multiplied.

Question Third.

On Consummated Sins of Lust.

14. Declarations. Those sins are called consummated in which effusion of semen has place. They are of two genera: some are according to nature, in which the effusion of semen of itself is apt for the generation of man; others are against nature, in which the effusion of semen is unfit for the generation of man. In the former, the end which nature intends in the voluntary effusion of semen is obtained; in the latter, it is frustrated. Wherefore sins against nature are of themselves graver than sins of lust according to nature.

- a. Sins according to nature are numbered as six: fornication, adultery, incest, defilement, sacrilege, and rape. These sins differ specifically among themselves, not indeed by reason of lust, but on account of another special circumstance: for they are opposed to the virtue of chastity in the same way, but to each one there is superadded a circumstance which is properly not against chastity, but against another virtue.
- b. Sins against nature are three: pollution, sodomy, and bestiality. These sins differ from one another in species by reason of lust, because each includes a special deformity and opposition against the virtue of chastity.

Article First.

On Sins According to Nature.

15. On fornication. Definition. Fornication is intercourse of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman by mutual consent.

- a. Intercourse is an act suitable for generating offspring. Perfect intercourse is distinguished, which consists in penetration of the female vessel with insemination made there, and imperfect, or begun, intercourse, which consists in penetration of the female vessel destined for generation, but without insemination made there. An unmarried man is one who, apart from the precept of chastity, is bound by no other bond, whether of marriage or of vow or order or kinship. By consent is added so that fornication may be distinguished from defilement. Effusion of female humor is not required for perfect intercourse, contrary to what several older authors had taught.
- b. Intercourse of a eunuch with an unmarried woman is not fornication, but impure touch with complete venereal delectation. Imperfect intercourse in which semen is poured out outside the female vessel is not simple fornication, but qualified fornication, because to the sin of fornication against chastity there

is added a sin which is reduced to sins against justice, because semen is frustrated against the order of nature and the end of human generation.

16. Concubinage and prostitution are referred to fornication.

1. Concubinage is frequent intercourse of an unmarried man with one and the same unmarried person. It differs from fornication in this, that a concubinarian always approaches the same person with whom he lives as if he had been joined with her in marriage; but a fornicator approaches now one, now another. Nevertheless, it has no bearing on the nature of concubinage whether they live in the same or in diverse houses. Therefore the proper malice of concubinage consists in the purpose, at least virtual, of persevering in sin.
 - a. Because a concubinarian is occupied in a proximate occasion of sinning, which he is held under grave obligation to abandon, he cannot be absolved unless he casts out the concubine; or if he does not have her at home, unless he has seriously promised that he will no longer approach her. And if he has a concubine at home, he ought to cast her out, even if he is in danger of death; and only where death is now imminent and time is lacking for casting her out can he be absolved, after eliciting a firm purpose of casting her out as soon as it can be done.
 - b. If in some parish two persons live in concubinage, one must proceed against them in this way.
 - c. First, they are to be admonished privately by the pastor, or by others, so that they amend themselves and make an end of a depraved and scandalous life.
 - d. If the admonition lacks effect, the matter is to be referred to the ordinary, who by his office ought to admonish public sinners; this can also be done by the pastor in the name of the bishop.
 - e. But if this admonition also is fruitless, the ordinary is to inflict excommunication, either publicly, to remove scandal, or privately through the pastor. Those who do not amend themselves are to be deprived of ecclesiastical burial.
 - f. If ecclesiastical admonition lacks effect, the help of the civil power can and must be invoked where this is offered.
2. Prostitution is the state of a woman prostituted to all, whether for the sake of gain or of satisfying lust. In order that she can be called a prostitute, she must admit at least more than two. The proper malice of this sin also consists in the depraved will of accumulating sins.

Note. Fornicators are to be asked whether offspring has been born from the fornication, whether they impeded generation or procured abortion, whether perhaps they neglected the offspring born. As regards prostitutes it must be noted that many and diverse seeds in the womb impede generation.

17. Malice. 1. Fornication is always a mortal sin: for it is gravely prohibited both by the law of nature and by positive law.

- a. By the law of nature. Caramuel had said that fornication is illicit only by positive law, but falsely: for it is opposed to the good of offspring and therefore to the propagation of the human race. Certainly those who fornicate seek vague concubitus, i.e. venereal delectation of intercourse without the obligations and burdens of marriage; but vague concubitus tends to the destruction of human society. For offspring, whose apt education requires not only the care of the mother but also the care of the father, is not sufficiently provided for; therefore it is gravely prohibited by the law of nature. And although accidentally offspring might be educated well by a fornicator, nevertheless fornication is always a grave sin, because what happens commonly and ordinarily must be considered, not what happens accidentally.²²

b. By positive law. St. Paul, in the places cited above, n. 11, counts fornication among the sins which exclude from the kingdom of heaven; moreover, in 1 Cor. 6, 15 ff., he shows by many internal reasons the deformity of fornication.

2. Concubinage and prostitution do not differ specifically from fornication; wherefore the circumstance of concubinage and prostitution of itself need not be declared in confession. But accidentally, on account of the occasion of sin, it must be declared to the confessor, especially when he asks. From the great number of sins which are accused, the confessor can easily suspect that there is question of concubinage or prostitution.

18. On prostitution. 1. Prostitution is lust exercised by women for pay. Public prostitution, which is distinguished from clandestine prostitution, is called that which is permitted by the civil power and is either unlimited or limited and moderated according to certain norms of morality and health.

Namely, only to women to whom a certificate of health is granted by physicians is permission conceded for exercising prostitution, and this only under certain conditions by which public morality is provided for.

Clandestine prostitution especially flourishes where public prostitution is not admitted by the civil power; but even in states which admit public prostitution, clandestine prostitution prevails.²³

2. But if the public power is said to permit prostitution, permission must be understood in such a way that it tolerates what it cannot impede without a greater evil; and the laws by which it moderates it tend to this, that harms to public honesty and health may be avoided.

a. The magistrate can admit clandestine prostitution as a lesser evil for impeding greater evils, pollution, sodomy, bestiality, etc.

b. Prostitutes certainly cannot be permitted by reason of the vehemence by which the carnal appetite inclines toward venereal matters, nor by reason of health, which would require that satisfaction be given to the rising carnal appetite; nor can they be permitted in any village whatever, but only in great cities and under certain conditions by which scandals are removed. Recent non-Catholic physicians judge each reason brought forward sufficient so that prostitutes can be admitted. But the will ought to resist the carnal appetite, however vehement, as it resists all other temptations; moreover, according to the authorship of physicians themselves, health is not endangered by the fact that the carnal appetite is repressed.

c. Whether greater evils are truly impeded through prostitution, or whether rather sins are increased by greater opportunity of sinning, is not established among experts. According to the mind of St. Augustine²⁴ and St. Thomas,²⁵ they can be impeded through prostitutes.

d. There are those who judge that public prostitution must be reprov'd and abolished. For the laws by which it is moderated tend to this, that harms to public honesty and health may be avoided; but experience being witness, these evils, especially dangers to health, are not excluded. For even from those for whom a certificate of health is at hand, innumerable persons are infected with syphilis, which authors call the French disease, and from these the same plague is derived also into mother and offspring.

Notes

22. Therefore this proposition, 48, was condemned by Innocent XI: Thus it seems clear that fornication involves no malice in itself and is evil only because it is forbidden, so that the contrary seems altogether discordant with reason.

23. In Berlin there are 5000 public prostitutes and 40000 clandestine ones; in Vienna 2000 public ones and 20000 clandestine ones.

24. *De ordine*, l. 2, c. 4.

25. Cf. St. Thomas II-II, q. 10, a. 11, and the author of the work *De regimine principum*, l. 4, c. 14.

- e. Brothels seem in no way to be tolerated: for first, through a brothel provision is not made for health; but great harm is brought to morality both because an easy occasion of sinning is offered and because sin appears as if permitted by law.

19. On adultery. Definition. Adultery is intercourse with the spouse of another. Simple adultery is distinguished, if an unmarried man sins with a married woman or a married man with an unmarried woman; double adultery, if a married man sins with a married woman.

- a. Where adultery is reserved, attention must be paid to whether only perfect intercourse or also imperfect intercourse is reserved.
- b. The nature of adultery is also had by: a. imperfect acts, namely touches, kisses, embraces, which a married person commits with another person not his own, whether that person is unmarried or bound; b. acts against nature, pollution, sodomy, which a married person commits either alone or with his own partner. But venereal delectations which a married person excites in himself by imagining intercourse with another do not have the nature of adultery, because this does not injure the right of the other spouse.
- c. Therefore if an adult penitent accuses himself of the sin of pollution or of immodest touches committed either in his own body or on another person, by strict right he must be asked whether he is joined in marriage. Nevertheless, because those who are untrained in moral matters do not apprehend the twofold malice which is present in these sins, the question can frequently be omitted, unless the confessor hopes that, after the penitent has been admonished concerning the greater gravity of the sin, he can frighten him away from committing new sins.

20. Malice. 1. Adultery includes two sins, each mortal: one against justice, for the adulterer violates the right of another, which by the matrimonial contract he alone has acquired over the body of the spouse; the other against chastity. And if adultery is had between two married persons, two adulteries are committed by each, and therefore three sins: one against chastity and two against justice, because the diverse rights of two persons are injured.

A married woman who commits adultery at that time when she can conceive offspring contracts another injustice besides, both against the husband, who perhaps will have to nourish spurious offspring to be conceived, and against the legitimate offspring, who are compelled to divide the inheritance with the spurious offspring.

- 2. Adultery is committed even if the other spouse consents, because he cannot yield his right: for the right which follows from the very nature of marriage cannot be alienated by the private will of the spouse.²⁶ Therefore St. Paul says generally concerning a married woman: while her husband is living, she will be called an adulteress if she has been with another man.²⁷

Whether intercourse with another's betrothed woman is adultery. Intercourse with another's betrothed woman is fornication, not adultery, because this aggravating circumstance does not change the species. For it is commonly called probable that the sin of the betrothed with an external person does not contain grave injustice against the other party.²⁸

In fact, doctors in resolving this question so dissent that some simply deny that the circumstance of betrothal changes the species of fornication; others say that it changes the species of fornication in the betrothed

Notes

26. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri III, n. 273.

27. Rom. 7, 3. Proposition 50, condemned by Innocent XI, has: intercourse with a consenting married woman is not adultery ...

28. St. Alphonsus, n. 847.

woman, but not in the betrothed man; and finally others affirm that it changes the species of fornication in each. The proper malice of this sin consists in the abuse by which a body promised to another is violated, therefore in injury to the right of another, to whom belongs a right over the body which had been promised incorrupt. Now this injury inflicted by a betrothed woman is certainly graver than that which is committed by a betrothed man; but whether it is so great that it constitutes a new species, and indeed a grave species, of sin, is not certainly established. Wherefore it is not necessary that the penitent declare the circumstance of betrothal, nor that the confessor ask about it.²⁹

21. On incest. Definition. 1. Incest is intercourse with blood relatives or relatives by affinity within the degrees prohibited by the Church for marriage. Therefore it belongs to the nature of incest that it be committed between those blood relatives and relatives by affinity who, according to the law of the Church, cannot enter a valid marriage, i.e. up to the fourth degree.

- a. Base touches which are committed between blood relatives and relatives by affinity, whether of the same or of diverse sex, also have the nature of incest.
 - b. If blood relatives or relatives by affinity sin after they have been dispensed for entering marriage, they do not commit incest, because the dispensation removes the prohibition of marriage; but where marriage is not prohibited, there is no incest.
 - c. The sin which those bound by the impediment of public honesty commit between themselves is not incest, because it belongs to the nature of incest that it be committed between blood relatives and relatives by affinity; but those who are bound by the impediment of public honesty are neither blood relatives nor properly relatives by affinity.
2. Since, besides affinity, kinship is threefold, natural, which arises from nearness of blood; spiritual, which arises from baptism and confirmation; and legal, which arises from adoption, a fourfold incest must be distinguished:
- a. with a blood relative up to the fourth degree;
 - b. with a relative by affinity up to the fourth, respectively up to the second degree;
 - c. with a spiritual relative;
 - d. with a legal relative.

A sin of lust committed by a confessor with a penitent does not have the nature of incest, because spiritual kinship arises only from the administration of baptism and confirmation, not from the sacrament of penance. Nor is a sin of lust committed by a pastor with a parishioner incest; but besides the guilt of lust this also puts on the malice of injustice, because a shepherd by office ought to draw back from sins the sheep entrusted to his care.

22. Malice. 1. Incest contains two grave sins, one against chastity, the other against piety: for it is repugnant to the reverence which is owed to parents and consequently also to persons joined with them either by blood or by affinity.

2. As regards specific difference: a. Incest between spiritual and legal relatives differs in species both among themselves and from incest which is committed between blood relatives and relatives by affinity; but it is commonly admitted that incest committed with a blood relative does not differ in species from incest committed with a relative by affinity. The reason is that kinships arise from a formally diverse root; but

Notes

29. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri II, n. 1007.

sins between blood relatives and relatives by affinity are prohibited from the same motive of piety; in each case the same reverence owed to blood is injured.

- b. It is probable that incests committed between blood relatives or between relatives by affinity in any degree whatever, whether of the direct line, even in the first degree between parents and children, or of the collateral line, even in the first degree between brothers and sisters, are of the same species. Wherefore, just as it is not necessary that the connection, consanguinity or affinity, be declared in confession, so it is not necessary that the degree be declared; but it suffices to say: I committed incest. For in all of them the same virtue is injured, namely the reverence owed to those joined, and in the same way as regards substance; wherefore diversity of connection and the nearer degree add nothing to the sin except an aggravating circumstance.³⁰

St. Alphonsus, n. 448 f., excepts the first degree of consanguinity and affinity in the direct line, judging that the reverence which is owed within the first degree is morally other than that which is owed within the other degrees. But this sentence is not certain. Indeed Suarez, *De poenitentia*, disp. 22, sect. 3, n. 12, says: "Concerning the degrees of consanguinity, insofar as they are circumstances of incest ... it is more probable that they do not change the species of sin."

23. On defilement. Definition. 1. *Stuprum* is taken in three diverse senses: broadly it is the violation of any woman, even a widow, a corrupted woman, or a married woman, where adultery is added to *stuprum*; juridically, in civil law, it is the violation of any honorable woman, whether she is a virgin or not; theologically, in canon law, it is the violation of a virgin, or the deflowering of a virgin, against her will.³¹

Violation is the violating of a woman without consent; therefore to fornicate with a woman out of her mind, drunk, sleeping, likewise with a girl who has not yet obtained the perfect use of reason, has the nature of *stuprum*. A virgin is said to be deflowered who is corrupted for the first time through carnal intercourse and in this way is deprived of integrity of the flesh and of the flower of virginity.

2. *Stuprum* taken strictly or theologically is distinguished as violent and voluntary, according as a virgin is violated against her will or plainly consenting. It is clear that voluntary *stuprum* properly does not differ from fornication; nevertheless it is sometimes called *stuprum* because a virgin is deflowered, even with consent. But *stuprum* is called violent not only where physical force is applied, but also where moral force is applied; for in each case injury is inflicted on the virgin.

Violent *stuprum* can be committed in five ways: a. by violent oppression; b. by threats or by fear unjustly instilled, even reverential fear, as if the defiler is a superior or a man of great authority; c. by deceit, as if someone abuses a girl's ignorance and brings her to intercourse which he had said was licit; d. by fraud, as by a false promise of marriage or of a great dowry; e. by oppressing a virgin in sleep or drunkenness.

24. Malice. 1. Every *stuprum* properly so called, or violent, contains two sins, one against chastity, the other against justice: for whatever woman is oppressed against her will, always her true right is injured, and therefore injury is inflicted on her.

- a. He who corrupts a consenting virgin by non-violent *stuprum* does not commit a sin specifically diverse from fornication: for although integrity of the flesh, of which the virgin is deprived, is a good to be held at a great price, nevertheless no injury is inflicted on the virgin, since she can consent to the violation of herself and in fact consents.³² But it is rightly affirmed that a virgin who freely consents to her own

Notes

30. Cf. Sporer-Bierbaum III, pr. 4, n. 609; Ballerini-Palmieri II, n. 1016 ff.

31. Cf. c. *Lex* 2, C. 36, q. 1.

deflowering, besides the sin of lust, commits the sin of prodigality, since she rashly casts away the good of bodily integrity, and therefore that the circumstance of virginity in a woman adds a new species of sin to fornication. But since the sin of prodigality is not mortal, it is not necessary that it be declared in confession.

- b. He who oppresses a virgin against her will properly commits a twofold injury, since he abuses her body against her will and moreover deprives her of virginity by tearing the virginal enclosure.³³
- 2. *Stuprum* which is affected by an ecclesiastical penalty or is reserved is understood as *stuprum* in the strict sense, namely the unjust deflowering of a virgin, unless something else is expressly noted.

In order that a woman oppressed by force be immune from sin:

- a. she cannot have herself negatively or permissively, but is held to resist both internally, lest she consent to pleasure, and externally, so that she repel force by force.
- b. But she is not held to cry out if this cannot be done without danger of life or notable infamy or without excessive shame, unless proximate danger of consent to the consummated act is imminent. For the rest, as Berardi notes well, the case of a woman oppressed without fault of her own, i.e. altogether against her will, is not so frequent.

25. On sacrilege. Definition. Sacrilege, insofar as it is a sin of lust, or sacrilegious lust, is the violation of a sacred person, place, or thing through a venereal act.

Therefore carnal sacrilege, or sacrilegious lust, is likewise threefold, personal, local, and real, just as sacrilege itself considered in itself, which is a species of irreligiosity.

26. Malice. 1. Sacrilege contains two sins, one against chastity, the other against religion: for it is repugnant to the reverence owed to God in sacred persons, places, and things.

- 2. Personal sacrilege is committed if a person bound by a vow of chastity sins against chastity, internally or externally,³⁴ or if someone sins with one who has such a vow.

If one bound by vow, e.g. a priest, sins with a person likewise bound by vow, each commits two sacrileges; if a religious priest sins against chastity, he commits one sacrilege, because he injures one obligation imposed twice from the same motive.

- 3. Local sacrilege is committed through an external sin of lust in a sacred place. And this indeed is certain concerning pollution, fornication, and conjugal intercourse which moral necessity does not excuse; but concerning other gravely immodest acts, touches, kisses, looks, conversations, this must probably be denied.³⁵

But internal acts certainly are not sacrileges, namely grave sacrileges: for some malice of light sacrilege is present in every sin which is committed in a church.

A sacred place in this question is a consecrated or blessed church, or public oratory, and this only from the roof to the pavement, and a blessed cemetery. Therefore private, or semipublic, oratories are not sacred

Notes

32. Cf. St. Alphonsus, n. 443.

33. Sanchez, *De matrimonio*, l. 7, disp. 14, n. 7.

34. Cf. *De praeceptis* 3, n. 177, where the explanation of this matter is given.

35. Cf. *ibid.*, n. 178.

places, nor is the sacristy, at least if it is not part of the building itself of the church, but if it is built exteriorly, nor the atrium of the church, nor the roof above the church.

4. Real sacrilege is committed through the abuse of a sacred thing for base things, as if a Mass were promised for obtaining consent to a base matter, or if a priest administering a sacrament, or refreshed by Holy Communion, at a time when the sacred species are not yet corrupted, were to sin carnally. To this also belongs that gravest sacrilege of solicitation in confession, by which a confessor abuses the sacrament of penance for a base sin.

27. On raptus. Definition. Raptus, insofar as it is a sin of lust, is the violent abduction of any person whatever for the sake of satisfying libido. The proper malice of raptus consists in the injury which is inflicted through violent abduction.

- a. Therefore for raptus it is required: a. that abduction or transfer from one place to another morally diverse place occur; b. with force inflicted, either physical or moral, either on the abducted person herself or on those in whose power she is: parents, guardians, a husband; c. for the sake of libido. Hence, if she is abducted for another end, e.g. that she may be used for services or for entering marriage, it is not a sin of lust; d. of any person whatever, whether this person is male or female, whether a virgin or corrupted, whether married or unmarried.
- b. Hence he does not commit raptus who inflicts force on a person in the same place, nor he who for the sake of exercising libido drags her from one room into another, although in this case, besides the sin of chastity, on account of the violence inflicted he also commits a sin of injustice to be declared in confession.³⁶

28. Malice. Raptus contains two sins: one against chastity, either through the intention of sinning or through carnal intercourse with the abducted person; the other against justice, on account of the force inflicted either on the abducted person or on those whose power she is subject to, or on both.

- a. For committing the sin of raptus, which at times is reserved, nothing else is required except that a person be abducted with the intention of sinning with her, whether through intercourse or through another base act, even if the external sin does not in fact follow. But in order that raptus can truly be numbered among consummated sins of lust, fornication must be committed with the abducted person.
- b. If a woman, for the sake of satisfying libido, abducts a male, as regards malice indeed the same sin is committed specifically; but the woman does not incur the penalty or reservation established for raptus: for penalties established are judged to be against raptus according as it is ordinarily done; but ordinarily males abduct females, not females males.

Article Two.

On Sins Against Nature.

§ 1. On Pollution.

29. Definition and division. 1. Pollution, which is also called softness or masturbation (*manustupratio*), is complete venereal delectation with effusion of semen without intercourse.

Notes

36. Cf. *De sacramentis*, n. 573 f.

- a. Since pollution consists in the effusion of semen with complete delectation, it is clear that pollution in the true sense of the name cannot occur in those who do not have true semen, namely in boys, old men, eunuchs, and women, although they can perceive complete and satiative venereal delectation.
- b. The essence of this sin consists in complete venereal delectation, to which, as specific malice, there is added the fruitless effusion of semen against the order of nature. Wherefore pollution is a sin specifically diverse from complete venereal delectation without effusion of semen.

Note. In order that pollution follow, it is necessary that some cause irritate the genital nerves, from whose contraction the expulsion of semen is had. A cause of this kind can be physical, as touch, motion, frictions, pressures of the genitals, or psychic, as more or less obscene phantasms.

2. a. Pollution is either voluntary, which is willed in itself or in the cause, or involuntary or natural, which is willed in no way, but follows from natural causes.
- b. Voluntary pollution is either direct or willed in itself, if something is done with the very intention of procuring it for oneself, or if consent is given to it when it happens involuntarily; or indirect, or willed in the cause, when something is done with foresight but without intention of a future pollution.
- c. Pollution which is called passive is involuntary. This occurs in the waking state because of great weakness of the organs, sometimes contracted from the custom of sinning, is provoked by any very slight causes, as motion, touch, effort, etc., and is completed without delectation. Passive pollution is an illness and is free from any fault.³⁷

30. On female pollution. Female pollution is the secretion or flow of vaginal humor, which is joined with complete venereal delectation; the sin of this pollution is not specifically diverse from the sin of complete venereal delectation in girls.

- a. Women perceive venereal delectation in the clitoris, in the vagina, and in the uterus. If it is had with emission of humor, it is called pollution, and, as in men, it occurs both in time of waking and in time of sleep. Women are accustomed to procure venereal delectation or pollution for themselves by compressing the thighs, by touching the clitoris, by introducing fingers or some instrument into the vulva, by soliciting the uterus itself.
- b. Female pollution is not an effusion of semen, since women do not have semen except the ovum, but is an effusion of vaginal humor, which nevertheless rarely is poured out exteriorly, but ordinarily flows down into the cavity of the uterus. If the humor flows down interiorly, its flow is rarely noticed; nevertheless it brings delectation. Therefore women can for the most part be judged to have been polluted only from this sign, that they have felt great delectation by which they have been libidinously satiated. They are capable of pollution of this kind already for some time before puberty.
- c. Whether female pollution is a sin specifically diverse from complete venereal delectation, authors dispute. Those who call female pollution a specific sin use this argument: although that flow of humor is not necessary for generation, nevertheless it is ordered by nature to generation, and for the sake of generation complete venereal delectation is attached to it. Therefore in female pollution there intervenes a pouring forth of humor outside intercourse, which by nature is ordered only to intercourse.³⁸ This reason indeed does not prove the matter. For the specific malice of pollution consists in the effusion of semen against the end of nature; but women do not have semen properly so called; that which could

Notes

37. Cf. Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*², p. 83.

38. Bucceroni, *Institutiones theologiae moralis*⁴ (Rome: Typographia Augustin., 1900), I, n. 813.

be called female semen is only the ovum. Although the vaginal humor which is poured forth when women suffer pollution is ordered by nature to generation, nevertheless, since it is not necessary for it, its fruitless effusion is not of such great moment.³⁹ Therefore according to this opinion female pollution is not a consummated sin against nature, but is indeed a complete sin of lust, because it is complete venereal delectation, yet not consummated, because it is completed without effusion of semen.

- d. Hence if women accuse themselves either of venereal delectation or of immodest touches, they are not to be questioned further as to whether they have been polluted; and this not only because often they do not know whether they have suffered pollution, or because pollution can be supposed, but especially because the question is not necessary, since the circumstance of pollution does not change the species of the sin. Therefore it suffices if they are asked whether they have basely satisfied themselves or have satisfied libido.

31. Whether they are of diverse species. Pollutions considered in themselves are not specifically diverse, but all are of the same species, because no specific difference appears by which diverse species would be constituted. For the diverse modes by which pollution is procured are related to the pollution itself, insofar as it is voluntary effusion of semen without intercourse, only materially and accidentally, provided only pollution is intended.

- a. Therefore in confession one must not ask concerning the mode by which pollution was procured: for whether it was sought by imagination alone or by a base sight, by one's own touches or those of another, in one's own body or in another's body, it is always the same sin of pollution, provided there is absent affection toward a person or toward intercourse. Nevertheless induction or cooperation is added if it is provoked by human touches of another.
- b. Many authors indeed teach that pollutions are specifically diverse according as they are provoked by the touch of a man, a woman, or a beast, because there intervenes affection toward the object which is touched; but affection is of diverse species according as it tends toward a man, a woman, or a beast. Nevertheless ordinarily it suffices if someone in this case accuses himself thus: I was polluted by touches of others, whether he himself touched others or allowed himself to be touched and thus polluted himself, because, if intercourse is not present, affection ordinarily is not borne toward sex but toward pollution alone. But if affection in fact tends also toward the object which is touched, the affection surely is specifically diverse according as it is borne toward a man, a woman, or a beast.
- c. Things to be noted. a. Even that mode by which someone pollutes himself by abusing the mouth of another is only an aggravating circumstance, unless affection for sodomy is present. b. If someone pollutes another unwilling person, he commits two sins, one against chastity, the other against justice. If someone pollutes another consenting person, likewise he commits two sins, one against chastity, the other through cooperation against charity. If two persons pollute each other by touches, each commits a threefold sin, two against chastity, by polluting himself and the other, and the third through cooperation against charity.
- d. Although in themselves all pollutions are of the same moral species, nevertheless from circumstances several diverse species are constituted. Circumstances of this kind occur: a. by reason of the subject; thus, if one bound by a vow of chastity is polluted, he commits sacrilege; if a married person is polluted, he commits adultery; b. by reason of the object; thus, if someone is polluted with a desire of sinning with an unmarried woman, he commits fornication, mental fornication; if with a desire of sinning with

Notes

39. Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis* (Rome: Pustet, 1905), I, n. 474 ff.

a married woman, adultery, mental adultery; c. by reason of the accomplice; if someone is polluted by touches of another, he commits the sin of induction or cooperation against charity; d. by reason of place; thus, if someone is polluted in a sacred place, he commits sacrilege.

32. On nocturnal pollution. 1. Its nature. This is completed in dreams and therefore without advertence and actual consent, but with delectation.

- a. Nocturnal pollution is involuntary if it follows from natural causes independent of the will, or from causes indeed voluntary, but posited without foresight of future pollution; and it is voluntary in the cause if it follows from an action freely posited in waking with foresight of the pollution that will follow in sleep.
- b. Among merely natural causes the chief is superfluous semen, by which nature, burdened, unloads itself; wherefore nocturnal pollution does not denote a libidinous soul, although more or less indecent phantasms provoke and accompany it. The words of St. Thomas are worthy of note: “when the seminal humor abounds in the body or when dissolution of the humor has occurred, ... the sleeper dreams those things which pertain to the expulsion of this kind of abundant or dissolved humor.”⁴⁰
- c. Young men suffer this after the years of puberty, and celibates, at the time when nature produces semen. At fixed times expulsions of semen of this kind return; but the time varies according to the diverse constitution of men and diverse manner of living; in some nocturnal pollution occurs once, in others even twice in a week, in others scarcely once in a month.

33. 2. Its malice. a. Nocturnal pollution, both in itself and in the cause involuntary, is free from all fault, whether it pleases the sleeping person or displeases him.

- b. Nocturnal pollution which sometimes happens to the half-awake must not be judged mortal, even if consent is given to it, because it occurs with imperfect cognition and will. The same must be said concerning nocturnal touches. In doubt it must be judged that no consent was present, if such things ordinarily displease in the waking state, because judgment must be made from things ordinarily occurring.
- c. Nocturnal pollution voluntary in itself is a grave sin; but voluntary in the cause it is a grave or light sin, according as the action posited before sleep without reasonable cause and with sufficient advertence by its nature influences gravely or lightly toward provoking pollution.
- d. Nocturnal pollution which is caused by honorable conversation with a person of the other sex, by very seasoned foods or by warm drinks moderately taken, by a certain more comfortable position in bed, is not imputed as sin, even if those causes were posited in waking with foresight of the future effect: for we are not bound to omit licit actions on account of the effect of future pollution, if there is a reasonable cause for positing them.
- e. Nocturnal pollution which is caused by depraved thoughts or desires, by obscene readings, by indecent conversations, must be imputed as grave or light sin according as those causes were posited in waking with foresight that they would have a proximate or remote influence upon pollution.

34. On the malice of pollution voluntary in itself. Pollution directly willed is always a mortal sin: for a voluntary pollution is a grave perversion of the order and institution of nature, for human semen by nature is ordered solely to the generation of man; but in pollution semen is poured out for the sake of pleasure in

Notes

40. *Summa* II-II, q. 154, a. 5.

such a way that the end intended by nature is wholly frustrated. b. If pollution were not gravely illicit, the use of marriage would be impeded, which is so necessary for the human race; for men, content with this pleasure alone, would for the most part abstain from marriages, which are so troublesome. c. Wherefore St. Paul expressly enumerates softness among the sins which exclude from the kingdom of God: nor will the soft possess the kingdom of God.⁴¹

1. Therefore it is never licit directly to procure pollution, not even if ejection of semen seemed necessary for preserving health; for even pollution which is taken up as a means for obtaining some end is willed in itself and directly, although not for its own sake.
2. Every voluntary effusion of semen, however small and slight, has the nature of pollution, and therefore is a mortal sin.
3. To promote in some way, by touch or motion or position, etc., pollution spontaneously begun, whether in waking or in sleep, is gravely illicit; but there is no obligation of impeding pollution spontaneously occurring or already begun in sleep, but it can be permitted that nature unload itself, provided consent to delectation is absent.
- a. The reason on account of which the older authors thought that spontaneously begun pollution did not necessarily have to be restrained is indeed of no weight; nor nevertheless for that reason must an obligation of containing the impulse of nature be imposed. They themselves thought that semen already discharged, unless it is poured forth, is corrupted and, when corrupted, brings detriment to health; but in truth semen is never actually corrupted, and even when discharged it does not infect nature, but rather assists it. Wherefore it is certainly to be advised, especially on account of the danger of consent, that pollution already imminent, where this can be done, be restrained; but no obligation of doing this exists, because that effusion is involuntary.⁴²
- b. In order that consent to delectation be avoided while pollution occurs involuntarily, it is best to change position, or at least, either by praying and fostering pious thoughts or by thinking about profane matters, to turn the mind to other things. To avoid cooperation with the pollution occurring, it is best to have oneself exteriorly altogether passively, by abstaining from touches and from every voluntary motion of the body.
- c. Any motion or impulse of the body deliberately employed, by which the effect of pollution follows, is gravely evil; nevertheless from deliberate motions there must be distinguished the motions or impulses which arise spontaneously in the body by the force of nature unloading itself, so that the effect of pollution may be completed.

35. Concerning the malice of pollution willed in the cause, judgment must be made from those things which were said above, n. 12, namely pollution is imputed as grave or light sin according as its cause by its nature influences gravely or lightly toward provoking it; but it is not imputed as sin if a sufficient reason is present for positing that cause.

- a. In order that pollution can be called voluntary in the cause, it is required that the one who posits its cause advert to the effect of pollution that will follow from it. Therefore one who, when he posits the cause of pollution, either does not advert to the effect arising from it, or prudently judges that the effect will not follow, cannot have pollution imputed to him, even if it follows.

Notes

41. 1 Cor. 6, 10. Proposition 49, condemned by Innocent XI, has: softness is not prohibited by natural law ...

42. A. Eschbach, l. c., disp. 5, c. 4, a. 2, § 3.

- b. One who, because of a peculiar disposition and infirmity, frequently suffers pollutions from actions licit in themselves which by their nature influence only lightly toward them, e.g. from riding horseback, is not bound to abstain from those actions, provided consent to delectation is excluded; for in positing them he uses his right. But if the action is lightly sinful, as a reading that is somewhat base, the sight of a somewhat obscene image, and is not excused by a just cause, is he bound under grave sin to avoid it on account of this evil effect? Of itself he must avoid it only under light sin; for the malice of pollution willed in the cause is taken from the influence which the cause by its nature has, not from the influence which in fact, on account of the peculiar temperament of the subject, it has on it. But practically he will rarely be excused from grave sin for another reason: for one who, taught by experience that he is frequently polluted by an action of this kind, nevertheless posits it without necessity, is shown to posit it from a depraved intention.

Therefore if, for example, the use of alcohol or of the nicotine herb, tobacco, so excites the nerves of someone that pollution follows from it either in sleep or outside sleep, there is no obligation of abstaining from those things if the use is moderate and therefore licit; the evil effect can simply be permitted, provided consent is avoided. But if the use of those things is immoderate, from the precept of chastity he must abstain from them under light sin; otherwise he sins according to the gravity of the matter gravely or lightly against temperance, and lightly, not gravely, against chastity, because those things accidentally, and therefore of themselves only lightly, excite libido.

36. On sufficient reason. 1. Declaration. Because pollution is not imputed as sin if the action which causes it is posited for a sufficient reason, it is now asked when there is present a sufficient reason for positing an action from which future pollution is foreseen. An action of this kind, which can be the cause of pollution, is always joined with a twofold danger, namely of material pollution and of consent to the venereal pleasure joined with it. Here abstraction is made from the danger of consent to base delectation: for to that danger the principles which are set forth elsewhere concerning the danger or occasion of sinning must be applied.⁴³ For making a judgment concerning the sufficiency of the reason in a particular case, the principles which follow below must be noted.

A greater reason is required in order that the danger of consent can be admitted than that the danger of material pollution can be admitted. Hence it can happen that, on account of proximate danger of consent, someone is bound under grave sin to avoid an action which on account of the proximate danger of pollution alone he is not bound to avoid, or at least not bound under grave sin to avoid. Someone who, for example, in horseback riding which he undertakes for the sake of recreation, is frequently not only polluted, but also sins by consent to delectation, if he cannot exclude sin by other means, is bound to omit horseback riding, which on account of the effect of pollution alone he is not bound to omit. Erotic readings idly undertaken, tender conversations with a person of diverse sex, kisses impressed on boys, even if they are only lightly sinful on account of the danger of pollution, nevertheless must be avoided under grave sin by him whom they cast into proximate danger of consenting.

37. 2. Principles. a. If the danger of polluting oneself is proximate from the nature of the action, a grave reason is required in order that the action inducing the danger can licitly be posited; but as grave reason there is judged both necessity and true utility, either one's own or another's.

Therefore it is licit for physicians and surgeons to care for the sick and to procure births; it is licit for servants to attend to bodily necessities in baths or hospitals, even if on this occasion they suffer pollutions.

Notes

43. Cf. *De principiis*³, n. 325 ff.

But proximate danger of consent, if any is present, must always be guarded against, by the fact that it is rendered remote or none by apt remedies.

- b. If the danger of polluting oneself from the nature of the action is remote, a light reason or any reasonable cause suffices in order that the action inducing the danger can licitly be posited.
- c. Therefore all those reasons excuse which in good faith appear either necessary or useful or suitable, indeed even merely advantageous to soul or body. Wherefore these actions are licit of themselves, even if they are foreseen to provoke pollution: a. kisses, embraces, hand-claspings according to the custom of the country; b. honorable dances undertaken from suitable recreation; c. horseback riding even for the sake of recreation alone; d. performing gymnastic exercises; e. reclining in a certain position even solely for resting more comfortably; f. while sitting, placing leg upon leg; g. moderately taking very seasoned foods or warm drinks.
- d. If the cause of positing an action from which pollution is foreseen to follow has indeed something of advantage and utility, but not sufficient to excuse the base effect, e.g. the study of medical or anatomical art undertaken from curiosity, probably a mortal sin is not committed, provided consent is excluded.⁴⁴

38. Whether it is licit to drive away by touch or friction an itching which someone suffers in the privates, however much pollution follows. a. If the itching is slight and easily tolerable, St. Alphonsus does not permit touch by which it would be driven away with danger of pollution, consent excluded; but he permits touch if only some arousal would follow.

- b. If the itching is great and troublesome and has its origin from acrimony of the blood, it is licit to drive it away by touch or friction even with danger of pollution, provided consent is excluded: for an action with a twofold effect is had; the good is intended, the evil is permitted from a just cause.
- c. But if the itching has its origin from the superfluous semen itself or from the ardor of libido, it is not licit to drive it away by touch or friction with danger of pollution, because the good effect follows only from the evil effect: for the touch tends directly toward procuring pollution or toward quieting libido, and only by this means is the itching driven away.

In order that one can discern whence pains in the genitals arise, attention must be paid to this. If the pains do not cease unless carnal movements or pollution have followed, these must be judged the means for quieting the pain and therefore to arise of themselves from touch and friction. But if, after touches or friction have been completed, the pains cease, even if carnal movements or pollution follow either not at all or not always, it is a sign that these are not the means of quieting the pain and that the movements and pollution follow accidentally. For the rest, if the itching is very troublesome, it must be judged to have arisen from acrimony of the blood rather than from semen. If it is doubtful whether it arises from acrimony of the blood or from superfluity of semen and from the ardor of libido, it is licit to free oneself from the itching: for in order that this be prohibited, it must be certainly established that it proceeds from semen or from libido.⁴⁵

39. For practice. Since the vice of pollution at the present time is most frequent in both sexes, though more frequent in men than in women, it will help to set forth briefly its causes, effects, and cure.

- 1. Of the causes some are external, others internal. The external causes are bad examples of others, to which must be added very many depraved books of every kind and base images, which excite libido. Idleness, which indeed is the origin of all vices, but especially of vices of the flesh; likewise a soft and effeminate

Notes

44. Cf. Lessius, l. 4, c. 3, n. 118.

45. Cf. St. Alphonsus, n. 483.

education. Everything which excites the genital nerves, as to be occupied for a long time, for the sake of pleasure, with venereal matters; lying supine; the warmth of the bed; exciting foods, such as are very hot and seasoned, and abundant alcoholic drinks. Mothers, nurses, and maids who, in order to quiet infants, arouse the venereal sense by handling their genital members. Besides the fact that this is prohibited by the moral law, it moreover brings a disposition and inclination toward venereal things. There must be added the impious counsel of physicians which is given to adolescents, that they pollute themselves at least once in a week, since nature demands this and it does not harm health. But in truth this counsel provides neither for morality nor for health, since the depraved habit of polluting oneself brings with it worse carnal vices, which gradually destroy health. Internal causes are the peculiar state of the organism, such as a sanguine and nervous temperament, defect of care for the genitals, illnesses which affect the nervous system, as pulmonary phthisis and hysteria. There is added the great delectation which this vice brings, and the ease with which it can be hidden.

Note. Although the vice of pollution is ordinarily committed by men of sound mind only for the sake of pleasure, nevertheless it must be conceded that it often does not depend solely on the will, but that the temperament of the body more or less disposes and impels one toward it and diminishes its moral fault.

2. The effects of this vice continued for a long time are most destructive. Among them must especially be numbered grave irritations of the nervous system, general fatigue and weakness of the whole organism, palpitation of the heart and disturbance of circulation, from which diseases of hypochondria and melancholy easily arise, which sometimes degenerate into madness. The acuteness of the intellect and the energy of the will are weakened, so that those who indulge this vice, even if they repent after the fall, nevertheless can scarcely abstain from sin.

Note. Nevertheless, evil effects of this kind do not show themselves in everyone. For there are men of so robust a constitution of body that from this vice they suffer only slight harms to health and light disturbances of the nerves. Therefore those who try to frighten lustful youths away from the vice by setting forth its evil effects must beware of exaggerations.

3. Cure. Once this vice has been contracted, unless the help of special grace intervenes, it is removed only with pain and difficulty; nevertheless, since it brings so many harms to soul and body, all whom it concerns must be admonished to direct themselves seriously to its cure. There are no certain signs from which this vice can be recognized in adolescents; nevertheless parents and teachers, sufficiently instructed about this matter, can recognize it from certain inconveniences which children manifest to them, and can restrain it by opportune remedies, especially by removing the causes from which the vice is induced.

Natural or hygienic remedies: to distract the mind; to exercise the body even to fatigue; to use baths or cold washings; to spend due care upon the genitals: the genital organs both in boys and especially in girls, on account of menstruation, need frequent washings; to use a hard bed; not to sleep supine: since the dorsal or supine position excites the genital nerves, the posture should be lateral, and indeed on the right side; in the morning, once sleep has been shaken off, to rise immediately; morning or evening to wash the body around the genitals with cold water, mixed with vinegar; before going to bed, to empty the urinary bladder; to choose light foods, of easy digestion, not exciting, which in small volume provide sufficient nourishment; to abstain from very alcoholic drinks and, in the evening, from meats; let clothes not be too warming nor compress the genitals. There are also medicines by which nervous erections, if they are frequent and vehement, are restrained.

Moral remedies: to instill hatred and horror of the vice and to inspire, by suitable motives, the desire of recovering virtue; to exhort to flight from occasions, frequency of the sacraments, and exercises of piety;

to strengthen the will, so that, despising pleasure, it energetically applies suitable remedies. For most the most efficacious remedy is marriage, which those who are given to this vice should be advised to contract as soon as possible.

4. Confessors who direct themselves to the cure of a penitent habituated in the base vice should note in particular these things, besides those which are indicated above and which are everywhere suggested to customary sinners and recidivists.
 - a. Let them prudently explore the time from which the penitent has been given to this vice; likewise let them strive to know both his bodily temperament and the circumstances of the sins, namely at what time, in what place, and in what circumstances of affairs the falls are accustomed to occur.
 - b. Let them take care that he return to the same confessor, make confession soon after a fall, and, if it can be done, also receive Holy Communion.
 - c. Let them inspire in him hope of victory, and to this end let them require that daily, morning and evening, he recite three times the Angelic Salutation in honor of the most pure Virgin, to obtain purity of body and soul, with the addition of a resolution not to sin.
 - d. There are young persons of both sexes, entangled in the habit of pollution, who because of a nervous or sanguine bodily temperament experience vehement temptations, and although they resist and pray, nevertheless are polluted. Let them know that pollutions which they truly suffer unwillingly are without sin.
 - e. There are others who first resist the temptation, but afterward, if the temptation continues to urge, are accustomed to yield to it. These must be encouraged to further resistance: for soon pollution will follow, which, as completed against the will, is inculpable.
 - f. Finally there are found others who, lying in bed, suffer vehement stirrings of the flesh, to which, if they continue to oppose positive resistance, they cannot fall asleep. These should be advised that, after imploring the help of God and eliciting dissent, with a secure conscience they may have themselves passively, whatever may happen.⁴⁶

40. On distillation. Distillation, which differs from pollution, is the moderate effusion of another, more subtle, non-prolific humor from the glands of the urethra. In pollution the effusion of humor is more copious and joined with great stirring and delectation; in distillation, on the contrary, the effusion of humor is slight and occurs almost drop by drop, with only light or scarcely any stirring and delectation that is perceived.

- a. Sometimes from weakness of the organs distillation occurs almost habitually; this is an illness to be healed by a physician, not by a confessor. Although this illness here and there is contracted from a long-standing habit of sinning, nevertheless ordinarily it arises from natural causes.
- b. Sometimes distillation also occurs with stirring of the genitals and venereal delectation; this distillation indeed is akin to pollution and disposes toward it.
1. If distillation occurs without delectation, no care must be had about it, nor does there exist an obligation of avoiding its cause. For this flow must be compared with the secretion of any other humor, e.g. of sweat, which nature is accustomed to cast out.

Notes

46. Cf. St. Alphonsus, l. 5, n. 9; Aertnys, *Theologia moralis*, l. 6, n. 313; Eschbach, p. 556 ff.

2. But distillation which occurs with delectation, directly willed or indirectly admitted without cause, cannot be excused from sin. This distillation is a sin of the same gravity and species as pollution itself, since it induces danger of it and is joined with venereal delectation.

41. On menstruation. 1. In women a peculiar phenomenon must be noted, which they call menstruation. By this name is signified the flow of blood which women suffer from the genital organs each month, and for this reason it is called the menstrual flow, the menses. Through the vagina menstrual blood flows out, on account of which the hymen is perforated. At the time of puberty menstruation begins and continues until about the fiftieth year of age, at which time fecundity is accustomed to cease. Physiologically this phenomenon is explained in this way. Each month in the ovaries an ovum matures, which, discharged from the ovaries, is transferred into the uterus. At the same time the interior parts of the uterus are filled with blood, so that blood may contribute to the development of the fetus, if it is conceived. But if the ovum has not been fertilized, blood flows out from the torn little arteries, and with the blood the ovum flows out through the genital organs. This flow ordinarily continues for two or three days, sometimes also for more days.⁴⁷ Sometimes the affected health of women demands that the menstrual flow be provoked by art, namely by the help of medicines; this indeed is morally licit, because no venereal delectation accompanies this flow.

2. Moreover it must be noted that women, at the time of the menstrual flow, especially in the first years in which they experience it, suffer vehement irritations of the nerves and are troubled by other inconveniences. But it cannot happen that these alterations of the body do not exercise an influence upon moral life. And indeed at that time they are agitated by various affections, especially by anger and sadness, which sometimes is increased even to melancholy. On this account they are then to be treated more indulgently and kindly, and not to be reproved on account of defects committed, but rather admonished to constancy in good resolutions.⁴⁸

§ 2. On Sodomy.

42. Nature. Sodomy is intercourse with a person of the same sex, or with a person of diverse sex but in an undue vessel.

- a. Intercourse is not had when someone touches the genitals of another with the hand, foot, mouth, or arm, and in turn is touched by the other; but it belongs to the nature of intercourse that the conjunction of the bodies themselves intervene, so that at least on one side the application of the genital member to the body of another takes place, whether this occurs in the preposterous vessel, or between the thighs or arms, or in another part of the body.

It does not belong to the nature of intercourse that there be penetration of some vessel; nevertheless intercourse differs specifically from impure touch; the essential difference is in this, that in touch the base affection is borne toward pollution, but in intercourse toward the person or beast with whom intercourse occurs.

- b. From the definition a twofold sodomy is distinguished: perfect and properly so called, which is intercourse with a person of the same sex, therefore of a male with a male, of a female with a female; and imperfect or improperly so called, which is intercourse with a person of diverse sex, but in an unnatural or preposterous vessel.

Notes

47. Cf. Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*², p. 87.

48. Cf. A. Eschbach, l. c., disp. 1, c. 3, a. 1; Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*², p. 87.

- c. Perfect sodomy, which is intercourse with the same sex, can be committed in two ways: either by a consummated act, i.e. with effusion of semen, or by a non-consummated act, i.e. without effusion of semen. Likewise sodomy improperly so called is committed either by a consummated act or by a non-consummated act in an unnatural vessel.

Consummated sodomy can also have place among females, namely if in the intercourse which is had between them, a flow of humor with complete delectation intervenes. Nevertheless, since this circumstance does not change the species of the sin, one must not ask about it in confession.

- d. The essence of this crime consists in affection either toward the sex or toward the undue vessel: each is against nature, because nature requires for the generation of offspring both the sex and also the due vessel.

43. Principles. 1. Sodomy is a crime much graver than simple pollution, both in itself, because it tends toward an undue sex or vessel, and by reason of cooperation, because each concurs in the sin of the other. Its specific malice consists in access to an undue sex or vessel, which is repugnant to the order of nature in a special way.⁴⁹

- 2. Perfect and imperfect sodomy differ from each other in species, because affection toward an undue sex contains a special malice, diverse from affection toward an undue vessel.
 - a. Perfect sodomy among persons of the same sex can be committed in diverse ways; nevertheless it does not differ specifically, whether intercourse occurs in the preposterous vessel or in another part of the body. Wherefore in confession it suffices to know that intercourse with effusion of semen has taken place, nor is it necessary to ask further about the mode of intercourse.
 - b. Imperfect sodomy between a male and a female is committed in only one way, namely if intercourse occurs in the preposterous vessel. But if intercourse has place in another part of the body, sodomy is not committed, but fornication in affection with pollution in effect.
- 3. It makes no difference whether someone was acting or suffering; the species of the sin is the same. Wherefore in confession one must not ask about this matter. But whether pollution, which happens more easily in the agent than in the patient, has had place or not must be declared.
- 4. Where sodomy simply is reserved, perfect and consummated sodomy is to be understood, which is committed between males with penetration of the preposterous vessel and with insemination made there.⁵⁰

§ 3. On Bestiality.

44. Nature. a. Bestiality is the intercourse of a human being with a beast. It makes no difference in what manner the intercourse occurred, whether in the natural vessel or in another part of the body, whether with effusion of semen or without it, provided intercourse has had place; for the specific malice of bestiality consists in affection toward another species.

- b. If the sin of bestiality is reserved, bestiality which is committed in the natural vessel with effusion of semen is to be understood, therefore consummated bestiality, unless the one reserving declares otherwise.⁵¹

Notes

49. Cf. Rom. 1, 24 ff.; Gen. 18, 20 f.

50. Cf. Salmanticenses, tr. 26, c. 7, n. 109.

51. Cf. Salmanticenses, *ibid.*, n. 140.

45. Principles. 1. Bestiality is the gravest among sins of lust, more horrible than sodomy itself. Its special malice consists in access to a diverse species, which is still more repugnant to right reason than access to an undue sex or to an undue vessel.

2. Bestiality does not differ in species, whether it was committed with a beast of this or that species; and since now it has been explored that generation cannot follow from intercourse of this kind, it makes no difference of what sex the beast was, whether male or female. For the specific malice consists in access to a species diverse from man; the specific diversity and the sex of beasts are related to this only materially.
3. Immodest touches with a beast are not the sin of bestiality unless the base affection of the one touching is borne precisely toward the beast, which rarely occurs, since the sinner ordinarily intends only to satisfy libido. Wherefore this circumstance does not have to be declared necessarily in confession if someone, by means of the tongue of a beast of burden or of another beast, has excited venereal pleasure or pollution in himself.

To complete the treatment concerning sins of lust, and specifically concerning sins of lust against nature, a few things must be treated concerning abnormal sexual appetite.

Sexual appetite deflects from the common norm in a twofold way: a. in that it is increased beyond measure, hypersexuality; b. in that it puts itself forth in another way, sexual perversion.

46. On hypersexuality. 1. Sexual affection in diverse human beings, as regards vehemence, is diverse; in men it is more vehement than in women, but even among persons of the same sex some have been allotted a more vehement affection 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. Sexual excesses are added, 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 very slight cause and then almost mechanically, by physical necessity, impels toward pollution.
3. The signs from which it is discerned that the 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 human being that he thinks and speaks almost only about this matter and seeks means of satisfying the affection.
4. Imputability. Those who are sound of mind can and must repress and moderate sexual affection, even the more vehement, nor do they suffer any detriment of health from not satisfying even a most vehement sexual appetite. Therefore sins committed against chastity must be fully imputed to them. Indeed even those who labor under a psychic defect sin voluntarily and culpably, unless the defect is of a greater degree. Sexual excesses will be so much the less voluntary and culpable as the illness of the soul is greater and more intense; they are fully involuntary in those who are mentally ill or fully psychopathic.

It must be noted that physicians addicted to materialism, by the worst counsel, exhort those, especially youths, who suffer frequent pollutions and vehement sexual excitations, to go to women in order to lessen the evil: for they say that abstinence brings grave detriments to the health of body and mind. Means and medicines are not lacking by which the vehemence of sexual libido may be lessened; therefore those for whom this is necessary should be directed to a physician, but to a Catholic physician, who uses licit means for repelling the evil, and who is persuaded that chastity commanded by the law of nature, even perpetual chastity, harms neither the health of the body nor of the soul.

47. On sexual perversion.⁵² 1. Sexual perversion consists in this, that sexual appetite and sexual actions are abnormal in this respect, that libido is excited not by internal and external acts pertaining to venereal matters, as ordinarily happens, but by other things altogether alien to sexual life.

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

3. Four diverse forms of perverse sexual disposition are distinguished: Sadism, Masochism, Fetishism, Contrary Sexuality.

a. Sadism⁵³ is so called if venereal delectation is excited by imaginations or actions which contain cruelty and violence, such as: to strangle, to stab with a knife, to strike, to whip, to slaughter (*Lustmord*).

b. These actions are not performed in order to obtain intercourse from the person to whom force is applied, but in order through them to excite, quiet, and satisfy libido.

c. This perversion is found frequently in men, scarcely ever in women; for since man in sexual life is the active principle and, if it is permitted to speak thus, the aggressive principle, it seems to have arisen from the degeneration of the office which in sexual functions naturally belongs to the man.

d. Masochism⁵⁴ is so called if venereal delectation is excited by the fact that one suffers violences and torments, such as being struck, being attacked with the heel, being beaten, being whipped, being stabbed even to the effusion of blood, etc.

This perversion is especially found in women, which is easily understood from the things said above, since the woman has herself more passively in sexual functions. Indeed they are not without 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 imaginations 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 imagination or handling excite venereal sense are the hand, foot, eye, hair, undergarment, shoes, feathers, cloths, etc. For the most part these things or parts of the body have a relation to a determinate person loved by an inordinate affection; but it can happen that even of themselves, independently of relation to a certain person, they provoke venereal delectation and pollution.

d. Contrary sexuality is so called if sexual appetite tends toward a person of the same sex. Therefore the venereal sense is provoked not from the imagination, sight, or touch of a person of diverse sex, but of the same sex.

e. The sins which are committed by those who labor under this perversion are mutual pollutions and sodomitical intercourses. If the perverse inclination is borne toward boys, it is called pederasty; nevertheless ordinarily it tends toward men.

f. This perversion is also found in women, in whom it is called lesbian or sapphic love, and it induces mutual pollutions and sodomitical sins which women commit among themselves.

Notes

52. Capellmann-Bergmann, *Past.-Mediz.*¹⁴ (Aachen: Barth, 1904), p. 87 ff.

53. The name is drawn from the Marquis de Sade, who was affected by this perversity and presents, as it were, its prototype.

54. The name is taken from Sacher Masoch, who especially describes this perversion in his fictional narratives (*Romane*).

4. Imputability. a. Sexual perversion is not a sign of a diseased mind: perversions are found even in those who labor under no psychic defect; nevertheless this seems capable of being affirmed, that perversions are had more frequently in persons of diseased mind than of sound mind.
- b. Not only those who are of sound mind, but also those who labor under a psychic defect, can repress perverse sexual appetites; accordingly the sins, or perversities, committed must be imputed to them, unless the psychic defect has reached a greater degree. It then becomes ineluctable when to the psychic defect there is added great vehemence of the sexual appetite, whether ordinary or perverse.
5. They ask whether sins with a person of the same sex committed by those in whom contrary sexuality is innate are specific sins of sodomy, since the perverse affection toward the same sex in them is without their own will and therefore inculpable. But in truth, since the specific nature of sodomy consists in affection toward the same sex, there can be no doubt concerning the nature of sodomy, even if by nature they are borne toward the same sex and suffer aversion from the diverse sex. Therefore just as others must repress an inborn fornicatory affection, so they must repress an inborn sodomitical affection.

Note. The confessor should know that certain traces of a 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 with who are basely excited by imaginations or actions which scarcely refer in any way to venereal things, as by a chastisement of boys represented through imagination, by reading about the torments which the martyrs suffered, by imagination or touch of hair gathered into a knot, etc. Against temptations arising from images or actions of this kind, they must fight just as against other temptations attacking chastity. Those whose sexual perversion is perfect are excited only by abnormal means; by base means, however, they are excited not at all or only a little.

Question Four.

On the Sins of Lust Not Consummated.

Sins of lust not consummated, in which effusion of semen has no place, are of two kinds: some contain lust itself; others do not contain lust itself, but only a cause provoking lust. Of the first kind are carnal movements; of the second are acts of immodesty.

Immodesty is defined as voluntary occupation about things which provoke venereal delectation. To it belong both internal acts, thoughts and desires, and external acts, sights, touches, kisses, embraces, words, and readings.

Article One.

On Carnal Movements.

48. Declaration. 1. Carnal movements, base movements, venereal movements, rebellion of the flesh, are called stirrings of the genital members and of the humors existing in those organs, joined with pleasure. Ordinarily they have joined to them erection of the virile member or of the female clitoris. Erection must be attributed to blood flowing together to those members.

2. Movements are distinguished: a. light and transitory, and grave and lasting. The latter induce proximate danger of pollution, the former remote or no danger.
- b. Voluntary, whether in themselves or in the cause, and involuntary, which either arise spontaneously and naturally, without the one who suffers them contributing anything, or in such a way that he indeed posits their cause, but ignorantly.

- c. The cause from which carnal movements arise is either external: the mode of sitting, lying down, touch, etc.; or internal, namely images of the phantasy, which are excited either spontaneously or from sight, conversation, or reading.
- d. Carnal movements ordinarily manifest themselves through erection of the virile member or of the female clitoris; this erection in this case is joined with pleasure and can be called venereal. But there is also another, merely natural erection, which arises from physical causes that are not venereal and is had without sense of pleasure. In each case erection must be attributed to blood flowing together to those members.

49. On the malice of carnal movements. Since carnal movements have venereal delectation joined to them and are evil only on account of this, those things which are said here concerning their malice are easily understood from those things which were explained above, n. 11 f.

- 1. Carnal movements directly voluntary, which are either deliberately excited or to which consent is given if they arise spontaneously and involuntarily, are a grave sin, however light they may be: for there is had consent to venereal delectation, which is always a grave sin, since this delectation does not admit smallness of matter.
- 2. Carnal movements involuntary both in themselves and in the cause, however grave, are no sin, unless consent and complacency of the will are added; for without consent of the will there cannot be sin.
- 3. Carnal movements voluntary in the cause, or the cause from which movements are excited beyond intention, are a grave sin if the cause by its nature gravely influences toward exciting them and no sufficient reason is present for admitting them.

Although causes lightly influencing toward base stirrings need not be avoided under grave sin, not even by those who suffer from them grave carnal movements, indeed even pollutions, unless proximate danger of consent is present, nevertheless those who admit actions of this kind from a just cause must be earnestly and insistently admonished to omit them unless they are necessary. For on account of the supreme inclination of corrupted nature toward venereal things, great danger threatens lest gradually graver things be admitted. Moreover the danger of self-deception easily occurs: for those who admit actions of this kind easily persuade themselves that in admitting them they are led only by curiosity or courtesy or friendship, but in reality they are impelled to them by the heat of libido.

50. On the resistance to be opposed to these movements. 1. If involuntary movements are light and transitory, no care must be had about them, but they are to be neglected and despised, both because the causes exciting such movements are most frequent and therefore the obligation of repressing them would be too difficult, and because they are better and more efficaciously repressed by contempt: for solicitude about impeding them is accustomed to excite the imagination and increase the movements.

- 2. If no reasonable cause is present for admitting carnal movements, it is not licit to have oneself passively toward them, but the obligation of resisting them positively presses, and indeed under light sin if the danger of consent or pollution is remote, under grave sin if the danger of consent or pollution is proximate. The reason for the first: one who does not repress the movements when he can is judged to consent to them indirectly and virtually. The reason for the second is that we are then bound to impede both the danger of consent and pollution.
- a. He has himself passively or permissively who neither approves them nor represses them by applying means, but admits them until they vanish of themselves. Therefore some positive resistance is necessary, whatever it is, provided it is apt for the end. Since the end consists in this, that the movements themselves

be restrained, an act of simple displeasure concerning the movement and carnal delectation does not suffice for positive resistance, because that act is ineffective for repressing the movements themselves.

- b. Positive resistance is either direct, by which the stirred parts, covered by clothes, are compressed, or indirect. Direct resistance is not to be advised, because it does not contribute to the intended end, but rather irritates the nerves and increases the movements. Indirect resistance is either external or internal. To external resistance belongs: to change place or position, to interrupt the work, to take up another occupation, to excite a sense of pain by pinching the hand or arm, by pricking, or by striking oneself, etc. To internal resistance belongs: to turn the mind to other things, to implore divine help, to invoke the most holy names, to elicit an act of love of God, to renew the resolution not to sin, etc.; these things also contribute to guarding against consent to base delectation.
- c. When movements are excited from a voluntary action and one that is superfluous, due resistance consists in this, that their cause be removed and that the action cease. Therefore one who is vehemently excited from an action of this kind is bound under grave sin to break it off immediately; but one who notices that he is lightly stirred is bound under light sin to desist from it. But if he continues it longer, he sins gravely on account of the grave danger of proceeding to further things and finally of consenting. Therefore, for example, a prolonged idle sight of a beautiful woman, or a prolonged vain conversation with a girl, or continued impure thought, when these actions already excite libido rather vehemently, are a grave sin. St. Alphonsus, n. 422.
- 3. There is no obligation of positively resisting carnal movements, even the more vehement, if a just cause is present for admitting them: for the just cause itself excludes indirect and virtual consent. Therefore in this case it is licit to have oneself negatively toward the movements themselves, provided the firm resolution of not consenting is retained.
 - a. A just cause of permitting them is present: a. if someone knows by experience that resistance rather increases them; b. if they are excited from a necessary action or one useful in any way, e.g. from hearing confessions, from useful reading, from necessary touch.
 - b. Because no one is bound, in order to avoid carnal movements, to omit actions that are necessary or useful, penitents must be admonished not to abandon a good work begun for this reason, that they suffer miseries of this kind, such as base movements, provided the danger of consent is absent. The same persons must be admonished not to omit prayers or exercises of piety because they are especially troubled by depraved images and movements during prayer. The movements are to be despised and repressed by persisting in the work begun.⁵⁵
 - c. Although positive resistance in this case, if, for example, more vehement movements are excited while working or lying down, is not necessary, nevertheless it is greatly to be advised, whether external or at least internal; but to avoid consent of the will an act of displeasure concerning those movements must be elicited.
 - d. It happens that pious women, especially nuns, in prayer or in Holy Communion are so inflamed with sensible love that they perceive venereal delectation, indeed even suffer pollution. In this case great discretion is necessary. If they are not hysterical, it must be said to them that they are not to care about these evil effects, unless on account of them they are troubled by anxieties in the spiritual life; in that case it is expedient that the affections of love be moderated. Frequently, however, women of this kind, who are carnally excited during prayer, labor under religious hysteria: for it is established that hysterical

Notes

55. Ballerini-Palmieri I, n. 597.

persons willingly foster obscene phantasms and consequently suffer vehement stirrings of the genitals even to pollution. These must be admonished, as far as can be done, to reject phantasms of this kind.

Article Two.

On External Sins, Immodesty.

51. Declarations. 1. In order that judgment can be made concerning the malice of external acts in particular, first the parts of the body must be distinguished with respect to honesty. Thus the honest parts are: face, hands, feet; the less honest, not base, are: breast, back, arms, legs; the indecent, base, obscene parts are: the genitals and the parts near them.

2. In external acts venereal pleasure itself is not found; those acts in themselves are not evil, but indifferent, and therefore can be performed both from a good end and from an evil end. But all by their nature are apt to excite base movements and the sense of delectation and therefore pollution; therefore they cast one into danger of sinning through consent to delectation and through pollution. Wherefore it is not licit to perform those acts without a sufficient cause, more or less grave according to the measure of the influence which they exercise in provoking delectation and pollution.

The true doctrine must be held, that base sights and touches are opposed to the sixth precept of the Decalogue not of themselves and by their nature, but only because they bring danger of venereal delectation, pollution, and danger of consent to it. Therefore if there were any, which indeed will rarely happen, who from these actions suffered no danger either of base movement or of consent to base delectations, those actions for them would contain only the sin of idle action, of sensuality, but in no way a sin against chastity. But insofar as non-consummated acts are performed either explicitly or implicitly from a libidinous end, they must be regarded as the beginning and commencements of the consummated venereal act. They are performed implicitly from a libidinous end if they have no other end of the one acting.

3. Acts of immodesty, both external and internal, differ in species from perfect or consummated acts, pollution and intercourse: for in the former either venereal delectation is not contained, or, if it is intended and perceived, in them there does not intervene the special malice of effused semen. Therefore it does not suffice to accuse impure touches if pollution was had.

But incomplete venereal delectation does not differ in species from complete delectation, n. 8; and just as pollutions considered in themselves are of the same species, so incomplete venereal delectations or carnal stirrings are all of the same species. Therefore one who provoked in himself or voluntarily admitted carnal movements and delectation need not confess in what way they arose: by thoughts, sights, touches, kisses, or impure speeches.

52. Their moral malice from the end of the agent. To determine the moral malice of acts of immodesty, attention must be paid to the end on account of which they are performed by the agent, and to the danger which they induce, of venereal stirring, pollution, and consent to delectation. As regards the first, outside marriage they can be performed for a fourfold end: a. from the intention of venereal delectation or from libidinous affection; b. from the intention of sensual delectation; c. from play, levity, and curiosity; d. from a just and reasonable cause.

a. If they are done from a depraved and libidinous affection, although of themselves they have little influence upon libido, as the sight of a woman, handling of the hand, etc., they are always a grave sin because of the gravely evil intention; therefore it makes no difference whether the acts themselves are more or less base.

- b. If they are done from the sole intention of sensual delectation, they are a light sin, unless they induce proximate danger of carnal stirring and of consenting to venereal delectation, as can happen if they are performed with some affection and delay.
- c. In these acts had from sensual delectation alone, a twofold malice is found: that they are disordered, i.e. that they are not referred and cannot be referred to a rational end, and that they induce danger of venereal delectation and of consent to it; but each is a light sin unless the danger is proximate. Now the greater the affection and delay in those acts, the greater is the danger of venereal delectation and consent; indeed a longer delay with which they are performed is frequently a sign not only of great affection, but also of a libidinous soul, although a just cause for performing them is present, e.g. for giving a kiss. Therefore touches, kisses, embraces, if without a reasonable cause they occur on account of sensual delectation alone, are of themselves light sins.
- d. St. Alphonsus teaches, n. 416, that there is no smallness of matter in sensual delectation, e.g. in the touch of the hand of a woman, as there is in the touch of a smooth thing, e.g. of a rose or silk cloth, because it is impossible that sensual delectation be intended and venereal delectation not also be intended, or at least because it is mortal to expose oneself to the proximate danger of consenting to venereal delectation; and one who acts from the intention of sensual delectation exposes himself to this danger. Therefore he denies that touches and kisses among young persons of diverse sex, had on account of sensual delectation, are venial sins. But it seems that it must be admitted that actions of this kind can occur on account of sensual delectation without intention and proximate danger of libido or of venereal delectation or of consent to it. For sensual delectation indeed disposes toward venereal delectation, but does not include it; therefore it can happen that sensual delectation alone is intended, both if venereal delectation is explicitly excluded and if it is only not thought about.⁵⁶
- e. If they are done from levity, play, or curiosity, and therefore briefly and cursorily, although of themselves they can excite very strongly toward libido, as base sights or touches, they are a light sin, both because curiosity is light and because the influence upon base movements in these is light and remote.
- f. If they are done from a just cause, even if a sense of delectation or even pollution is excited beyond intention, they are no sin, provided consent is absent. A just cause of positing them is: decency, utility, necessity. But the more modesty is injured, the greater the cause is required which excuses the immodest action; hence only necessity excuses a gravely immodest action, as to look at or touch the indecent parts of a person of the other sex, as in physicians and surgeons.

53. Their moral species. External acts of immodesty are: sights, touches, kisses, embraces, speeches, songs, readings. Now if their moral species is treated, the question properly concerns sights and touches: for kisses and embraces are reduced to touches, but speeches, songs, and readings had from the intention of venereal delectation are of themselves the same sins as thoughts and desires which are fostered interiorly while the words are spoken.

Between sights and touches this difference must be noted, that sight is not so material and concrete, and therefore easily abstracts from the circumstances of the person as such and regards that person as a man or woman, not as married, sacred, or related by blood; but touch by its nature is more material and concrete, and therefore does not abstract from the circumstances of the person who is touched.

- a. Sights and touches performed on account of venereal delectation are not sins of diverse species; therefore in confession it need not necessarily be asked whether venereal delectation occurred from touch or

Notes

56. Cf. Sporer-Bierbaum, III, tract. 10, n. 686 f.; Elbel-Bierbaum I, pr. 4, n. 183 ff.

from sight or from a depraved thought, unless the touch was done on another, and this on account of cooperation.

Although sight and touch differ essentially by reason of the act, because they proceed from essentially diverse faculties and tend toward diverse objects, by reason of moral malice they do not differ specifically: for their proper malice consists in the venereal delectation sought through them, which does not obtain a specific difference from the fact that it is procured by this or that sense or mode, but is of the same species in all these acts.⁵⁷

- b. Touches, kisses, embraces, which from a depraved intention are done on another, are sins of diverse species according to the diversity of circumstances in the persons who are touched indecently; for since touch attains the person materially and in the concrete, as happens in the very acts of lust, they are of diverse species, just as the perfect acts to which they are naturally ordered.

Therefore touch on a person of the same sex and touch on a person of diverse sex differ in species: for the latter by its nature is referred to fornication, the former to sodomy. Touch on an unmarried person and touch on a married person differ in species: for the latter naturally tends toward adultery, the former toward fornication. Hence in confession the object of the touch must be explained.

- c. But base sights which from a depraved intention are done on another, unless desire is added, are not sins diverse in species according to the diversity of circumstances in the person who is seen. For sight attains the object less materially and concretely than touch, so that ordinarily it abstracts from the circumstances of the person, unless the libidinous affection is borne precisely toward such a person. Therefore in confession the quality of the person basely seen, whether she was related by blood, married, sacred, etc., need not be declared.

Nevertheless a base sight of a male and of a female differ in species, and therefore also venereal delectation sought from the base sight of a male or female: for sight can indeed abstract from the circumstances of the person, but not from the diversity of persons; wherefore sight of a male is referred to intercourse with a male, sight of a female to intercourse with a female.⁵⁸

54. Their moral malice from danger. To determine the moral malice of acts of immodesty which are done without the direct intention of procuring venereal delectation for oneself, attention must be paid to the danger which they induce, more or less proximate, of venereal stirring and pollution, or to the influence which they exercise in exciting libido. Therefore those acts are grave sins which proximately and notably influence toward exciting libido; those acts are light sins which remotely and lightly influence toward exciting libido.

- a. To determine this influence, three things especially must be considered: a. the nature of the acts; for some acts of themselves and by their nature stir gravely, others only lightly; b. their various circumstances: for acts which are done with lingering delay and are repeated more often excite much more than acts which are done in passing and only once; likewise acts which are done vehemently and with great ardor stir more than acts which are done lightly and calmly; c. the disposition of the agent: for acts which excite some vehemently stir others little because of subjective disposition. Therefore concerning each act of immodesty one must judge which ordinarily influence gravely and proximately, which lightly and remotely, upon venereal stirring and upon pollution, and therefore which ordinarily are grave and which are light sins.

Notes

57. Cf. St. Thomas II-II, q. 154, a. 4; Buceroni I, n. 783.

58. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri II, n. 969 ff.

- b. Although corruption of morals for the most part arises from obscene conversations: evil conversations corrupt good morals,⁵⁹ nevertheless things heard influence the phantasy, and therefore the stirring of the flesh, less than things seen; but most of all and most efficaciously the flesh is solicited from touch.

55. On touches. 1. In one's own body. a. To touch oneself in the indecent parts for the sake of necessity or utility, for curing an illness, for driving away itching, or for wiping away filth, consent to delectation perhaps arising being excluded, is licit, although carnal movements, indeed even pollution, follow.

But it should be advised: a. that as far as can be done touches of this kind be performed in passing and mechanically, with thought turned to other things; b. that one cease from touches when the movements become more vehement.

- b. To touch oneself in the indecent parts without a just cause, but short of a depraved affection, in those who know that they are not stirred by touches of this kind, is not a sin, at least in the genus of lust. But for children touches of this kind, especially while they are lying in bed, must be severely forbidden on account of the destructive consequences of this matter. But those who for a longer time without cause touch themselves basely ordinarily excite carnal movements and venereal delectation; indeed for the most part they do this from the depraved end of delectation or pollution.
2. In another's body. a. To touch a person of the same sex in the indecent parts without a just cause is grave, even if it is done mediately only over clothes, because it stirs much. The same must be said a fortiori of a touch of this kind on a person of diverse sex. Nevertheless, the libidinous intention being excluded, if it is done only in passing and without delay, from levity or play, it is not a grave sin.
- a. Touches of this kind had among the impubescent from levity or play and without delay are not grave sins, because at this age they are not accustomed to excite stirrings.
 - b. Authors who excuse from mortal sin indecent sights or touches on a person of diverse sex done from curiosity suppose that both danger of consent to delectation and danger of pollution are absent; but in truth the circumstances in which each of these dangers is absent will be rare.
 - c. To touch a person of the same sex in the less honest parts, a depraved intention being excluded, will scarcely be a sin, at least a grave one; but to touch a person of diverse sex in the less honest parts can scarcely be excused from grave sin, unless it is done very much in passing, from levity or play, on the arm or shoulders. For although touches at the beginning are done on account of sensual delectation, for the most part it is impossible that carnal movements, indeed pollution itself, should not follow from them.
 - d. To touch a woman on the breasts, even if it is done by a person of the same sex, is not excused from grave sin, because it stirs very much and therefore induces danger of pollution and consent.
 - e. To touch a person, even of diverse sex, in the honest parts, if it is done from a reasonable cause, is not a sin; if it is done without a reasonable cause, even with some delay and affection, a depraved intention being excluded, of itself it is a light sin, but it easily induces grave danger.
 - f. To touch a beast in the indecent parts ordinarily is not a grave sin unless it is done from a libidinous affection; nevertheless if the touches are continued deliberately, especially if it is done even to the pollution of the animal, ordinarily it is a grave sin, both on account of the danger of consent to base delectation, which easily arises in the one touching, and on account of grave danger of one's own pollution.

Notes

59. 1 Cor. 15, 33.

56. On kisses. 1. Lingering kisses, often repeated, impressed with great affection between persons of diverse sex, ordinarily are grave sins, because they stir very much; besides, they often proceed from libidinous affection: for among the unmarried they rarely have another cause.

Nevertheless it can happen that they are not grave sins. Thus if someone, for example, about to depart elsewhere, kisses a person of diverse sex, related by blood or well known, more often or lingeringly from sensual affection, but does not care about the carnal movements which perhaps he experiences and does not consent to them, he does not sin gravely: for a legitimate cause is present and both libidinous affection and consent to pleasure are excluded. Since nevertheless due moderation is lacking in the use of a licit action, a venial sin is committed; but kisses and embraces of this kind, repeated and lingering, between parents and children, which are done as a sign of special love, are free from all fault.

2. Decent kisses, which are done according to the custom of the country, for the sake of courtesy, friendship, kinship, or for signifying and increasing honorable love, even between persons of diverse sex, are licit, although carnal movements are excited, provided consent to venereal delectation is avoided. The same must be said concerning embraces and handling of hands.
3. Decent kisses, embraces, hand-pressures, which are done from play, levity, or even from sensual affection, with no cause of necessity or utility making them honorable, are light sins, if venereal delectation either does not arise or arises without foresight, and if, on account of the danger of consent and pollution, there is cessation from those actions when delectation of this kind is perceived.

Likewise it is a venial sin if decent kisses, touches, embraces are done from sensual affection, n. 7, by which someone, for example, follows after an impubescent boy or girl on account of beauty. This is not mortal, because depraved intention and proximate danger of exciting delectation or pollution are lacking; nevertheless it is not without fault, because a reasonable end is lacking. But because the passage from sensual delectation to venereal delectation is easy, these acts committed from sensual affection are grave sins if they are done lingeringly and without a just cause among pubescent persons of diverse sex and there is no cessation when the increasing delectation is already perceived, because they induce grave danger of pollution, indeed of consent.⁶⁰

4. Kisses on the less honest parts, and especially on the indecent parts, are a grave sin, because they stir very much. Besides, these can scarcely proceed except from libidinous affection, since a reasonable cause for kissing those parts can with difficulty be imagined.

57. On sights. 1. To look at oneself in the indecent parts from necessity or utility, depraved affection being excluded, is nothing. To do this from curiosity or levity, consent being excluded, is venial, because one's own parts move less; nevertheless it can be mortal if it is done lingeringly without necessity. To look at the less honest parts of one's own body even without cause is not a sin, at least in the genus of lust, because this does not stir.

2. To look at a naked person of the same sex, for example one swimming together, in passing from curiosity, is venial, because ordinarily it does not move much; but to look seriously, deliberately, and lingeringly at a naked person of the same sex even from curiosity alone is mortal, because by its nature and proximately it excites libido.
- a. Nevertheless it must be required from those swimming together that they do this with the indecent parts covered, unless somewhere, as in England, in the East, common usage bears that they swim even with

Notes

60. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri II, n. 976 ff.

the indecent parts uncovered: for those accustomed to sights of this kind are stirred with more difficulty. In like manner the custom of certain regions brings it about that images and statues representing naked persons, angels, are looked at without danger, unless it is done studiously and lingeringly.

- b. Boys and girls who from levity or curiosity uncover the genitals to one another must be gravely reproved: for although this at that age is not mortal, nevertheless it diminishes chaste modesty and disposes and leads to further things.
3. To look at the less honest parts of a person of diverse sex of itself is not mortal, because it does not notably excite; but a long-lasting sight of this kind cannot be excused from mortal sin. Likewise to look at a person of diverse sex in the indecent parts, even only from curiosity, is mortal, because this ordinarily much excites corrupted nature. There must be excepted a sight which occurs very much in passing and almost unexpectedly, or which is done briefly and from a distance; likewise the sight of a naked infant of diverse sex.
4. To look at statues or images of either sex plainly naked, without reason of necessity or great utility, with fixed, serious sight and with some delay, is a grave sin, because they much excite the rebellion of the flesh, unless perhaps they are very ancient statues which, as experience testifies, do not stir so much. But if indecent statues and images are looked at without cause in passing and cursorily, it is venial, because sights which are not intense and with delay do not excite much.
5. To look at the base parts or the intercourse of animals from curiosity without libidinous affection is venial, especially if the animals are smaller, as birds or dogs, and if they are looked at only in passing, because this is not accustomed to excite pleasure much. To look at human intercourse is a grave sin, unless it is done briefly and from a distance.

Necessity excuses those joining domestic animals, as bulls and horses, even if stirring of the flesh or even pollution should arise, consent being excluded; but this office, as far as can be done, must be entrusted to married persons or older persons, who are not so inclined to venereal things as young persons.

Note on works of art. From these things must also be taken the principle to be observed by artists, whether painters or sculptors, in the representation of the human body. For art is not exempt from the observation of the natural and divine law, but on the contrary is plainly held to the moral laws in producing its works. It is easily conceded that the human body in itself is honest and beautiful, but nevertheless apt to excite venereal sense in others. Therefore since it is prohibited by the moral law that anyone by his actions solicit others to sin, it must be said to be prohibited that those parts of the body be exhibited naked and uncovered which commonly excite those looking at them toward libido. Nor can it in any way be conceded that bodies, if you abstract from the not yet developed bodies of infants and from the withering bodies of old men, can be exhibited by artifice, stylization, idealization, in such a way that, although naked, they do not stir carnally.

58. On speeches. 1. To speak base things can be sinful in three ways:

- a. by reason of the end, if someone speaks base things from a libidinous affection for taking venereal delectation, or for seducing another to sin;
- b. by reason of the danger of exciting base movements or even pollution and of consenting in it;
- c. by reason of the scandal which is furnished to those hearing, especially if they are of younger age.

Therefore he commits a grave sin who speaks or sings base things from the depraved end of delectation, or with proximate danger of consenting to delectation, or with grave scandal of others.

2. To speak base things, if the words are lightly obscene, or indeed gravely so, but are uttered for the sake of play for vain recreation, as is done by workmen while working, is light; indeed even if from levity very obscene conversations are mixed in, e.g. concerning the conjugal act, concerning means of impeding generation, concerning the genital members especially of the other sex, concerning the mode of polluting oneself, concerning the mode of generating, etc., they are not always mortal, because as experience testifies they frequently excite nature little.
3. From boasting to narrate grave sins perpetrated by oneself, and to adorn this with very obscene words, is grave, and ordinarily indeed in three ways: by reason of joy concerning an evil thing, by reason of scandal, and by reason of the danger of impure delectation, especially if the conversations are drawn out longer.
4. To hear base speeches is a grave sin if the hearer by his manner of acting provokes gravely base speeches, or if from a depraved affection he is delighted by them. But one who from human respect smiles or even mixes in some word, likewise one who from curiosity hears such things when he could easily leave, does not sin gravely.⁶¹
5. To sing songs even very obscene is not always a grave sin, namely if it is done from levity or on account of vain solace; for since the things which are sung from this end ordinarily do not stir gravely, proximate danger of grave sin can be excluded.

As regards obscene words, penitents must be asked before whom they uttered them: before adolescents or more grown persons, before unmarried or married persons, on account of scandal; for the unmarried are more easily scandalized than the married, boys and girls more than adults. But it is not fitting for the confessor to ask penitents who accuse themselves of depraved conversations what they said. Wherefore, for making judgment concerning the gravity of this sin, after the question has been made whether the conversations were very indecent, he should rather presume the gravity of the sin from the condition of the penitent. Thus it must be noted that base speeches which married persons have among themselves are rarely grave sins; but base speeches which young persons have among themselves, or married persons with the unmarried, or a married person with an external person of diverse sex, can easily be grave sins, whether on account of depraved affection or on account of danger of consent to base movements, especially if the speeches are drawn out longer.

59. On readings. 1. To read books only lightly base, from curiosity or for the sake of recreation, without depraved affection, is venial: for the danger of depraved delectation is remote if the books are only lightly base.

The reading of novels which treat of loves in such a way that they are neither altogether chaste nor altogether obscene must be greatly dissuaded for young persons of either sex, since their reading weakens character, fills the phantasy with inept images, and universally disposes toward softness. By those who know by experience that from reading of this kind they suffer grave temptations or frequent pollutions, these books must be avoided under grave sin; otherwise they are not prohibited under grave sin, even if here and there stirring or even pollution follows, to which nevertheless consent is not given. Their reading is licit if it is undertaken from a reasonable cause, for erudition, for style, and temptations perhaps arising are rejected.

Notes

61. Cf. Berardi, *Praxis confess.*⁶¹ 3, I, n. 921.

2. To read books, even if not very base, is ordinarily a grave sin, because reading of this kind, as prolonged for a longer time, ordinarily stirs gravely and exposes to proximate danger of base delectation and pollution.

If nevertheless someone read only a little from curiosity, or if he knew by experience that he was not stirred by such reading or that he did not consent to the stirring that arose, he would not sin gravely. Likewise young persons who from curiosity seek obscene words in dictionaries do not of themselves sin gravely.

3. To read books even only lightly base from a libidinous intention or with proximate danger of consenting to base delectation is a grave sin.
4. To read base books from a just and proportionately grave cause, proximate danger of consent to base delectation being excluded, is not a sin.
 - a. Therefore they do not sin who read obscene books for acquiring due knowledge for themselves, for correcting morals, etc.; likewise those who read obscene classical books on account of elegance of speech for perfecting style, though these books must not be handed over to young persons, provided they do not consent to base delectation.⁶²
 - b. It must be carefully examined whether the cause on account of which an obscene book is read is sufficiently grave: for the greater the danger of base delectation is, the graver the cause ought to be. Curiosity, likewise recreation, which can equally be taken from other innocent things, is not a just cause. Nevertheless stirring or pollution which is foreseen to arise from the study of medicine, anatomy, fine art, etc., consent being excluded, is not imputed as grave sin, even if the study is done without necessity from mere curiosity.⁶³

60. Whether it is licit for painters and sculptors to look for a long time at naked persons of the same or diverse sex, who present themselves to them as a model (*Modell stehen*).

This certainly is not licit for painting or sculpting obscene things: for an evil end cannot make honorable a dangerous sight; but for painting or sculpting honorable things, insofar as it is necessary for the end of art, under certain conditions and with due cautions it is licit.

- a. It is clear that both the persons who offer themselves to be looked at and the artists looking at them expose themselves to grave danger of sinning; wherefore these things are licit only insofar as they are necessary for the end of art. But artists contend that “studies” in the nude body are altogether necessary for the perfection of art, even honorable and religious art; and so this necessity excuses those sights.
- b. The required conditions are: a. that the model be truly necessary; b. that the denudation not be extended beyond necessity, for the end of art can be obtained even if the wholly obscene parts are covered; c. that by employing cautions, especially prayer and the honorable intention of seriously devoting oneself to the study of art, danger of consent to delectation perhaps arising be excluded.
- c. The use of models where these conditions are not observed is of itself a grave sin. Nevertheless, if for young painters who are compelled to attend academies for the sake of learning art, naked persons are proposed in academies as models without necessity, the young persons looking at such things indeed do not sin, provided they employ due cautions for avoiding consent, because they cannot abstain from them without being compelled to withdraw from the academies. Nevertheless, by reason of scandal and

Notes

62. Cf. const. *Officiorum ac munerum*, n. 10.

63. Lessius, l. 4, c. 3, n. 99.

induction, both those who propose such things and the persons who offer themselves to be looked at sin gravely.⁶⁴

Whether it is licit to admit touches or kisses which are known to proceed from libidinous affection.

If the touches are of themselves indecent and are done without necessity, this is not licit, both because it is cooperation with the sin of another without a just cause, and because the one who is touched exposes himself to the danger of sinning: for not only to touch indecently, but also to be touched indecently excites pleasure. But if the touch or kiss is of itself honorable, and it is done publicly before others who do not notice the depraved affection of the other, it can be admitted if it cannot be declined without the other being defamed. But if it is done secretly, or if it can be prevented without one's own inconvenience or another's, it is not licit, since there is no cause excusing the cooperation.

Article Three.

On Internal Sins.

Internal sins against chastity are commonly signified by the name of impure thought; but in reality three are distinguished: a. impure thoughts; b. morose delectations; c. impure desires.

61. On impure thoughts. Thoughts are called impure, or rather imaginations, which represent a base matter. Thoughts of this kind are indifferent of themselves, but they contain a twofold dangerous efficacy: of exciting libido even to pollution, and of enticing to consent, namely so that the base thing itself pleases or the desire of perpetrating it arises. Concerning impure thought, insofar as it contains danger of provoking libidinous movements, the discussion is in this number; insofar as it contains danger of consent, the discussion is in the following number.

1. Moral malice. a. To admit impure thoughts from a libidinous affection or from the depraved end of enjoying venereal delectation, which they excite, is a grave sin; likewise to have complacency in the pleasure which thoughts of this kind, arising beyond the will, provoke.
- b. To admit impure thoughts which do not stir much, from mere levity or idleness, or to linger over them, is a light sin, because they do not cast one into grave danger of sinning by consent to venereal delectation or of polluting oneself.
- c. To admit impure thoughts which stir much, from mere levity or idleness, or to linger over them, ordinarily is a grave sin, because they bring proximate danger of consent to delectation and of pollution. Nevertheless, in order that these thoughts be a grave sin, it is required that advertence to the grave danger of sinning be present.
- d. But to admit impure thoughts or to foster them from an honorable end is licit, even if they cause carnal movements, indeed even pollution itself, provided nevertheless that consent to delectation is excluded.

Where someone adverts that from an indecent thought he is carnally stirred, he is bound to repel it if he does not have a just cause of lingering over it; and where nevertheless he adheres to it lingeringly and for a longer time, he sins gravely on account of the proximate danger of consenting to delectation and of arriving at pollution. But if a just cause is present for continuing that thought, he ought to guard against consent to delectation at least through an act of displeasure.

Notes

64. Cf. Genicot I, n. 407.

2. Specific malice. Impure thoughts which are sinful insofar as they excite libidinous movements are not specifically diverse according to the diversity of the object represented, but all are of the same moral species: for all agree in this, that they excite libido; but the affection and complacency of the will are borne only toward this effect. Therefore it is not necessary that the object of the impure thought be declared: for it makes no difference whether venereal pleasure arises or is sought from this object or from another.

62. On morose delectations. Morose delectation signifies complacency concerning a base sin represented through thought and imagination, as if it were now being done, as if someone represents to himself base touches, pollution, fornication, sodomy, as if they were now being done either by himself or by another. Concerning it the question is how great and what kind of sin it is.

1. Morose delectation concerning a base thing is a sin of the same gravity and species as the base thing itself represented by thought and imagination: for an act of the will receives its theological and moral species from the object toward which it tends.

Voluntary delectation concerning a base touch on a male differs in species from delectation concerning a base touch on a female; likewise delectation concerning fornication differs in species from delectation concerning sodomy. As regards the gravity of the sin, each of these latter is grave; delectation concerning touch can be grave or light according to the nature of the touch.

2. Morose delectation does not contract the specific malice of circumstances which are contained in the base object, unless the will is delighted in the circumstances themselves: ordinarily the will, by abstracting from the circumstances, is delighted in the object alone.
 - a. It is a great question whether morose delectations receive specific malice also from the circumstances of the object concerning which the will is delighted: whether, for example, one who is morosely delighted concerning a base touch on a blood relative admits not only delectation concerning venereal touch on a female, but also concerning an incestuous touch; likewise whether an unmarried man who is morosely delighted concerning intercourse with a married woman commits not only delectation concerning fornication, but also concerning adultery.

Since in morose delectation abstraction is made from the execution of the evil thing, one can abstract, and ordinarily in reality one does abstract, from the circumstances of the object, which therefore do not pour back their malice into the delectation. Certainly delectation receives specific malice from the object insofar as the object pleases and delights; but the circumstances of the base object, that it is a blood relative, a married person, are not apt to delight. Therefore it can be said that the will is not delighted in them unless it is explicitly borne also toward the circumstances.

Therefore, although the object of morose delectation must be declared in confession, nevertheless it is not necessary that the circumstances of the object changing the species also be declared: for true probability cannot be denied to the opinion which denies that morose delectation puts on specific malice from the circumstances of the object, unless the will is delighted in those very circumstances.⁶⁵

- b. Although simple delectation or complacency concerning a base action represented through thought and its inefficacious desire can be distinguished theoretically, nevertheless in the concrete an inefficacious desire is almost always joined with simple delectation. Therefore the faithful ordinarily do not know how to distinguish between morose delectation and base inefficacious desire. Likewise simple delectation

Notes

65. Cf. Lacroix, l. 6, pr. 2, n. 1028; Reuter, l. c., n. 209; Lehmkuhl I, n. 255 ff.

concerning a base thing and venereal delectation concerning the same thing are in reality distinguished; but because simple delectation almost always excites venereal delectation, or venereal sense, the faithful do not sufficiently distinguish the latter from the former.

For confessors it follows from these things that the faithful who accuse themselves of impure thoughts must be asked whether they also desired something base. But if they deny it, it is not necessary that confessors be solicitous about the object of the base thought; it suffices that they ask whether they experienced delectations or base senses and consented to them. But if they affirm base desires, the office of the confessor of itself requires that he prudently and directly investigate their object and circumstances; nevertheless, because this investigation is frequently too arduous and renders confession burdensome, and because moreover the faithful do not sufficiently distinguish between thoughts and desires, there will often be cause for omitting that investigation.

63. On impure desires. An impure desire is the will by which someone intends to complete a base thing. It is twofold: efficacious, when someone absolutely intends to complete the base thing; and inefficacious, when someone conditionally, if I could, intends to execute the base thing.

Even in an inefficacious desire there is of itself affection toward the base thing; wherefore the same theological and specific malice belongs to it as to an efficacious desire, and therefore it is not necessary in confession to declare whether the desire was efficacious or inefficacious.

1. Impure desires, whether absolute or conditioned, are sins of the same gravity and species as the external work which is wished for: for the internal act receives specific malice from the object toward which it tends.

That a depraved desire is a sin of the same gravity and species as the desired object is clear also from the words of the Lord: Everyone who sees a woman in order to desire her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.⁶⁶ What is said here concerning adultery must be said concerning any other base work: he who desires it has already performed it in his heart.

2. Impure desires take specific malice not only from the object, but also from all circumstances of the object apprehended: for since the depraved will is borne toward a determinate object, it is necessarily borne toward all things which are contained in that object, provided they are known.

Therefore the desire of fornicating with a blood relative is the sin of incest, and the desire of fornicating with a married woman is adultery, namely the same sin which would be committed if the desire were fulfilled. Hence one who confesses a base desire is bound of himself to declare its object and all circumstances of the object changing the species.

Whether it is licit to desire merely natural pollution.

- a. Merely natural pollution is called that which occurs spontaneously and involuntarily, whether in dreams or in waking, from the abundance of semen by which nature tries to unload itself.
- b. It is not licit to desire it on account of the venereal delectation which accompanies it; but it is licit to desire it from an honorable end, e.g. as a means of quieting temptation, of unloading nature: for the object of this desire is not evil and the end is good.

Pollution which arises naturally, i.e. through causes instituted by nature, is not evil in itself. There are those who say that pollution which occurs from a base dream or from movements and touches following sleep is

Notes

66. Matt. 5, 28.

evil, and therefore that it is illicit to desire it or to rejoice about it. Others, however, think that even pollution occurring in this way is indifferent, because the causes provoking it are natural, n. 34.

Whether it is licit for betrothed persons to rejoice concerning future intercourse. The desire of future intercourse to be had after marriage has been entered, and joy concerning it, is not a sin in betrothed persons, because its object is licit; nevertheless the matter is not without danger. For thought of intercourse to be had easily excites venereal sense; but joy and delectation concerning venereal sense in betrothed persons is as grave a sin as in the unmarried.

Note. Pious penitents who are importunately troubled by depraved images are not to be blamed or rebuked, but suitably instructed in this way: a. imaginations of this kind are not of themselves sins, but temptations excited by nature or by the devil; wherefore b. they are a cross to be borne patiently, by which the merit of good works is increased; and c. they are to be efficaciously fought by ejaculatory prayers interposed from time to time, but otherwise by contempt.

Book Two.

On the Use of Marriage.⁶⁷

64. The use of marriage consists in that action of spouses which was instituted by nature for conserving and propagating the human race, namely in carnal intercourse. By the Apostle this action of spouses is called the debt,⁶⁸ because spouses, from the matrimonial contract, mutually owe it to one another. We must treat: a. of the liceity of the conjugal act in itself; b. of its liceity by reason of circumstances; c. of its obligation; d. of those things which are licit for spouses in marriage; e. of the impediments of the conjugal act.

- a. Intercourse or the conjugal act, from the things said above, n. 6, on the part of the man consists in penetration of the womanly vessel and is completed by effusion of semen joined with carnal delectation; on the part of the woman it consists in reception of the virile semen and is completed by effusion of vulvo-vaginal humor likewise joined with carnal delectation. From these things it is understood what is signified by the name of insemination. Insemination on the part of the man is the emission of semen; on the part of the woman it is the emission of vulvo-vaginal humor.
- b. For effecting generation in the woman neither the sense of pleasure nor insemination is necessary: for experience establishes that women have been made pregnant without these things. Nevertheless insemination helps to render fecundation easier, because the spermatozoa can move more easily and more swiftly in the vulvo-vaginal humor and proceed toward the interior organs of the woman.

Question One.

On the Liceity of the Conjugal Act in Itself.

Article One.

On the Liceity Itself.

65. **Whether it is licit.** The conjugal act in itself is licit and honorable: for it is a means ordained by God for propagating the human race; wherefore, if the right end is not excluded, it is not only licit, but, with the

Notes

67. St. Alphonsus, l. 6, *De usu matrimonii*, n. 900-954; Thomas Sanchez, *De matrimonii sacramento*, l. 9, *De debito coniugali*; Sporer-Bierbaum, *Theologia mor. sacram.* (Paderborn: Typograph. Bonifac., 1901), III, pr. 4, *De peccatis coniugum in usu matrimonii*, n. 467-520; Ballerini-Palmieri, *Opus theolog. mor.*[^]3 (Prati: Giachetti, 1900), VI, n. 306-416; Lehmkuhl II, n. 833-859; Jos. Aertnys, *Fasciculus theol. mor.*[^]5 (Leipzig: Kittler, 1888), tr. 2, *De usu matrimonii*; Antonelli II, n. 354-479.

68. 1 Cor. 7, 3.

things to be supposed having been supposed, also meritorious. Moreover, in Sacred Scripture the conjugal act is directly commanded to the first parents in those words: increase and multiply;⁶⁹ but it cannot be said without blasphemy that God commands anything which is not licit and honorable. Finally Christ raised the matrimonial contract, by which spouses mutually confer on one another the right to conjugal acts, to the dignity of a sacrament; but only a contract by which those contracting obligate themselves to a licit and honorable thing could be raised to so great a dignity. Therefore St. Paul praises marriage and commands the conjugal act to spouses.⁷⁰

66. The conjugal act is licit even in those circumstances in which generation of offspring cannot be obtained, provided it can be performed in a natural way. For by marriage legitimately contracted spouses have the right to the conjugal act as long as at least one of the essential ends of marriage can be obtained through that act; but since each is an essential end of marriage, both the generation of offspring and the quieting of concupiscence, although offspring cannot be generated, the conjugal act is not without its proper end, which is the quieting of concupiscence.

- a. Old persons and sterile persons licitly have intercourse, even if generation of offspring from it is impossible, provided they are capable of natural intercourse, at least in an imperfect mode.
- b. Intercourse is licit during pregnancy, even if at that time conception cannot occur, unless intercourse is prohibited on account of another cause.
- c. A husband whose two testicles have been amputated on account of illness licitly has intercourse; likewise a wife whose ovaries have been extirpated or whose uterus even has been cut out.

Therefore through impotence supervening upon a valid marriage, spouses do not lose the right to the use of marriage: namely, removal of the testicles and excision of the ovaries or uterus are causes of impotence arising after marriage. There are authors who say that spouses in this case lose the right to the use of marriage and cannot licitly exercise anything except imperfect acts. Nevertheless they admonish that, since spouses upon whom impotence supervenes ordinarily use marriage in good faith, they are to be left in good faith.⁷¹ But the opinion of those who say that intercourse in the case of supervening impotence is licit seems altogether probable. Generation indeed in this case is impossible, but after marriage has been entered it is not necessary that its primary end be able to be obtained, provided one of the essential ends is obtained. Moreover the right to intercourse acquired by a valid marriage is not taken away through that which happens accidentally; but it is accidental that a spouse, after entering a valid marriage, becomes impotent from illness or misfortune.

67. How it must be completed. The conjugal act ought to be completed in such a way that the essential end of marriage, which is the generation of offspring, as regards the act itself, can be obtained in a natural way. It is not necessary that this end actually be obtained; but this is altogether required, that from the side of the act it can at least be obtained. For virile semen is not supplied by nature for any other end except that it serve for generating offspring by natural intercourse.

Therefore spouses sin gravely if they do anything by which generation is impeded, or if they come together in such a way that generation is either impossible or at least improbable: for they act against nature and the primary end of marriage.

Notes

69. Gen. 1, 28; 1 Cor. 7, 3.

70. Heb. 13, 4; 1 Cor. 7, 3.

71. Cf. Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis* II, n. 426 ff.

- a. If the man, after insemination has been completed, withdraws himself without awaiting the insemination of the woman, he does not sin, because nothing is done by which generation is impeded, since the insemination of the woman is not necessary; moreover a reason for acting in this way is easily present.
- b. If the man withdraws himself before insemination, when the wife has already inseminated or is in proximate danger of inseminating, he does not sin, provided the danger of pouring forth semen is excluded and a reason for acting in this way is present: for since the insemination of the woman is not necessary for generation, nothing is done in this way by which generation is impeded.
- c. If the wife restrains insemination when the man has already inseminated, the omission itself of insemination is not a sin, because it cannot impede generation. But the intention on account of which insemination is restrained can be gravely sinful, namely if it is done to impede generation.
- d. Sometimes women, while they exercise the conjugal act, turn the mind to other things or procure sensible pain for themselves, lest they be aroused to insemination. If they do this to impede generation, they sin gravely from this depraved intention. But if they know that the insemination of the woman is not required for generation and therefore that conception cannot be impeded by this manner of acting, they certainly do not sin gravely; whether they sin lightly depends on the end on account of which they do these things.
- e. Although the so-called insemination of the woman is not necessary for conception of offspring, nevertheless, according to the very probable hypothesis which physiologists now establish, the hope of future conception increases where the woman not only is herself aroused even to the effusion of humor, but moreover her insemination occurs at the same moment of time at which the man pours forth semen.⁷²

68. Conditions required for generation. For obtaining generation by natural intercourse, two things are required on the part of the act:

- 1. That the man penetrate the vessel of the woman with the genital member and pour forth semen there.
 - a. From recent physiology it is established that generation can occur, provided the virile semen is poured forth at the mouth of the womanly organ. Therefore, if the conjugal act cannot be had in another and more perfect mode, it is licit to exercise it in this way: for in order that the conjugal act can be exercised licitly in this case, nothing else is required except that the essential end of marriage, which is the generation of offspring, can be obtained, even if part of the semen is frustrated. But if the more perfect mode is possible, it is not licit to exercise the conjugal act in this imperfect mode, because this would be the same as morally impeding generation: for by this mode of coming together generation follows very rarely and only accidentally.
 - b. The conjugal act which is completed in such a way that the man only penetrates part of the vagina of the wife and there pours forth semen is not illicit of itself, unless it is done from the depraved intention of impeding generation, because in this way conception is indeed rendered more difficult, but not impossible nor improbable. But spouses are not bound to choose the more certain mode by which offspring may be conceived. Nevertheless, if without another cause they come together in this way only for rendering conception more difficult, they sin venially, because there is some disorder in rendering conception more difficult without cause.
 - c. Although spouses can omit the mode of coming together which leads to easier and more certain conception, provided the act remains truly apt for effecting conception, nevertheless it is not licit for

Notes

72. Stohr-Kannamuller, *Handbuch der Pastoralmedizin*⁴ (Freiburg: Herder, 1900), p. 467 f.

them directly to posit a positive action by which conception is impeded, even only probably. Therefore it is illicit to introduce into the vagina of the woman not only means by which the semen is killed, but also means, a certain kind of fat or butter, by which the semen is not destroyed, yet conception is rendered less probable.

- d. Spouses who on account of old age or another indisposition for the most part pour forth semen outside the vessel can licitly exercise the conjugal act, provided there is a probable hope of pouring forth semen within the vessel: for as long as a probable hope of generation is present, spouses have the right to intercourse; but if the semen in fact is poured forth, this occurs accidentally.⁷³

But if spouses, from supervening impotence, whether on the part of the man or on the part of the woman, cannot complete the conjugal act in such a way that the semen is at least in some measure received within the female vessel, intercourse is rendered illicit.

- c. Spouses who exercise the conjugal act but both restrain insemination, i.e. break off intercourse before insemination, do not sin, the danger of pouring forth semen outside the vessel being excluded, if they do this by mutual consent and a sufficient cause is present for acting in this way, e.g. lest insemination harm health, or lest poor spouses be burdened by new offspring. The conjugal act in this case has the nature of an immodest touch, which in married persons, the danger of pollution being excluded, is not gravely illicit; and if it is done from a just cause, e.g. for quieting concupiscence, it is free from fault. But if one withdraws without the consent of the other, he sins gravely, because he injures the other's right in a grave matter; for the other has a right to completed intercourse. Nevertheless the hypothesis, namely that proximate danger of pollution is not induced by an act of this kind, will very rarely have place.
- d. If the man withdraws himself and restrains insemination when the wife has already poured forth humor or is so aroused that she cannot impede the effusion, he does not commit mortal sin, and from a reasonable cause this manner of acting is excused: for since the insemination of the woman is not necessary for generation, its frustration is not grave.

The opinion of many authors, whom St. Alphonsus followed, l. 6, n. 91, 8, namely that by this action a grave sin is committed, rests on a false supposition, namely that the semen of the woman, necessary for generation, is frustrated. These authors indeed concede that that frustration is not so intrinsically evil that it cannot be excused for any reason; but they require a most grave cause, e.g. danger of death or scandal, in order that it be licit. But in truth Capellmann,⁷⁴ whom Berardi⁷⁵ rightly follows, does not require so grave a cause; they think, for example, that the sense of great pain by which either party is affected suffices for the man to withdraw himself, whether because the wife has already poured forth humor or because he exposes himself to grave danger of pollution: for to permit the frustration of virile semen, and a fortiori of female humor, so grave a reason is not required.

69. 2. That the woman retain the received semen.

- a. The wife does not sin who immediately after intercourse rises, walks, works, or urinates: for since the vaginal walls immediately cohere with one another and close the vagina, so that the received semen ordinarily is not emitted, by that manner of acting nothing is done by which generation is impeded. Nevertheless, if this were done with the intention of expelling the semen and impeding generation, this depraved intention would be a mortal sin.

Notes

73. St. Alphonsus, n. 954.

74. *Medicina pastor.*⁹ (Aachen: Barth, 1893), p. 146.

75. *Praxis confessor.*³, I, n. 993.

- b. Every action by which a woman tries to expel the received semen for impeding generation, as to wash out the vagina with an irrigator, is a grave sin: for although the action which she uses may be insufficient for producing that effect, at least from the depraved intention she commits a grave sin. Neither the annoyances, however great, which perhaps women experience unless they cast out the semen by washing out the vagina, nor the miscarriages which they are accustomed to suffer, excuse this manner of acting: for if they do not wish to preserve the received semen, they ought to abstain from intercourse.

Vaginal washings rarely impede generation, even if they are done soon after intercourse; but there is absolutely no danger of losing the semen if they are done some hours after intercourse.

- c. Just as a woman is bound to preserve the received semen, so also she is bound to avoid impeding its ascent into the uterus. Therefore it is in no way licit, by applying medicine before intercourse, to close the mouth of the uterus, by which the ascent of the semen is impeded and the fecundation of the ovule is rendered impossible: for every action which tends to this, that generation be impeded, is illicit.

Nevertheless, it is licit for a woman who was compelled by force or deceit to have intercourse to expel the received semen immediately after intercourse, before conception has occurred, by washing or another means: for the semen then has itself in the manner of an unjust aggressor, whom it is licit to repel.⁷⁶

- d. If intercourse is completed in the natural and fitting mode, but the woman cannot retain the received semen on account of indisposition of the organs, intercourse is licit, because the ejection of the semen occurs accidentally.

70. On things licit in the conjugal act. In the use of marriage, acts of imperfect lust, whether mutual or solitary, which are either necessary or useful for completing the conjugal act, are licit for spouses: for to him to whom the end is permitted, the means are also permitted; and to him to whom the consummated act is permitted, acts which by nature itself are destined as a disposition and preparation for it are also permitted.

- a. Hence when the intention of completing intercourse is present, sights, touches, etc., which excite toward intercourse, whether they are performed before intercourse or in intercourse itself, are licit for spouses. But spouses ought to take care that pollution not follow by lingering too long in acts of this kind; nevertheless, if it should sometimes follow beyond intention, it would be free from fault.
- b. If intercourse on the part of the man has already been consummated and he withdraws before the woman has completed the act, she herself can complete the act by touches or in another way and procure full pleasure for herself.
- c. For although this completion by the woman is not necessary for generation according to recent physiologists, nevertheless it cannot be denied that the insemination of the woman contributes something to the conception and formation of the fetus; and this natural destination of female insemination suffices for it to be licit for the woman to complete the act. Moreover, no reason appears why the woman cannot from her own part complete an act which she began by her own right and licitly. Finally, since from the institution of marriage she has a right to taking full pleasure from intercourse, she can procure it for herself from intercourse licit in every respect. Therefore for a wife who cannot inseminate either during or after intercourse, it is licit even immediately before intercourse to obtain for herself complete delectation, pollution or insemination, since delectation belongs to the complete conjugal act.

Notes

76. Lehmkuhl, *Theol. mor.* I, n. 849; Genicot, *Theol. mor.* I, n. 378.

- d. Capellmann judges that this completion is licit for the woman even when the conjugal act is not completed because of the fault of the man, who withdraws before insemination,⁷⁷ and Berardi agrees with him, because an act legitimately begun can be brought through to the due end.⁷⁸ But one must plainly agree with Lehmkuhl, who, n. 858, pronounces this illicit: for since insemination on the part of the man has not occurred, insemination on the part of the woman has the nature of mere pollution, since it can contribute in no way either to completing the conjugal act or to assisting conception.
- e. But it is not licit for the man by touches to excite himself to insemination if the woman, after her insemination has been completed, withdraws without awaiting the insemination of the man: for this emission of semen would not be the completion of the act of generation, but voluntary pollution and frustration of semen.

Article Two.

On Sodomy and Onanism.

Against the primary and essential end of marriage spouses can sin in two ways: a. by imperfect sodomy; b. by onanism.

71. On sodomy. Imperfect sodomy is committed when the man penetrates the preposterous vessel of the woman, whether he inseminates in it or outside it.

1. Sodomy committed between spouses is a grave sin, both because it is opposed to the natural end of the conjugal act and of virile semen, and because it is opposed to conjugal fidelity, which requires that spouses not use the body otherwise than in a mode apt for generation; nor can spouses remit this fidelity to one another.

Therefore if sodomitical intercourse occurs by mutual consent, it is a most grave sin on each side; if it occurs with the wife dissenting, certainly the man sins most gravely by a sin against nature; but it is asked whether the wife can ever permit this and cooperate with the sin of the man.

2. Positive cooperation with sodomy is never licit. Nevertheless, from a most grave cause a wife can licitly suffer the sodomitical intercourse of the man under this twofold condition: a. that she tries to impede this intercourse and permits it only then when she cannot impede it without danger of a most grave evil; b. that she does not consent to the venereal delectation then arising.

Note. In this matter one must altogether insist on the principle: apart from those things which are against the end of nature, there do not occur actions between spouses, however disordered and filthy they may be, which can certainly be accused of grave sin. Wherefore, sodomitical affection being excluded, this twofold action is not to be called gravely culpable: a. to begin intercourse in the preposterous vessel with the intention of consummating it in the natural vessel; b. to touch the preposterous vessel of the wife with the genitals, provided effusion of semen is guarded against.

72. On onanism. Onanism is called intercourse completed in such a way that generation cannot follow from the semen poured forth.

This can occur in two ways: a. if the man, after intercourse has been begun in the natural vessel, withdraws himself before insemination and pours forth semen outside the vessel; b. if by the help of an instrument he impedes the semen from reaching the vessel of the woman and scatters it.

Notes

77. Cf. Capellmann, *Medicina pastor*.⁹, p. 143 f.

78. Cf. *Praxis confess.*³, I, n. 993.

- a. Medical doctors by the name of onanism also designate the sin of softness or solitary pollution; but theologians distinguish the sin of pollution from the sin of onanism, and by the name of onanism signify only the effusion of semen outside the female vessel which is joined with intercourse. Sometimes onanism is also called Malthusianism from the Englishman Malthus, who sought means of impeding the excessive multiplication of human beings.
- b. The sin of onanism received its name from Onan, who, as Sacred Scripture testifies, “entering to the wife of his brother, poured forth semen on the earth, lest children be born in the name of his brother.”⁷⁹ The same sin had already been perpetrated before Onan by his brother Her.
- c. The former mode of committing onanism was once the only one, wherefore by older authors onanism is customarily defined as: the breaking off of intercourse already begun, so that semen is poured forth outside the vessel and thus generation is impeded. But in recent times certain preservative or preventive means have been invented, by which it is brought about that semen does not reach the vessel of the woman, or, if it has reached it, that it is killed there.⁸⁰
- d. The reasons on account of which today spouses frequently come together in an onanistic manner are chiefly these: a. lest they generate children whom they either cannot or do not wish to nourish; b. lest, with the patrimony divided among many, the nobility of the family suffer detriment; c. for satisfying libido and at the same time for escaping the inconveniences of pregnancy, childbirth, and education.

73. Its malice. 1. Onanism committed by mutual consent of spouses is a grave sin on each side, both because it is opposed to the primary end of marriage, and because it is opposed to conjugal fidelity, and finally because it is opposed not only to the health of the spouses but especially to the good of human society. Therefore in Sacred Scripture it is called a detestable thing,⁸¹ and the Holy See declares it prohibited by natural law⁸² and intrinsically evil.⁸³ Where it is committed by the man alone without the consent of the wife, he certainly sins gravely, nor is the wife bound to render the debt to a man who completes intercourse onanistically: for she obligated herself only to the use of marriage which of itself is apt for generation. But it is asked whether the wife can permit this mode of coming together and cooperate with the sin of the man.

From onanism must be distinguished the interruption of intercourse which occurs from fortuitous necessity, e.g. to avoid scandal which a person unexpectedly arriving would suffer. But if, after intercourse has been interrupted, semen were poured forth, the effusion would be free from fault: for since intercourse is interrupted from another end, the effusion occurs beyond intention, and therefore must be equated with involuntary pollution.

2. To break off intercourse already begun before semen is poured forth, without proximate danger of pouring it forth outside the wife’s vagina, a. is a grave sin if either party is unwilling, because it is against the right which the other party has to completed intercourse; b. is not a sin if both consent, provided there is a reasonable cause for acting in this way and danger of pouring forth semen is excluded, because intercourse of this kind is like an immodest touch, which is licit between spouses.

Notes

79. Gen. 38, 9.

80. Cf. Seved Ribbing, *Die sexuelle Hygiene* (Leipzig: Hobbing, 1898), p. 102 f.; G. Adolf, *Die Gefahren der kunstlichen Sterilitat* (Leipzig: Kruger, 1899); Antonelli I, n. 458 ff.; Nardi, *De Sanctitate matrimonii vindicata contra onanismum*³ (Rome: Desclee, 1907).

81. Gen. 38, 9-10.

82. Holy Office, 21 May 1851.

83. Holy Office, 19 Apr. 1853.

Today it not rarely occurs that men, from true or vain fear lest the wife will die if she conceives again, break off intercourse already begun before the effusion of semen. Although they must be exhorted to abstain from this kind of thing because of the danger of pollution, nevertheless, if they assert that pollution follows only rarely, this cannot be prohibited to them.

Note. a. The more this lamentable and detestable practice, such as the prohibition of offspring, gains strength even in Germany, not only in families of the rich but also in families of laborers and the poor, the more the necessity appears, both in the examination of betrothed persons and in the confessional, of openly declaring that the prohibition of offspring never in any case becomes licit, and that abstinence is the only licit means of preventing offspring. Nor should it be said that continence, especially for younger spouses, is morally impossible on account of proximate danger of sinning. For Christian spouses who must abstain from the use of marriage, not from egoistic motives but only from truly just causes, either for a time or perpetually, have in prayer and other exercises of piety the means of obtaining from God the gift of continence, who will not suffer anyone to be tempted beyond what he is able.⁸⁴

b. In most cases the fault of frustrated generation is in the man, more rarely in the woman, except that women are more indulgent toward men abusing marriage and by their complaints about fear of illness and of death itself, about the inconveniences of pregnancy and education, and by their moroseness in rendering the debt, give the man an occasion of abusing marriage. Wherefore women must be treated in different ways according to the diversity of circumstances. Some must be taught concerning the obligation of obeying; innocent women must be consoled and taught how they ought to conduct themselves toward onanist husbands, lest they themselves also commit sin; the fainthearted must be lifted up and admonished to trust in God and not too readily to believe physicians exaggerating the dangers of pregnancy and childbirth, and that they themselves can impede many sins of the husband and in this way contribute to his eternal salvation. But women who complain concerning the inconveniences and difficulties of pregnancy, childbirth, nourishment, and education should remember that these are consequences of original sin: I will multiply your toils and your conceptions; in pain you shall bring forth children,⁸⁵ and therefore are to be borne in a spirit of humility and penance.

74. On the cooperation of the wife with onanistic intercourse. 1. It is clear that formal cooperation, by which namely the wife consents to onanism, is gravely illicit. And indeed the wife sins gravely even then when, by her complaints concerning the pains of childbirth, concerning numerous offspring, etc., with foresight of the sin to be committed, she gives the husband an occasion for onanistic intercourse.

2. Material cooperation with the first mode of onanism is licit from a moderately grave cause.⁸⁶ It is not necessary that this cause be plainly grave, because the wife does not cooperate with a thing already evil from the beginning; nevertheless this is required, that she prudently admonish the husband to complete the act rightly: for from charity she is bound to impede the sin of the man. But she ought to admonish the husband cautiously and prudently, lest, if perhaps he were in good faith, afterward he sin formally. Nevertheless, she is not bound to admonish on each occasion if no fruit is hoped for; and if she cannot admonish without grave inconvenience, e.g. without fear of indignation, discord, adultery, etc., she can omit the admonition.

a. That the positive, material cooperation of the wife with the onanistic intercourse of the husband is not intrinsically evil and therefore is not illicit in itself is admitted by all today: for immediately she

Notes

84. 1 Cor. 10, 13.

85. Gen. 3, 16.

86. This is confirmed by several responses of the Sacred Penitentiary, the last of which is from 8 June 1842.

cooperates with licit intercourse and only mediately with the illicit effusion of semen. Nor is this cooperation argued to be illicit from the fact that cooperation with sodomitical intercourse is illicit. Certainly onanistic intercourse cannot be compared with sodomitical intercourse: for onanistic intercourse, licit at the beginning on each side, begins to become evil on the part of the man when the man withdraws himself, while the woman has herself merely passively. On the contrary, sodomitical intercourse at any instant is intrinsically evil on each side, and therefore is never licit on either side.

- b. If women accuse themselves because they rejoiced about the onanistic practice of the husband, they must not immediately be accused of mortal sin: for often they rejoice not about sin but about an altogether licit thing, namely either about the pleasure of intercourse or about the effects of the sin, as about preservation from the troubles of pregnancy and childbirth.
 - c. But the wife can give consent to the pleasure arising from intercourse, because she herself, in rendering the debt to an onanist husband, does a licit thing. Sometimes, as experience testifies, offspring is conceived even from onanistic intercourse of the first mode. Now if it were probable that conception could follow even from onanistic intercourse, or at least if the wife judged it probable that she had received the semen, she would have the right of exciting herself to complete pleasure.
 - d. A sufficient cause which renders cooperation with the onanism of the man licit for the wife would be this: a. fear of inconvenience, as of quarrels, disputes, etc.; b. fear lest the husband commit adulteries; c. if otherwise she would have to abstain from the use of marriage for a long time with her own inconvenience; d. if she would be impeded from exercises of piety and from the use of the sacraments; e. if, with domestic peace disturbed, cohabitation would be rendered troublesome.
3. Material cooperation with the second mode of onanism can be permitted only from fear of a most grave evil, and consent to delectation must be excluded; for in this case the wife cooperates proximately with a thing wholly illicit, but in the former case she cooperates with an act which is licit apart from the pouring forth of semen. Therefore in the former case, in which intercourse is rightly begun, the wife can render the debt and have herself simply passively toward the breaking off of intercourse; but in the latter case it is not licit for her to have herself passively, but she is bound, by resisting positively according to her strength, to impede the act sinful in itself; and only from a most grave cause can she permit what she cannot impede.
- a. The wife not only can, but also is bound to render intercourse to an onanist husband in the former case: for since the husband seeks a thing to which he has a right, the wife cannot deny it, although she knows that he will abuse it. Nevertheless, because the one rendering cooperates with the sin of the husband, she cannot render it without a just cause.⁸⁷
 - b. From a moderately grave cause, the wife in the former case licitly seeks the debt from an onanist husband. For since the act which she seeks is not evil in itself and the husband, if he wishes, can furnish it without sin, nothing stands in the way of the petition except the precept by which from charity she is bound to impede the sin of the husband. But since charity does not obligate with grave inconvenience, she licitly seeks it whenever it is grave for her to lack the conjugal act.

75. Means of avoiding onanism. a. The crime of onanism today spreads widely and is propagated more widely day by day especially for this reason, that spouses wish to enjoy the pleasure of marriage without undergoing the burden of nourishing numerous offspring. For avoiding onanism, wives especially must be

Notes

87. Cf. St. Alphonsus, l. 6, n. 947.

admonished to induce husbands by blandishments, prayers, and exhortations either to complete the act rightly or to abstinence.

Motives by which spouses can be deterred from the crime of onanism: a. onanism is a cause of adulteries: for since spouses, especially women, are not satiated by imperfect acts of this kind, they seek illicit pleasures; b. it destroys conjugal peace and concord; c. it causes the joys of father and mother to withdraw from families, into whose place succeed remorse of conscience and fears lest God punish so horrible a crime and snatch away from the living the only offspring; d. onanism is the cause on account of which a family in which only one or another offspring is procreated soon perishes; e. finally, it brings pains of body and manifold detriment of health, especially in women.⁸⁸

- b. Since no licit means of impeding generation exists, the confessor can advise spouses who wish to prevent further generation of offspring, cautiously and prudently however, that at the time at which conception more easily occurs, namely three or four days before and fifteen days after menstruation has begun, they should contain themselves, but at another time, at which conception rarely occurs, they may use marriage.
- c. That this mode of acting is licit is clear not only from the nature of the matter, since nothing is done which is against the end of marriage, but is also established from the declaration of the Holy See.⁸⁹ But the reason on account of which this practice should be suggested only cautiously and prudently is twofold: both because it can give spouses an occasion at any time either of denying the debt or of committing onanism, and because this means is not certain: for experience establishes that conception sometimes has place even at this time.⁹⁰

76. As regards the manner of treating penitents given to onanism, from several responses of the Holy See⁹¹ these things must be noted:

- a. The confessor is bound prudently and discreetly to question penitents when a founded suspicion is present that they are altogether silent concerning onanism to which they are addicted. But he can question by inquiring whether there is something which troubles the conscience concerning the sanctity of marriage, the generation of offspring. But if the penitent denies it, for the most part he can abstain from further questioning.

In those regions in which the vice of onanism spreads widely, the confessor can almost always reasonably suppose that the penitent deliberately conceals that sin. Nevertheless, let him abstain from special questions: whether they have poured forth semen outside the vessel; whether they have impeded generation by withdrawing themselves, etc.

- b. When the confessor, either from spontaneous confession or from prudent questioning, has known that the penitent is an onanist, of himself he is bound to admonish him concerning the gravity of this sin, to reprove him with paternal charity, and to impart absolution to him only when it is established by sufficient signs that he sorrows concerning the past and has the resolution of no longer acting onanistically.

Notes

88. Eschbach, p. 569 ff.; Stohr, *Handbuch der Pastoralmedizin* (Freiburg: Herder, 1900), p. 497 ff.

89. The Sacred Penitentiary, 16 June 1880, responded: spouses using marriage in the aforesaid way are not to be disturbed, and the confessor can suggest, cautiously however, the opinion in question to those spouses whom he has tried in vain to lead away from the detestable crime of onanism by another reason.

90. Cf. Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*², p. 70 f.; Capellmann, *Die fakultative Sterilität* (Aachen: Barth, 1889).

91. Holy Office, 21 May 1851; Penitentiary, 14 Dec. 1876; 10 Mar. 1886.

- c. Nevertheless, if he discovers that the onanist penitent is in good faith, but that admonition will have no fruit, according to the general rule concerning admonishing those who sin in good faith, he can omit the admonition or speak in such a way that he does not disturb the good faith of the penitent.⁹²

Although invincible ignorance enduring for a long time cannot be admitted as regards secondary precepts of the natural law, nevertheless if those precepts are joined with circumstances apparently excusing, especially in those who are untrained in moral matters, ignorance will have to be admitted, as if the husband knows that the wife cannot bear children without danger of life, or that he cannot nourish children.

77. Artificial fecundation is called that by which virile semen is injected into the uterus of the woman apart from perfect intercourse. Now artificial fecundation must be said to be illicit.⁹³

- a. Spallanzani, a priest of Modena and professor of physiology in the University of Pavia, was the first to teach that fecundation can be done in an artificial mode; he had introduced male semen into the female organs in animals with successful outcome. Physicians have tried the same thing and with the same outcome in human beings, and day by day they perfect it when spouses desire offspring, the wife indeed being capable of conception, but the husband incapable of rightly performing intercourse.
- b. Since it is not licit for a woman to receive semen except that of her own husband, in the fecundation concerning whose liceity the question is asked, it is supposed that the semen of the proper husband is introduced into the uterus of the wife; this is customarily done in two ways.
- c. The first mode consists in this, that the man has intercourse with his spouse, but when insemination is imminent withdraws himself and pours forth semen in some vessel, which afterward the physician gathers by the help of an instrument and injects into the uterus. This mode is illicit, because onanism or effusion of semen outside the female vessel has place.
- d. The second mode consists in this, that the man, apart from intercourse, pours forth semen in some vessel, which afterward the physician gathers by the help of an instrument and introduces into the uterus of the wife. This mode is illicit, because fecundation is obtained only through an illicit means, namely through voluntary pollution.
- e. Nevertheless the wife, for avoiding truly grave inconveniences, could admit artificial fecundation, because she herself does not cooperate actively in the evil action, but has herself merely passively and permissively in receiving the semen of her husband.
- f. There is a twofold mode of fecundation which can be called artificial, but is licit. The first consists in this, that the man places an instrument in the female vessel, either so that the vagina may be dilated, or so that the uterus may be placed in its natural position; this being done, they have intercourse in the accustomed manner. This mode is licit, since nature is only assisted in performing intercourse. The other consists in this, that the man has intercourse in the usual manner and pours forth semen within the vagina, which afterward the physician draws by the help of an instrument and injects into the fundus of the uterus. This mode also is licit, because natural intercourse is had; this being posited, by the help of an instrument the defect of nature is supplied.

Whether by illicit artificial fecundation marriage is consummated if offspring follows from it, Sanchez

Notes

92. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri VI, n. 247; Genicot II, n. 551.

93. The Holy Office, to the question "Whether artificial fecundation of a woman can be employed," responded on 25 Mar. 1897: It is not licit. Cf. Eschbach, *Disputationes physiol. theolog.*², p. 70 ff.; Berardi, *Praxis confessoriorum*³, I, n. 1009 ff.; Antonelli I, n. 115 ff.

affirms,⁹⁴ who judges that marriage is consummated whenever semen is received within the natural vessel of the woman, by whatever art this occurs. Gasparri denies it,⁹⁵ and rightly indeed: for marriage is not consummated except by intercourse, to which marriage is ordered by nature; but this is intercourse which occurs with penetration of the female vessel and effusion of semen in the same. Wherefore marriage is not judged to be consummated even when the husband applies semen to the mouth of the vagina, although offspring is born from it.

Question Two.

On the Liceity of the Conjugal Act by Reason of Circumstances.

The circumstances which can bring it about that the conjugal act becomes illicit and morally evil are its end, mode or situation, time, and place.

§ 1. On the End.

78. There are several ends on account of which the conjugal act can be exercised; some of these are proper and essential, others improper and accidental. The proper ends are: a. for generating offspring; b. for avoiding incontinence or quieting libido; c. for satisfying the obligation toward the other spouse. Of these essential ends the first indeed, the generation of offspring, is the primary end; the others are secondary ends of marriage. Besides this threefold proper end, there are other improper ends, e.g. for conserving and fostering mutual love, for preserving or recovering health of body, etc.

1. The conjugal act can licitly be exercised on account of any honorable end whatever. If a proper end is in question, the reason is that an action fitting to nature is licitly exercised on account of those ends for which the author of nature instituted it. But if an improper end is in question, the reason is that an action not evil can licitly be applied to an honorable end for the obtaining of which it is useful.
 - a. There are those who with St. Thomas say that the conjugal act performed for avoiding one's own incontinence, not the spouse's, is a venial sin.⁹⁶ But in truth a. this end is not only honorable and laudable in itself, but also belongs to the essential ends of marriage; but to exercise an act indifferent in itself on account of an honorable end cannot be sin. b. St. Paul teaches that this end was intended by God in instituting marriage, 1 Cor. 7, 2, 5, and since the Apostle assigns this end alone to the conjugal act, he manifestly supposes that the work of marriage performed for this end alone is licit. c. The Church blesses the nuptials of old persons whom it knows to enter marriage for avoiding their own incontinence; this indeed the Church could not do if the use of marriage performed on account of that end were illicit.⁹⁷
 - b. To exercise the conjugal act with affection toward another person whom one represents to himself, so that from that person he may take venereal delectation, is mental adultery and therefore a grave sin. In the conjugal act to represent another person to oneself, so that from that person's beauty one may take delectation and be excited to the conjugal act, is indeed not a sin but is very dangerous. Finally, if spouses put beautiful images before their eyes and look at them, either to excite themselves or to conceive more beautiful offspring, they do not commit sin, provided the images are not sacred.
2. To exercise the conjugal act on account of pleasure alone is a venial sin: for it is a disorder, although not grave, to will to rest in some thing as an end which the author of nature willed as a means to an end.⁹⁸

Notes

94. L. 7, disp. 99, n. 37.

95. II, n. 1302.

96. *Supplementum*, q. 49, a. 5.

97. Cf. Roman Catechism, pr. 2, c. 8, q. 14; St. Alphonsus, n. 882.

But if no honorable end is positively intended, and the conjugal act occurs with this positive intention of taking pleasure, the act seems to have to be called honorable, provided in its exercise nothing is exceeded on any side against the prescriptions of reason, and the act is apprehended as licit or at least not as illicit. For the act itself is licit; the delectation which is sought is likewise licit; in the manner of exercising the act and taking pleasure, the order prescribed by reason is preserved, i.e. concupiscence is ruled by reason and will. Therefore nothing is understood to be lacking to the act that would prevent it from being fitting to rational nature and therefore orderable and objectively ordered to God, the ultimate end.⁹⁹

Whether the conjugal act is licit if it is established that the woman will suffer miscarriage or bring forth dead offspring. It must be affirmed, at least if it is done for avoiding the danger of incontinence: for on the one hand, even for such offspring it is better to exist with original sin than not to exist at all; on the other hand, exclusion from supernatural beatitude is permitted by the parents from a grave cause, for avoiding the sin of incontinence.

3. It is not necessary that spouses in the use of marriage will the generation of offspring; indeed, from a just cause they can wish that it not be generated and from this desire restrict the use of marriage to that time at which there is less hope of future conception. Nevertheless, it is required that the intention of offspring not be positively excluded, i.e. that nothing be done by which offspring is impeded, but that the order of generation be preserved.

§ 2. On Situation and Place.

79. On situation. The natural and ordinary situation of the conjugal act is this, that it occur lying down, in such a way that the woman lies beneath and the man lies above: for this situation is most apt for the infusion of semen into the vessel of the woman. Any situation is unnatural which departs from the natural one, as if intercourse occurs sitting or standing, or in such a way that the man lies beneath and the woman lies above. Through an unnatural situation generation is indeed rendered more difficult, but not impossible, because the semen reaches the ovaries not by descent, but by attraction.¹⁰⁰

To choose a mode of coming together by which conception is actually rendered more difficult, from the intention of rendering conception more difficult, is a venial sin if it is done without a just cause: for since the generation of offspring is the primary end of marriage, to act thus without a just cause is against reason; nevertheless not gravely, because conception is not impeded.

1. An unnatural situation, whatever it may be, does not exceed venial sin, provided grave danger of pouring forth semen outside the vessel is excluded: for any situation by which intercourse can be had is apt for generation.

Therefore spouses must never be questioned concerning the situation which they employ in performing the conjugal act, since the matter is not necessary for confession; and if the penitents themselves ask about this matter for the sake of counsel, let the confessor respond only in general, that they complete the act duly and, as far as can be done, in the natural mode. But if penitents accuse themselves concerning an unnatural situation, let him ask whether generation could have followed from that intercourse, because it suffices for the confessor to know whether generation was altogether impeded.

Notes

98. This proposition, 9, was condemned by Innocent XI: "The work of marriage exercised on account of pleasure alone is entirely without all fault and venial defect."

99. *De principiis* 3, n. 87 ff.

100. St. Alphonsus, n. 917; Capellmann, *Medicina past.* 9, p. 151.

2. If a change of the natural situation is done from a just cause, e.g. on account of danger of miscarriage or on account of difficulty of coming together in the natural mode, there is no sin, even if some part of the semen is scattered; indeed, if another mode of intercourse is impossible, even if a great part of the semen is lost: for on the one hand the scattering occurs accidentally, and on the other hand generation is not impeded, since a small part of semen suffices for it.¹⁰¹

80. On place. 1. Natural shame and the law of charity, by which we must avoid scandal, require that the place be secret.

- a. To have intercourse before others is a grave sin by reason of scandal.
 - b. Parents ought to take care lest children acquire knowledge of this matter and thus suffer scandal.
2. In a sacred place ecclesiastical law prohibits intercourse under grave sin, unless necessity presses: for through the effusion of human semen irreverence is inflicted on the sacred place, and if the effusion becomes notorious, the church is polluted.¹⁰²

§ 3. On Time.

It is asked whether the conjugal act is licit first in sacred times, then in certain other times in which the conjugal act brings greater or lesser harm either to one spouse or to the conceived offspring. These times are: the time of menstruation, pregnancy, purification, lactation, and infirmity. Concerning these universally it must be said: if there underlies danger of grave harm in health or life, the conjugal act is gravely illicit; if the danger of harm is light, it is prohibited under light sin; but a just cause, especially if the harm which is feared is light, renders the use of marriage licit. But the cause is judged to be just if the inconvenience which arises from abstinence outweighs, or at least equals, the harm which is feared from use. Therefore if only light harm is feared, but abstinence would be long-lasting, intercourse must be said to be licit, both because to abstain for a long time is very burdensome for spouses, and because long-lasting abstinence brings danger of incontinence.

81. 1. In sacred time, i.e. on feast days, during Advent, Lent, and Holy Communion, the conjugal act is licit, because it is prohibited by no law. And although it is counseled that spouses abstain from asking the debt on days which are especially dedicated to doing penance, and especially on days of Holy Communion,¹⁰³ nevertheless if on the preceding night they have had intercourse honorably, they are not kept from Holy Communion. But if in completing the act they have sinned venially, reverence toward the most holy sacrament requires that on that day they abstain from Holy Communion, unless there is a particular reason for communicating on that very day.

- a. There does not exist, nor has there ever existed, an ecclesiastical law which prohibited the use of marriage on sacred days; but the words of the holy Fathers and the ecclesiastical canons which seem to prohibit it must be understood not of a law obligating in conscience, but of counsel.¹⁰⁴
- b. The opinion of St. Alphonsus is stricter, n. 922, affirming that one commits venial sin who after intercourse had from pleasure approaches Holy Communion. For spouses who are moved to perform intercourse by no other cause than pleasure do not sin even venially, and therefore can approach Holy Communion without sin, n. 78. But Laymann wisely teaches that the wife must be admonished not to

Notes

101. Capellmann, *Medicina pastor.*, p. 151.

102. Cf. St. Alphonsus, l. 3, n. 458; cf. *De praeceptis* 3, n. 178.

103. Cf. 1 Cor. 7, 5.

104. Ballerini-Palmieri VI, n. 366.

show herself difficult in rendering the debt, especially if she is accustomed to communicate frequently, e.g. on all feast days. Hence she can indeed ask her husband to be willing to abstain from the conjugal act on days of Holy Communion; but if the husband bears this with difficulty, she herself is obliged to render the debt.¹⁰⁵

82. 2. During the time of menstrual flow. One must distinguish between the menstrual flow or ordinary flow of blood, concerning which above, n. 41, and the extraordinary flow, which comes from illness and sometimes continues for a longer time, up to fifteen days.

- a. Intercourse which is had during the time of extraordinary flow never fails to bring harm to the health of the woman; wherefore abstinence from the use of marriage through that time is advised. But intercourse cannot be called altogether illicit unless, according to the judgment of a physician, grave harm threatens the wife, because it is burdensome for the man to abstain from intercourse so long.
- b. During the time of ordinary flow, intercourse indeed is not illicit; nevertheless, for a twofold reason abstinence from the use of marriage is to be advised, especially since it is only of a few days. First, on account of a peculiar indecency, not moral but physical; wherefore the man, even with natural and innate nausea, turns himself away from a woman who suffers menstrual flow, and in like manner the woman at that time experiences an innate aversion from every marital intercourse. Then, on account of the danger to health which threatens the wife, whose genital organs at that time are already irritated of themselves.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, since each of these reasons is not grave, intercourse during the time of menstrual flow must be called licit, provided there is a reasonable cause of coming together. What the older authors feared, namely that offspring conceived at this time would be born infirm or leprous, is empty.¹⁰⁷

In the old law the use of marriage during the time of menstrual flow was prohibited by a particular precept;¹⁰⁸ the older theologians also in the new law held the use of marriage at this time to be gravely illicit, especially on account of harm to future offspring: for they thought that offspring, if conceived at this time, would be infirm or monstrous. Others said that intercourse through that time was at least lightly illicit, because the woman is then unfit for generation. Since today it is established that these reasons do not stand, the opinion of the older authors in this matter must be omitted: for offspring can be conceived more easily at this time than at another, and of itself it is healthy and firm.

83. 3. During the time of pregnancy, intercourse can be illicit because it induces danger of miscarriage, especially if it is completed often and impetuously. But since danger of miscarriage properly exists only in the first months of pregnancy, and gradually vanishes as the fetus matures, but the state of beginning pregnancy can scarcely be known, intercourse at this time will have to be called simply licit; nevertheless moderation in both the number and the manner of intercourse is to be commended to spouses who suspect pregnancy.

What some authors teach is difficult, namely that intercourse with a pregnant woman is not free from fault because the semen is frustrated: for marriage is ordered not only to generation, but also to other ends, and especially as a remedy for concupiscence.

Notes

105. Cf. Laymann, *Theologia moralis*, l. 5, c. 6, n. 16.

106. Capellmann, *Medicina past.*⁹, p. 152.

107. Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*², p. 64.

108. Lev. 15, 19-20; 18, 19.

84. 4. During the time of purification after childbirth, conception indeed does not occur, and therefore from this side harm does not threaten the woman; but from intercourse itself danger of illness threatens the woman, both because of the great weakness contracted from the pains of childbirth and because of the genital organs wholly altered after childbirth. The danger, which in the first days after childbirth is greater, gradually diminishes and lasts as long as the genital organs have not yet been restored to their prior state. After about two months have elapsed, returning menstruation indicates that the organs have been restored to their places and that a new conception can occur. Wherefore in the first days after childbirth intercourse is gravely illicit on account of the danger of harm, afterward lightly illicit.

Capellmann judges that the danger of grave harm after childbirth continues for two weeks, and of light harm for the following four weeks.¹⁰⁹ Men must be told that they should either restrain concupiscence arising at this time or take care to quiet it by other licit modes. Nevertheless, if a grave cause, especially danger of incontinence, makes intercourse honorable, it is excused from sin even at this time.

85. 5. During the time of lactation, a new conception ordinarily is not to be feared; nevertheless, if it occurs, soon the milk is also diluted and diminished, and in a short time ceases altogether. Since intercourse had at this time does not bring another harm, it will have to be called licit: for the offspring can be nourished in another way, namely by artificial lactation; moreover spouses would have to abstain too long from the use of marriage, since lactation continues beyond a year, if intercourse were not conceded during this whole time.

86. 6. During the time of illness, the conjugal act of itself is illicit if it brings danger to life or health; but from a grave cause it is licit, namely if otherwise spouses would have to abstain for a long time with danger of incontinence, provided proximate danger of death is not induced. In particular, one must distinguish between contagious diseases, syphilis, phthisis, and non-contagious diseases. A physician must be consulted concerning the quality of the disease. Therefore:

- a. If one party labors under syphilitic disease, the French disease of theologians, the use of marriage seems illicit on account of the horrible consequences which it brings both to the other party and to offspring. Moreover the danger of infection is certain; but if the disease is light, it can be removed within a short time.

In this assertion the more recent authors, Lehmkuhl, Ballerini-Palmieri, Marc, etc., agree, led by the reasons which are brought forward by physicians. These are unanimous in describing the most grave evils which arise from this disease for spouses and offspring and gradually affect innumerable families, indeed an entire nation.¹¹⁰ St. Alphonsus, who does not absolutely forbid the use of marriage in this case, n. 909, perhaps can be reconciled with recent theologians. For diverse degrees of the French disease are distinguished; therefore it can happen that the more recent authors deny concerning the highest degree what St. Alphonsus concedes concerning the milder degree. Let others judge whether, speaking absolutely, the use of marriage can be conceded even in the highest degree of the French disease, because it does not induce proximate danger of death to be undergone within a short time.

- b. For those laboring under phthisis, the use of marriage is not illicit, both because phthisical persons ordinarily experience vehement concupiscence, and because grave harm does not come from a moderate use of marriage.

Notes

109. Capellmann, l. c., p. 153.

110. Cf. Capellmann, l. c., p. 158; Olfers, l. c., p. 67; Antonelli I, c. II, n. 393 ff.

- c. Although phthisis of itself is a contagious disease, nevertheless from the use of marriage it must rather be called hereditary, because danger of infection through intercourse is scarcely ever induced. Offspring generated from phthisical parents is not born affected by phthisis, but afterward very easily contracts it on account of the very great disposition to this disease received by heredity from the parents.
- d. Because more frequent intercourse can harm those laboring under this disease greatly, great moderation in this matter is to be commended to them.
- e. The fact that phthisical offspring, or rather offspring disposed to phthisis, is born does not impede the use of marriage, both because it is not certain that offspring will be generated from this particular intercourse, and if it is generated, it is not certain that it will be generated infected, since hereditary disposition often proceeds by a leap; and finally because for offspring which is generated infirm, "it is better thus to exist than not to exist at all."¹¹¹
- f. If diseases are not contagious, intercourse is licit where the diseases are lighter and not greatly weakening, because they are not made worse by intercourse; but it is illicit where the diseases are greatly weakening and joined with fever or great pain: for these ordinarily become much worse through intercourse. To this genus of diseases must be numbered illnesses of the genitals in the woman, which are accustomed to be so increased through the use of marriage that afterward they are healed with difficulty.¹¹²

Women for whom, according to the judgment of a physician, the next childbirth will bring death, ordinarily are not to be obliged to abstain from the use of marriage, both because conception is uncertain, and because judgments of this kind by physicians, as experience testifies, are often false.

Question Three.

On the Obligation of the Conjugal Act.

87. Declaration. Of itself it belongs to the man to ask, and to the wife to render the debt: for to women, on account of their innate modesty, asking is ordinarily very troublesome; but men, on account of modesty, are ordinarily not kept from asking. Wherefore the wife is not bound to render the debt unless the husband asks: for if he does not ask, the wife can presume that the husband does not demand the debt. But accidentally even the woman is bound to ask: for if the husband is in danger of incontinence, she is bound from charity to free him from danger; but since charity does not oblige with grave inconvenience, she is not bound to ask if she cannot do so without grave inconvenience, e.g. great shamefacedness.

From express asking, which is done by words or equivalent signs, interpretative asking must be distinguished, which is gathered from certain indications. Thus if a wife existing in danger of incontinence wishes to use marriage, but because of shamefacedness does not dare to ask expressly, she is said to ask interpretatively, and the husband, noticing these things, is bound himself to ask, or rather to render the debt to one asking interpretatively.

88. Principles. 1. There exists no obligation of asking the conjugal debt except sometimes accidentally from charity: for there exists for individual spouses no obligation of using marriage, but they have only a right to that use; but no one is bound to use his own right.

Notes

111. Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis* II, n. 418.

112. Cf. Capellmann, l. c., p. 161.

Accidentally, however, there can be an obligation of asking, especially in the man: a. if he judges that the other party is placed in danger of incontinence and because of shamefacedness does not ask: for each one is bound from charity to impede the sin of another if he can conveniently do so; b. if the use of marriage is necessary for fostering love or for averting dissensions.

Although the use of marriage is ordinarily to be advised to spouses, especially to those who can nourish offspring and suitably educate them, nevertheless by mutual consent it is also licit for them to abstain from the use of marriage, provided there is no danger of incontinence. And indeed, if they abstain from a motive of virtue, with danger of incontinence excluded, this is to be praised; if it is done from another reasonable motive, and there is no danger of sin, it is at least to be permitted.

2. There exists an obligation of justice, of itself grave, of rendering the debt whenever the other spouse expressly or tacitly asks seriously.
 - a. For by the matrimonial contract the spouses mutually transfer to each other the right and power over the body in order to the conjugal act; but to the right of asking there corresponds in the other the obligation of rendering the debt. The Apostle expressly teaches the same: let the husband render the debt to the wife, and the wife likewise to the husband.¹¹³ Moreover, one who denies the debt often exposes the other party to danger of grave sins.

Wherefore it is not licit voluntarily to render oneself impotent, e.g. by excessive labors, vigils, austerities, etc.: for the spouse has a right to the conjugal act; therefore one who renders himself impotent makes himself unable to pay the debt. Nor is it licit, without necessity or the consent of the other party, to be absent for a notable time: for an absence of this kind would be equivalent to denial of the debt.

- b. The object of the mutual contract is of itself a thing of grave moment: for it concerns the generation of offspring, the avoidance of incontinence, and the signifying of conjugal love for preserving peace; therefore to render the debt is of itself a grave obligation of justice when the other asks seriously, namely in such a way that, when asked, he would not wish to yield. Nevertheless denial of the debt can be a light sin in a twofold case: a. from smallness of matter, if it is done only rarely, if, e.g., it is denied once in a month to one asking often, or if it is not denied altogether, but is only deferred for a short time, e.g. until the night; yet with danger of incontinence excluded; b. if the other asks not seriously but only weakly, so that he is judged benevolently to remit the debt.
 - c. Therefore of itself a spouse sins gravely who denies the debt to the other asking seriously, even only one time, especially if in the other party there is danger of incontinence or grave trouble; and indeed not only against justice, because he denies what is owed, but also against charity, because he exposes the other party to danger of grave sins.
 - d. Men also sin gravely who, whether from avarice, lest they have to nourish offspring, or from malevolence, never or almost never know their own wives, although they ought to presume that the wives bear this with the greatest difficulty.
 - e. Women, especially those who are already of more advanced age and burdened with numerous offspring, sometimes think that by denying the debt they do not sin gravely unless it is done almost always or unless the husband is placed in danger of sinning. But if the confessor discovers this, let him beware lest he fruitlessly take good faith away from them.

Notes

113. 1 Cor. 7, 3.

- f. For the rest, women must be seriously and gravely admonished not to show themselves difficult and peevish to their husbands if the husbands demand intercourse, or other things which are licit for spouses, from them, lest namely they expose them to the danger of leaving their own wives and approaching other women.
3. A spouse is bound to render the debt to one asking seriously, even if from this he fears light harm or inconvenience: for light harm or inconvenience in no way excuses from a grave obligation, which moreover is one of justice.

Although a light inconvenience, e.g. a bad odor which the wife emits from her mouth and nostrils, does not excuse from asking or rendering the debt, nevertheless an inconvenience truly grave excuses even from this obligation, as from others, as will be said in what follows, n. 91 ff.

4. Within the first two months, by a special concession of law, spouses are not bound to render the debt.¹¹⁴ This privilege is indeed conceded to spouses by law for deliberating about entrance into religion; nevertheless they can probably use it even if they do not wish to enter religion. But once the debt has been rendered, the privilege ceases. Spouses, however, are not accustomed to use this privilege, both because they are ignorant of it and because, even if they know it, they do not wish to use it, and indeed deservedly, on account of the danger of sinning.¹¹⁵
 - a. Although many authors deny this privilege to those who do not think about entrance into religion, nevertheless, since St. Alphonsus (n. 958) affirms it, a spouse who wished to use it could not be compelled to render the debt.
 - b. This privilege refers only to a religion in which solemn vows are emitted, since marriage is dissolved only by solemn vows.
 - c. The two-month period begins from the day of the contracted marriage (others think from the day which the ecclesiastical judge determines), and when this period has elapsed the privilege ceases.
 - d. A spouse who contracts marriage with the intention of entering religion, without the other party being forewarned, sins because he deceives the other party.
 - e. The obligation of rendering the debt, which presses from the time of the contracted marriage, is suspended by force of this privilege. But if the bride enters religion, the husband, in order that he may be able to enter another marriage, must wait until, after the novitiate has been completed, or rather after the three-year period has been completed, she emits the profession of simple vows, by which the bond of marriage is dissolved.

89. When the right of asking is lost. The cases in which the right of asking is lost are chiefly the following:

1. If one of the spouses has committed adultery, and a fortiori if he has committed incest. The right of departing from an adulterous spouse is conceded to the innocent party, whether it is the man or the woman, from the very nature of the matrimonial contract: for fidelity is not owed to one breaking fidelity. In order that the right of asking be judged lost, it is required that the adultery be formal, certain, not committed by both, and not explicitly or implicitly condoned: for if it has been committed by both, there is compensation, and if the innocent party asks the debt or freely renders it to one asking, the injury is judged implicitly condoned.

Notes

114. Council of Trent, sess. 24, canon 6. C. *Ex publico* 7. *De convers. coniug.* (III. 32).

115. Cf. *De sacramentis* n. 522.

A husband who, without his wife's knowledge, has committed adultery can ask: for by adultery he is not deprived of the use of marriage as by incest; moreover he does not lose the right of asking by the adultery itself, but when the innocent party, after the adultery has been known, deprives him of his right by denying the debt for a long time (n. 100), nor is he bound to manifest his crime to the other party.

2. If the one asking lacks the use of reason, as if he is insane or drunk, because the asking of one who lacks the use of reason is not a human act; moreover by marriage there has not been contracted an obligation except to the conjugal act to be performed in a human manner. But it is licit for the party in possession of reason to render the debt to an insane or drunk person, especially if he is in danger of incontinence. But if the insanity is not perfect, of itself there exists in the other party an obligation of rendering.

Whether a spouse is bound to render the debt to one perfectly drunk or insane if the one asking is in danger of committing pollution, there is not one opinion of authors. Many affirm it, because the spouse is bound from charity to impede the sin of the other, even if it is only material.¹¹⁶ Their opinion is to some extent confirmed by the judgment of those physiologists who assert that harm is not to be feared for offspring from intercourse had at the time of drunkenness: for if offspring of a drunken spouse is born infirm or dull, this does not arise from intercourse had at the time of drunkenness, but from the organic constitution of the drunken person, altered by frequent drunkenness.¹¹⁷ Some, however, deny this obligation, because a spouse is excused from the precept of charity by a just cause; but a just cause is a founded fear lest offspring arisen from intercourse of this kind contract not only grave defects of body, but also depraved habits of soul.¹¹⁸ Practically, therefore, a spouse cannot be obliged to render the debt to one perfectly drunk, even if the one asking is placed in danger of incontinence.

90. Whether the wife is bound to render the debt to one asking illicitly. If the conjugal act is illicit on account of some circumstance which is had on the part of the person asking, the wife not only can, but also must render; but if the act is illicit either in itself or on account of a circumstance which is referred to the conjugal act, she is not bound and cannot render.

- a. He asks illicitly to whom the conjugal act is illicit; but the conjugal act can be illicit on account of a circumstance which is in the one asking himself, as if he asks from a depraved end, for taking pleasure alone, or if the one asking is bound by a vow of chastity; moreover the conjugal act can be illicit in itself, as if an onanistic or sodomitic act is asked; finally the conjugal act can be illicit because of some circumstance which is on the part of the act, as if it is asked in a public or sacred place.
- b. Now there are some who with Pontius answer the proposed question, with no distinction made, that it is not licit to render the debt to one asking illicitly: for he asks formal cooperation with sin, with the single case excepted in which the one asking, if he wished, could also actually have intercourse licitly, as if he asks for pleasure alone; but it is never licit formally to cooperate with sin.¹¹⁹
- c. But others, making the distinction which is set forth above, with Sanchez teach that the wife can and must render the debt if the conjugal act is illicit on account of a circumstance which is in the one asking: for the conjugal act on the wife's part is licit, and because the husband, on account of that circumstance which renders the act illicit, has not lost the right of asking, the act is also owed from justice. And Sanchez indeed illustrates this doctrine by these examples: if someone demanded coins deposited with

Notes

116. St. Alphonsus n. 984. Sanchez l. 9, disp. 23, n. 11.

117. Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*², p. 70, to whom however others are opposed, judging that from intercourse with a drunk person there arises danger lest offspring be born infirm.

118. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri VI, n. 407 ff.

119. Cf. Pontius l. 10, c. 3, n. 3.

another in order to fornicate, the latter would have to return the coins; and if one having a credit with another vows that he will not exact the credit and nevertheless exacts it, the other can and must render the debt.¹²⁰

91. When the obligation of rendering ceases. A spouse is not bound to render the debt if from this he ought justly to fear grave harm, which is not of itself annexed to marriage, for himself or for conceived offspring: for those entering marriage are not judged to bind themselves to the conjugal act with so great an inconvenience. The cases in which for this reason a spouse is not bound to render are chiefly the following:

1. If the asking is immoderate: for intercourse performed immoderately exhausts strength and harms health. Asking can be immoderate absolutely, if it is asked more than once in one night, or relatively by reason of illness or weakness of body, according to the judgment of prudent men.
 - a. How often spouses can perform the conjugal act without detriment to health cannot be determined by a general rule: for it depends on the physical constitution of the spouses themselves and on other circumstances. According to medical authors, the use of marriage which occurs twice in a week does no harm, and if spouses are vigorous and of firm constitution, they can use it even three or four times, excepting times in which nature itself advises that they abstain from the conjugal act, as at the time of menstrual flow, pregnancy, etc. But spouses who are weak and of infirm constitution, especially men who are occupied for a long time and seriously with mental labors, can exercise the conjugal act without detriment only once in a week. If in a concrete case doubt arises about this matter, it will be helpful to consult a physician.¹²¹
 - b. Therefore a wife does not sin by denying the debt to a man for whom intercourse had once on any night is not sufficient, so that he asks even during the day or more often in the same night, unless this occurs in an extraordinary case, e.g. in danger of incontinence.
2. If grave danger of life or health is to be feared according to the judgment of a prudent physician.
 - a. Therefore there is no obligation of rendering the debt to one who labors under a contagious disease, nor to one who labors under a strong fever or another grave disease. If, e.g., a wife labors under an organic disease of the heart, intercourse can bring sudden death, and therefore she is not bound to render the debt; if the husband labors under the same disease, he cannot ask, and the wife is not bound to render to him asking; if nevertheless because of danger of incontinence he asked, the wife could render the debt, unless sudden death were certain.
 - b. Likewise a woman is not bound to render the debt who has experienced that she cannot give birth without danger of death; nevertheless a woman is not excused from rendering the debt who underwent danger of death in the first childbirth or suffered extraordinary pains, because experience establishes that women experience greater difficulties in the first childbirth than in those following.
 - c. If from the judgment of a skilled and prudent physician it were established that the one rendering would be exposed to a grave disease or to death itself, he would not be bound to render; nevertheless in these circumstances it would be licit to render if the danger is not altogether certain and proximate, because always to abstain would be most difficult.

Notes

120. Sanchez l. 9, disp. 6, n. 7. Cf. St. Alphonsus n. 944. 947.

121. Cf. S. Ribbing, *Die sexuelle Hygiene*, p. 58 f.

d. If a woman rendering the debt is exposed to danger of grave and long-lasting infirmity, which would bring only a slow death, she is not bound to render: for she is not bound to this with danger of death, even if only of a slow one.

3. Inconveniences which are internal to the condition of marriage do not excuse from rendering the debt: for those entering marriage are judged by that very fact to wish to undergo these inconveniences. Inconveniences of this kind are held to be: a. ordinary inconveniences of pregnancy and of nourishment; the ordinary difficulty of childbirth; b. some weakening of health; c. pains which are indeed grave but not long-lasting, or long-lasting but moderate, such as headaches for several months after childbirth.

92. 1. If spouses already gifted with numerous offspring are so poor that they cannot nourish further offspring, with danger of incontinence of each party excluded, they are probably excused from rendering the debt on account of the grave harm which is to be feared for the wife and for the offspring already born.

Although spouses already gifted with numerous offspring can abstain from the use of marriage, nevertheless if danger of falling into grave temptations is imminent, it is rather to be advised to them that, committing themselves to divine providence, they use marriage, supported by this hope, that God who gives fecundity will also give nourishment.

2. A husband who, having no care of the family, leaves the burden of nourishing the offspring to the wife, loses the right of asking; wherefore the debt can be denied to him without sin. And this indeed can be done even when the husband is placed in danger of incontinence: for the wife cannot be obliged to rescue the husband from this danger with so great an inconvenience.¹²²

Whether and what kind of harm to offspring excuses from rendering the debt. Universally it can be said: if for the offspring it is better thus to exist than not to exist at all, harm to offspring, at least when danger of incontinence exists, does not excuse from rendering the debt. Wherefore fear does not excuse, lest offspring be born infirm, nor fear lest it have to live in need and want; indeed not even a fear founded on experience lest offspring be brought forth by abortion or be born dead, because it is better for it to exist in original sin than not to exist at all. Nevertheless, if offspring is already conceived, it is not licit for spouses to perform intercourse or any other action whatsoever which may harm its life or formation.

In all these cases the wife not only can licitly render, but also, for avoiding the danger of incontinence, which scarcely is not always present or must be presumed in one or the other party, she is even bound to render if the husband asks seriously, especially because these harms occur accidentally, and therefore do not certainly happen.

Question Four.

On Licit Things in Marriage.

93. Principles. The question is whether and when internal acts of lust (thoughts, delectations, and desires) and imperfect acts (touches, kisses, embraces, looks, and conversations) are licit for spouses. Further, spouses perform these acts either alone or mutually; and if the acts are mutual, they either have an order to intercourse or do not have this order. Here, however, we consider actions which do not have an actual order to having intercourse, since above (n. 70) it has been said concerning those which are ordered to intercourse actually to be had. Now, for solving the proposed question, two principles must be noted:

Notes

122. Lehmkuhl, II, n. 853.

1. In spouses that alone is a grave sin which is against the primary end of marriage; but apart from voluntary pollution, whether solitary or onanistic, and the crime of sodomy, nothing is against the primary end of marriage, which is the generation of offspring. All other actions in themselves, or considered in their nature, are licit for spouses, and become sins if they are exercised for pleasure alone or with foreseen danger of pollution without a just cause.
 - a. Pollution and its proximate danger are no less illicit in married persons than in the unmarried; indeed both pollution itself and actions which induce its proximate danger are a graver sin in married persons than in the unmarried, because through them not only chastity, but at the same time the right of the other spouse, is injured. For this reason married persons are bound under grave sin to avoid pollution and its danger, just as the unmarried are bound to this.
 - b. They ask whether also in wives pollution, namely complete venereal delectation which occurs with the effusion of vaginal humor, and its proximate danger, is a grave sin. Those who affirm this bring forward these reasons: because there occurs an effusion of humor, not indeed prolific, which nevertheless is uniquely destined by nature to generation, namely to rendering it easier and more pleasurable; because the effusion occurs with the greatest organic commotion; because it brings complete delectation.
2. Venereal delectation sought within marriage is in itself licit for spouses: for marriage, since it grants a right to the conjugal act, brings it about that the delectation instituted for that act, which is gravely illicit for the unmarried, becomes licit for the married. Nor is it licit to them only when they intend intercourse, but also when they either cannot have intercourse or do not wish to have it.
 - a. Sought within marriage, i.e. by acts ordered by their nature to the conjugal act, such as mutual touches, looks, conversations, etc., which by their nature are apt to dispose to intercourse and prepare it. And since even touches and looks which a married person exercises upon his own body can be ordered to the conjugal act, the married person who shamefully touches or looks at himself does not seek delectation outside marriage, but within marriage.
 - b. Venereal delectation is licit for married persons, upon whom there lies the office of conserving and propagating the human race, just as the delectation of food and drink is licit for men universally, upon whom there lies the office of conserving the human individual. And just as excess in the use of the delectation of foods is a venial sin because of defect of an honorable end, so excess in the enjoyment of venereal delectation, with proximate danger of pollution excluded, is a venial sin because of defect of an honorable end.
 - c. Therefore those acts which by their nature excite lust, such as touches, kisses, looks, etc., are in themselves licit for spouses apart from proximate danger of pollution, provided they have an honorable end. The honorable end on account of which acts of this kind are performed by married persons is chiefly this, that conjugal love may be manifested and fostered.¹²³

94. Corollaries. From these principles the following corollaries are now inferred: a. concerning mutual imperfect acts; b. concerning solitary imperfect acts; c. concerning morose delectations in spouses.

1. Mutual imperfect acts which are not joined with proximate danger of pollution are no sin if they are done from a reasonable cause; they are a venial sin if they are exercised without a reasonable cause from pleasure alone.

Notes

123. Cf. Sanchez l. c., disp. 41, n. 2 ff. Sporer l. c., n. 502 ff. Gobat, *Experient. theol. de sacram.*, tr. 10, n. 666 ff.

- a. Therefore one who looks at or touches his wife immodestly, without the intention of intercourse and from mere pleasure, does not sin mortally, provided danger of pollution is absent: for looks and touches of this kind are licit for spouses of themselves; but if they are done without an honorable end, they are a venial sin, because the disordered use of a thing otherwise licit is only a venial sin.
 - b. There are some who condemn enormously obscene acts between spouses as grave sin, even apart from danger of pollution. Among acts of this kind they recount: if they touch themselves with mouth or tongue on the genitals, and similar things. But in these acts, as in the rest, two elements must be distinguished. The first is danger of pollution. This is common to them, even though in a greater degree, with all imperfect acts; therefore insofar as this danger is considered, a special malice does not belong to them. The other element is the obscenity or foulness, as it is called. But between married persons there is no action, nor can one be imagined, which on account of foulness alone is so intrinsically evil that it can never become licit. Therefore authors are not lacking (Sanchez, Filiuci, Sporer, Ballerini, Berardi, etc.) who judge that those acts are not to be exempted from the common rule concerning the liceity of imperfect acts. Therefore if by experience it were established that in determined persons those acts do not induce proximate danger of pollution, at least they would not be gravely sinful.
2. Mutual imperfect acts which are foreseen to be joined with proximate danger of pollution are no sin if they are exercised from a grave cause of necessity, utility, or decency, and there is no danger of consent. For just as the unmarried can perform licit acts from a grave cause, even if pollution follows from them besides the intention (n. 36 ff.), so married persons can perform licit acts from a grave cause, even if pollution is foreseen to follow; but acts of this kind are licit for married persons.
 - a. A cause of this kind, sufficiently grave, is: for fostering or restoring mutual love; for averting suspicion of infidelity or of love toward another person; for obeying the other party asking that those acts be permitted or rendered.
 - b. Since pollution itself is illicit in itself, it is not permitted to consent to the delectation joined with pollution; nevertheless most spouses are ignorant of the malice of this consent, and it is not expedient to admonish them about this matter, lest from material sins there be made formal sins.¹²⁴
 3. Mutual imperfect acts which are foreseen to be joined with proximate danger of pollution are a grave sin if by their nature they induce that danger and are exercised without a just cause: for pollution is no less illicit for spouses than for the unmarried; therefore whatever of itself induces its proximate danger is also illicit for them.

Spouses who, because of supervening impotence, cannot have the conjugal act can licitly perform mutual imperfect acts from an honorable end, provided proximate danger of pollution is excluded, even if sometimes it follows accidentally. Nevertheless they must beware of consent to its pleasure, since it is illicit.

95. Solitary imperfect acts in married persons are venial sins if they are done without danger of pollution; and they are mortal sins if by their nature they induce proximate danger of pollution. The reason for the first is that they are done from pleasure alone; the reason for the second is that married persons must avoid pollution and its danger no less than the unmarried.

It is said that imperfect acts, e.g. shameful touches which a spouse performs upon his own body, apart from danger of pollution are light sins, because the opinion teaching that they are grave sins is not certain. The reason of St. Alphonsus, who says that the contrary opinion is more probable (n. 936), is this: marriage does

Notes

124. Cf. Lehmkuhl, II, n. 836.

not confer upon a spouse a right over his own body, except that he may dispose himself for intercourse; therefore if he does not dispose himself for this, he can no more use his own body than an unmarried person. The reason of those who with Sanchez¹²⁵ hold that those acts are only a venial sin is this: they would be mortal because of venereal delectation directly willed; but venereal delectation directly willed, apart from foreseen danger of pollution, pertains to those things which in marriage are licit by their nature; therefore in married persons, if it is admitted from pleasure alone without a just cause, it is a venial sin (n. 93).

96. 1. Morose delectations (joys) and desires concerning those things which are licit for spouses are no sin; concerning those things which are prohibited under light sin, they are a light sin; concerning those things which are prohibited under grave sin, they are a grave sin, because delectation receives its morality from its object.

- a. Therefore delectation concerning intercourse thought of as present, joy concerning intercourse had or to be had, and desire for it, with proximate danger of pollution nevertheless excluded, is not a sin, even if venereal delectation arises from them: for it is joy and desire concerning a licit thing. In practice, however, complacency of this kind concerning conjugal intercourse, although by reason of the object it is licit in itself, nevertheless is not free from light sin, because it is an idle occupation and has no other end besides pleasure. But if a thought of this kind and the delectation arising from it is admitted from a reasonable end, e.g. for driving away melancholy, it is altogether without sin.
 - b. If a married person is spiritually delighted about intercourse with another person, he commits grave sin, because the object of the delectation is gravely illicit; for he is delighted about adultery.
2. Venereal delectation from a licit thought, voluntarily admitted outside intercourse, with proximate danger of pollution excluded, is of itself not a sin, because the matrimonial state makes it licit; moreover, considering the circumstances in which spouses are found, venereal delectations easily and frequently arise; hence an intolerable burden would be imposed upon them if they had to avoid consent in those things.

From these things it is clear that morose delectations, and venereal delectations arising from them, of spouses concerning acts had or to be had with the other party are not sins except by reason of idleness; but delectations concerning gravely dishonorable acts with an extraneous person are grave sins, because they are delighted about an illicit object. Therefore spouses who accuse themselves of morose delectations should be asked whether they were delighted about their own spouse or about an extraneous person, and they should be suitably instructed not to take delectation from an illicit object.¹²⁶

Question Five.

On the Impediments of the Conjugal Act.

The impediments of the conjugal act are of two kinds: some arise from marriage itself, others from the married persons.

97. On the part of marriage there arises an impediment of the conjugal act: a. if the marriage is certainly invalid; b. if the marriage is doubtful.

1. If the marriage is certainly null and both spouses know the nullity, they must abstain from the conjugal act until a dispensation is obtained. If only one knows the nullity, he is bound to admonish the other

Notes

125. Cf. Sanchez l. 9, disp. 44, n. 16.

126. Cf. St. Alphonsus l. 5, n. 25. Ballerini-Palmieri I, n. 555 ff.

party about this matter; but if he cannot do this, certainly he must abstain from intercourse under some pretext (e.g. that intercourse is harmful to him, intolerable), until a dispensation has been obtained: for intercourse, as being fornication, would be evil in itself.

- a. It can happen in a twofold way that a spouse who certainly knows the nullity of the marriage cannot instruct the other party about it. Namely, a. it can happen that his proof is rejected by the ecclesiastical judge as insufficient, and therefore the spouse is compelled, even under penalty of excommunication, to cohabit with the putative spouse and render the debt to her; b. it can happen that he cannot reveal the impediment without danger to life or reputation.
- b. I said above that the spouse knowing the impediment must abstain from intercourse. Nevertheless, if the case should ever occur, the confessor could permit intercourse where the impediment which induces nullity is of ecclesiastical law and a dispensation cannot be obtained at once. For the opinion is probable that in this case of most grave inconvenience the impediment ceases for the same reason as, in a perplexed case, according to the probable opinion of many, the impediment ceases. Meanwhile, however, for caution a dispensation is to be sought.¹²⁷

98. 2. If the marriage is doubtful, whether the doubt already exists before marriage, or whether it supervenes only after the marriage has been contracted:

- a. If the doubt is light, it is to be disregarded; if the doubt is grave, the truth is to be investigated.
- b. During the investigation, if both spouses doubt, they must abstain from intercourse to avoid danger of fornication; if only one party doubts, this party cannot ask, lest he expose himself to danger of fornication, but he can and must render if the other has not lost the right of asking, lest he expose himself to danger of injuring justice.
- c. If, after investigation has been made, the doubt persists, the marriage must be considered as valid both in the external forum and in the internal forum, because in doubt one must stand for the value of the act.

99. On the part of the spouses an impediment of the conjugal act can arise from a threefold head: a. from incest; b. from adultery; c. from a vow of chastity.

Concerning the case of supervening impotence, see n. 66.

From incest. a. One who has committed incest inducing supervening affinity, as a penalty imposed by the Church, loses the right of asking,¹²⁸ but he can and must render the debt to the innocent party, even before a dispensation is obtained.

- b. In order that an incestuous person incur this penalty, there is required: a. knowledge of the imposed penalty, because extraordinary penalties are not incurred by those who are ignorant; b. immunity from force and fear,¹²⁹ because force excuses from transgression of any law, and grave fear from transgression of ecclesiastical law and therefore also from incurring the penalty. Since these conditions are rarely had in spouses, they scarcely ever incur this penalty unless they have been warned about it.
- c. If in the meantime the incestuous person is placed in great danger of incontinence, he can ask the debt, because ecclesiastical law does not oblige with so great an inconvenience.¹³⁰

Notes

127. Cf. Ballerini-Palmieri VI, n. 532 f. Lehmkühl II, n. 826.

128. C. *Si quis* 1. *De eo, qui cognovit* (IV. 13).

129. C. *Discretionem* 6. *De eo, qui cognovit* (IV. 13).

130. St. Alphonsus n. 930.

But the innocent other party, who notices the danger of sinning in the spouse, is bound neither to ask the debt nor to comply with one asking: for charity, from which of itself one is bound to remove a spouse from danger of sinning, does not oblige with grave inconvenience; but this is a grave inconvenience for the innocent other party. For since incest contains adultery, the innocent party has from it the right of demanding separation; but by asking or by rendering the debt this right is lost, which can be a grave inconvenience for the innocent party.

- d. The innocent spouse is not indeed bound to comply with the incestuous other party asking the debt; nevertheless he can render the debt to her, even if he has knowledge of the incest of the other party and of the penalty laid upon the incestuous: for since only the asking, not intercourse itself, is illicit, the spouse does not cooperate with an evil thing.

For practice these things must be noted:

- a. If a married person accuses himself of incest, first he must be asked in what degree he committed the incest: for affinity from illicit intercourse, just as it does not annul marriage, so neither does it take away the use of marriage beyond the second degree.
- b. Then he must be asked whether he knew the ecclesiastical penalty, and if, as mostly happens, he was ignorant of this penalty, he must be warned about incurring it through a new incest.
- c. Finally it must be investigated whether perhaps he consented to incest from grave fear: for the opinion of those whom St. Alphonsus also follows (n. 1071) is probable, namely that grave fear excuses, not indeed from grave sin, but from incurring the ecclesiastical penalty.
- d. Incest always involves adultery; but the penalty of incest is one thing, that of adultery another. The injured party can condone the penalty contracted because of adultery, but cannot condone the penalty contracted because of incest: for the former has been enacted in favor of the innocent party, but the latter solely for punishing incest; therefore its removal must be sought from the Church itself.
- e. Imperfect acts are not prohibited by this ecclesiastical law: for a penal law prohibiting intercourse, since it is of strict interpretation, is not to be extended to touches and other imperfect acts.
- f. From this impediment, to dispense, or to restore the lost right of asking, not only bishops, who can also delegate this faculty to others,¹³¹ but even regular confessors can do this, and indeed outside confession.¹³²
- g. For granting the dispensation validly a cause is indeed required; nevertheless it is scarcely not always present, namely danger of incontinence.
- h. Authors dispute whether regular confessors need the permission of a superior for granting this dispensation. The opinion which denies the necessity of permission seems safe, because the faculty has been conceded by the supreme pontiff without this condition; in practice, however, one must stand by the statute or custom of individual orders.

Notes

131. Formula for petitioning from the bishop the faculty of restoring the right of asking the debt: "Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lord. Caius, a married man, has had carnal intercourse with his wife's blood-relative in the first (or second) degree, and has thereby lost the right of asking the debt. But since he cannot preserve chastity with his spouse and the incest is occult, I most humbly beg that the faculty be granted to me of restoring to him, by dispensing, the lost right."

132. St. Alphonsus l. 6, n. 1076.

100. From adultery. a. One who has committed adultery can ask the debt, because he has lost not the right of asking, but the right of exacting the debt; nevertheless he probably does not lose this right before the innocent party has known the crime.

Whether an adulterous spouse loses the right of exacting the debt by the adultery itself, or only by the quasi-sentence of the innocent party, namely when the latter has known the crime and has not condoned it, but has determined to deprive the guilty party of the right, is disputed. Nevertheless the opinion which holds that the adulterer retains even the right of exacting the debt as long as the innocent party is ignorant of the crime is probable, because this privation of right has the character of a quasi-penalty, which the guilty person is not bound to impose upon himself. Wherefore the adulterer can not only ask the debt, but also exact it, until the innocent party, after the crime has been known, deprives him of this right by denying the debt.¹³³

b. By condonation the lost right is acquired again; furthermore adultery can also be tacitly condoned by rendering the debt.

Some suspicion or probability concerning adultery committed by the other party is not sufficient; rather, such indications are required as generate moral certitude, so that the innocent party may be able to deny the use of marriage to the other guilty party.

101. From a vow of chastity. a. If one of the spouses is bound by a vow of chastity, he indeed cannot ask, because by vowing he has promised abstinence from every venereal act, which promise indeed he must fulfill as far as he can; but he can fulfill it by not asking. Nevertheless he can and must render, because an emitted vow cannot deprive the other of his right.

a. The vow of chastity which a spouse emits without the knowledge of the other spouse can be twofold: either of not using marriage and therefore not rendering the debt even if it is asked, or a vow of not asking. The first, once the marriage has already been consummated, is invalid, as being about an illicit thing; the other indeed is valid, but can be indirectly annulled by the other spouse. According to others, however, this vow is valid only in the wife, but not in the husband: for in the husband it would be about an illicit thing, because it would be grave for the wife if she herself were always compelled to ask the debt.¹³⁴

b. If a spouse bound by a vow of chastity notices that the other is most gravely tempted and is placed in danger of pollution, he licitly asks the debt in order to free the other from the danger of sin, because in this case he must be said not so much to ask as to render to one asking interpretatively; but he can licitly render.

c. If both spouses by common consent have vowed to abstain from the work of marriage for a certain time, neither can ask or render. But if one asks contrary to his vow, the other is bound to render, because the former has not renounced the right of asking by the vow. Nevertheless, from the precept of charity the other is bound to admonish the one asking, where he can do so without grave inconvenience, that he desist from the illicit asking.¹³⁵

If because of the emitted vow they are placed in grave danger of incontinence, recourse to dispensation is to be advised; but probably even the husband can indirectly annul the vow of the wife, and the wife the vow

Notes

133. Cf. Sanchez I. 1, disp. 68, n. 2 ff. Lehmkuhl II, n. 846.

134. Cf. *De praeceptis* n. 232.

135. Cf. St. Alphonsus n. 944.

of the husband: for by the fact that they vowed by mutual consent, they do not seem to have renounced the right of annulling the vow of the other party.

- c. Regular confessors can dispense with married persons who, either before or after the marriage has been entered, have emitted a vow of perpetual chastity, to this extent, that they can licitly ask the debt (even outside confession).
- d. That they can dispense in a vow emitted before marriage is established from the privileges conceded by the supreme pontiffs to mendicants;¹³⁶ that they can do the same in a vow emitted after marriage is established from the known canon, that regulars can dispense in all vows in which bishops dispense by ordinary law.
- e. But they cannot dispense if both spouses by common consent have emitted the vow, or if only one has done so, but with the consent of the other, who by this very fact yields his right. The dispensation in this case remains reserved.
- f. Since spouses have been dispensed only for the use of marriage, they sin against the vow if outside the use of marriage they sin against chastity; moreover after the death of the other party they cannot enter a new marriage without dispensation.

Appendix.

Notes for Confessors.

102. In general. 1. In examining penitents concerning shameful sins, the confessor must be very cautious. In this matter it is better to fall short than to abound, lest the penitent from the questions of the confessor learn sins which he previously did not know and thus take an occasion of committing them, and lest confession be rendered odious, because the questioning of the confessor is for the penitent a cause of temptation or an occasion of scandal. For this reason one must not only refrain from asking about circumstances of sins, however notably aggravating, or about the mode in which the sin was perpetrated, but even in those things which of themselves would be necessary for an integral confession, it is better to omit questions from which, rightly and deservedly, grave inconvenience is feared to follow. In this case, therefore, once the certain species (although not the lowest species) and the number of the sin are known, one must abstain from further investigation, even if the integrity of confession is lacking.

- 2. If an adult accuses himself only in general of sins committed against chastity, and the confessor rightly and deservedly can suppose several sins of this kind, the examination is more suitably begun not from depraved thoughts, but from graver sins, according to the mode which is indicated in the volume *De sacramentis*, n. 441.

Since questions about shameful sins, as those which wound shamefacedness both in the penitent and in the confessor, are of such great difficulty and trouble, those opinions are to be well retained which remove the specific differences of sins, provided they are still truly probable, so that in practice we can safely follow them.

- 3. Those who accuse themselves of voluntary pollution sometimes, in sinning, desire a person of the different sex and therefore fornication. Younger persons, however, should not be explicitly asked about this matter, lest they learn sins which perhaps up to this point they do not know; but first they should be asked whether meanwhile they had depraved thoughts. If they deny this, beyond the number of the

Notes

136. Cf. St. Alphonsus l. 6, n. 1128.

sin there is nothing else about which they should be asked; but if they affirm it, they should be asked whether they desired something shameful, and what.

4. If someone accuses himself of intercourse with a person of the other sex, besides fornication there can be present the sin of onanism or another sin perpetrated for impeding generation. In order that this may be discerned, he or she can be asked (whether man or woman): whether she could have become pregnant; if the answer is affirmative, none of these things occurred; if it is denied, let the person be asked further: why not? From the response there is had what is necessary to be known.
5. From boys or girls it must not be asked whether an effusion of semen (humor) occurred, lest perhaps they learn what they still do not know and from curiosity be stirred up to experience it. For the same reason they should not be explicitly asked about touches committed with others, whether of the same or of a different sex, but only about touches performed on their own body and about the pleasure perceived from them.
6. Although it is most certain that every venereal delectation freely admitted is a grave sin, nevertheless it is equally certain that very many of the faithful exist, especially from those who live with little Christian spirit, who in good faith judge that a slight venereal delectation, e.g. one taken from a light shameful touch or from a kiss, is not a grave sin. Therefore let the confessor consider whether it is better to admonish penitents of this kind about the gravity of any carnal delectation, or rather to omit this admonition. But lest those things which are dissembled for the salvation of the soul be turned into a lax practice, penitents of this kind must be admonished and exhorted with grave words that they abstain even from slight delectations, lest from slight things they proceed to graver ones.

103. In particular. 1. Those who accuse themselves of impure thoughts must be examined in diverse ways according to the quality of the persons.

- a. Those whom the confessor rightly supposes to have sinned against chastity can be asked: whether they have done anything shameful; whether they desired to do it. For penitents frequently accuse sins of lust under the name of shameful thoughts, because they either do not wish or are not able to express anything else, and they expect to be examined about this matter by the confessor.
 - b. Those who are not accustomed to sin gravely against chastity can be asked: whether they also had depraved desires; whether they had depraved sensations (*Gefühle*) and consented to them.
 - c. If it can rightly be supposed that they have not sinned gravely, as frequently happens in the impubescent, they are not to be questioned further; but, with an admonition added, if there is need, that temptations of this kind are to be vigorously and diligently repelled, they are to be dismissed.
2. Those who confess impure touches on their own body can be asked: whether the touches were necessary; if they deny this: whether they were long-lasting or morose; if they deny this, nothing further is to be asked; if they affirm it, either pollution can simply be supposed, or it can be asked whether they polluted themselves, unless they are impubescent.
 3. If imperfect acts (looks, touches, conversations, readings, etc.) occurred without a complete venereal act (pollution, intercourse), without commotions or venereal delectations having followed, or if, when they arose, consent was not given, the individual acts are grave or light sins according as the danger which they cause is grave or light. In confession, therefore, the acts themselves are to be accused distinctly, or it is to be said: I exposed myself to a light or grave danger of sinning against chastity. Likewise, if someone by those acts either intended commotion or delectation, or admitted it when it had arisen without intention, either the acts themselves are to be accused distinctly, or it is to be said: I voluntarily had carnal motions or venereal delectations, with their number added.

Since, however, the confessor sometimes ought to know how the commotions or delectations arose - namely where they arose from an object furnishing a voluntary occasion of sin, e.g. from obscene reading, from conversation, from frequenting the theater, etc. - it is necessary that the confessor ask about the occasion, so that it may be removed, unless the penitent himself declares it.

104. Concerning married persons. 1. Married persons who do not accuse themselves of abuse of marriage and do not furnish any suspicion of this abuse are not to be asked about this matter; but if the confessor prudently fears that they abuse marriage, let him cautiously ask them whether there is anything which in this matter gnaws at their conscience. Prudence, decency, and the sanctity of the place require that he speak nothing in particular about this matter unless he has been asked.

2. If spouses accuse themselves that they have had intercourse in a preposterous way or from behind, by these words they signify either the sin of sodomy or an undue position. To discern the matter it is sufficient to ask whether generation was possible; but if they deny this, the sin of sodomy is supposed. It can indeed happen that even in a case of undue position generation was impossible because of the effusion of the whole semen outside the vessel; if this had been foreseen, the undue position would be a grave sin; but in this slippery matter it is not necessary that everything be asked about.

3. Concerning the mode of acting with onanistic spouses, cf. n. 76.

Index of Subjects.

The Arabic number indicates the marginal number.

A.

Conjugal act: it is licit 65; even if generation cannot be obtained 66; how it is to be performed 67; twofold condition for it to be licit 68 ff.; in the case of supervening impotence not illicit 68; whether it is licit where it is established that the woman suffers abortion, brings forth dead offspring 78.

Conjugal act, manifold end 78; licit for avoiding incontinence, illicit on account of pleasure alone 78.

- natural, unnatural 79; what kind of sin an unnatural position is 79.
- place 80.
- obligation 87.
- time: whether it is licit in sacred time 81; at the time of menstrual flow 82; at the time of pregnancy 83; at the time of purification 84; at the time of lactation 85; at the time of illness 86.
- impediments: on the part of marriage 97; whether the impediment ceases in the case of most grave inconvenience 97; on the part of the spouses: incest 99; adultery 100; vow of chastity 101.

Acts of lust, see Lust.

Imperfect acts of lust: in the use of marriage they are licit 70; whether mutual acts are licit for spouses 94; whether solitary acts are licit for spouses 95.

Adultery: what it is; simple, double 19; it includes two sins 20; intercourse with another's betrothed is not adultery 20; it is an impediment of intercourse 100; whether the right of asking is lost by adultery itself 100.

Shameful looks: they do not differ in species from immodest touches 53; according to the diversity of the object seen they differ in species; according to the diversity of circumstances of the object they do not differ in species 53; malice of diverse looks 57; whether looks at a nude model are licit for painters 60.

B.

Bestiality: what it is 44; its malice 45; according to diversity of the beast it is not specifically diverse 45; shameful touches upon a beast ordinarily are not a sin of bestiality 45; what is to be understood as reserved 44.

C.

Shameful songs: their malice 58.

Chastity: what it is, its material and formal object 1; how manyfold it is 2.

Vow of chastity: it impedes conjugal intercourse 101; whether one bound by a vow can render or ask 101.

Impure thoughts: which are so called; their malice 61; according to diversity of object they are not specifically diverse 61.

Concubinage: what it is 16; how the parish priest must proceed against concubinaries 16. See Fornication.

Intercourse: what belongs to the nature of intercourse 42.

Cooperation: to onanism see Onanism.

- to sodomy see Sodomy.

Carnal intercourse: what it is 6, 64; perfect, imperfect 15.

- conjugal: licit for the old and sterile 65; the woman licitly procures its completion for herself, unless the man withdraws before semination 68; whether joy about future intercourse is licit for the betrothed 63. See Conjugal act.

Onanistic intercourse, see Onanism.

Sodomitic intercourse, see Sodomy.

D.

Conjugal debt: what it is 64; obligation of asking the debt 88; obligation of rendering the debt 88; within the first two months 88; when the right of asking is lost 89; whether it must be rendered to one asking illicitly 90; when the obligation of rendering ceases 91; whether a spouse is excused from rendering because of numerous offspring, because of harm to offspring 92; whether it must be rendered to a man neglecting care of the family 92; whether it exists in doubt concerning the value of marriage 98; whether one bound by a vow of chastity can ask and render 101.

- right of asking the debt: when it is lost 89; through incest 99; through adultery 100; how the lost right is to be restored 99.

Delectation: what it is 7; venereal, spiritual, sensible, sensual 7.

- venereal: complete, incomplete 8; whether they differ in species 9; whether the impubescent are capable of complete delectation 8; directly, indirectly willed 10; directly willed does not admit smallness of matter, indirectly willed admits it 11; when indirectly willed is a grave sin 12; actions influencing it gravely and lightly 13; whether it is licit for spouses 93, 96. See Lust.

Morose delectation: what it is 62; of what gravity and species of sin it is; whether it contracts species from the circumstances of the object 62; whether it is licit for spouses 96.

Impure desire: what it is; efficacious, inefficacious 63; it takes species from the object and circumstances 63; whether desire of natural pollution is licit 63; whether it is licit for spouses 96.

Distillation: what it is; how it differs from pollution 40; whether it is a sin 40. See Pollution.

F.

Artificial fecundation: whether it is licit 77.

Fornication: what it is 15; it is always a grave sin, prohibited by natural and positive law 17; it does not differ specifically from concubinage and prostitution 17.

G.

Generation: active, passive 6; organs of generation in the male, in the female 5; act of generation 6.

H.

Hypersexuality: what it is, its cause, signs, imputability 46.

I.

Immodesty: what it is 9; acts of immodesty 47; they differ in species from consummated acts 51.

Impurity: what it is 9.

Incest: what it is; how manifold it is 21; a carnal sin of a confessor with a penitent is not incest 21; it includes two sins 22; incest among blood-relatives and relatives by affinity do not differ in species 22; incest among diverse cognates differs in species 22; it is an impediment of intercourse 99.

L.

Shameful readings: malice of diverse shameful readings 59.

Shameful books, see Readings.

Lust: what it is 9; directly, indirectly willed 10; directly willed does not admit smallness of matter, indirectly willed admits it 11; when indirectly willed is a grave sin 12, 13; actions influencing it gravely and lightly 13. See Venereal delectation.

Acts of lust: perfect, imperfect; consummated, non-consummated; internal, external 10; malice of external acts 52; specific difference 53.

Sins of lust: they have a special foulness 11; consummated according to nature 15 ff.; against nature 29 ff.; non-consummated 48 ff.; whether invincible ignorance is given in them 13; external 51 ff.; internal 61.

M.

Malthusianism: what it is 72. See Onanism.

Masochism: what it is 47.

Marriage: use of marriage, see Conjugal act.

Menstruation: what it is 41; how those who suffer menstruation are to be treated by the confessor 41; use of marriage at the time of menstruation 82.

Prostitution: what it is 16; whether prostitutes can be permitted 17. See Fornication.

Carnal motions: what they are, grave, light 48; their malice 49; what resistance is to be opposed to them 50.

O.

Onanism: what it is; twofold mode 72; it is a grave sin 73; cooperation to the first mode is licit from a grave cause, to the other mode only from a most grave cause 74; means of avoiding onanism 75; whether spouses are to be asked about it by the confessor 76.

Onanist: whether he is to be admonished about the sin if he is in good faith 76; whether the wife of an onanist can render the debt, whether she must, whether she can ask from him 74.

One oppressed: when she is immune from sin 24.

Dishonorable kisses: malice of diverse kisses 56; whether it is licit to admit lustful kisses 60.

P.

Parts of the body: which are honorable, less honorable, dishonorable 51.

Sins of lust, see Lust.

Sexual perversion: what it is and how manyfold it is, its imputability 47.

Pollution: what it is 29; its specific essence 29; all pollutions are of the same species 31; from circumstances they are of diverse species 31; voluntary, involuntary, passive 29; malice of pollution voluntary in itself 34; voluntary in its cause 35; when there is a sufficient cause of permitting pollution 36, 37; whether it is licit to drive away itching, even if pollution follows 38; how it is to be treated 39; its distinction from distillation 40.

- nocturnal: its cause 32; its malice 33.
- feminine: what it is 6; it is not a specific sin 30.
- natural: whether it is evil 63; whether desire of it is evil 63.

Prostitution: how manyfold it is, whether it is licit 18.

Modesty: what it is, what its end is 3.

R.

Rape: what it is 27; it includes two sins 28.

S.

Carnal sacrilege: what it is 25; it contains two sins 26; personal, local, real, how it is committed 26.

Sadism: what it is 47.

Semination: what it is on the part of the man, on the part of the woman 64.

Dishonorable conversations: they can be sinful in three ways 58; what kind of sin it is to hear shameful conversations 58.

Contrary sexuality: what it is 47.

Sodomy: what it is, how manyfold it is 42; in what its essence consists 42; its malice 43; perfect and imperfect differ in species 43; what is to be understood as reserved 43.

Imperfect sodomy: a grave sin 71; positive cooperation to it is never licit 71; passive cooperation is licit from a most grave cause 71.

Defilement: what it is, in the wide and strict sense, violent and voluntary 23; it contains two sins 24.

T.

Shameful touches: they do not differ in species from immodest looks 53; according to diversity of object and circumstances they are specifically diverse 53; malice of diverse touches 55; whether it is licit to admit lustful touches 60.

V.

Virginity: what it is; material, formal virginity 3; in what chastity and virginity differ, the vow of chastity and the vow of virginity 3; it is a special virtue 3; when it is lost formally, materially, reparably, irreparably 4.

Index.

First Book. On the Sixth and Ninth Precepts.

Section	Page
Question 1. On chastity and virginity	2
Question 2. On lust in general.	
Article 1. On the nature of lust	6
Article 2. On the malice of lust	12
Question 3. On consummated sins of lust	18
Article 1. On sins according to nature	19
Article 2. On sins against nature.	
§ 1. On pollution	30
§ 2. On sodomy	43
§ 3. On bestiality	45
Question 4. On non-consummated sins of lust.	
Article 1. On carnal motions	49
Article 2. On external sins	53
Article 3. On internal sins	66

Second Book. On the Use of Marriage.

Section	Page
Question 1. On the liceity of the conjugal act in itself.	
Article 1. On the liceity itself	72
Article 2. On sodomy and onanism	79
Question 2. On the liceity of the conjugal act by reason of circumstances.	
§ 1. On the end	88
§ 2. On situation and place	90
§ 3. On time	91
Question 3. On the obligation of the conjugal act	96
Question 4. On licit things in marriage	104
Question 5. On the impediments of the conjugal act	108
Appendix. Notes for confessors	114

A. M. D. G.