

MANUAL OF MORAL THEOLOGY

by Ludovicus Wouters, C.SS.R.

Emeritus Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology

VOLUME II

On Baptism — with Treatise I, On the Sacraments in General

Bruges: Carolus Beyaert, Pontifical Publisher • The Latin is in the public domain.

The English translation is our own, made from the Latin for the Morals of the Church library, where the text may be read and searched online. The author's paragraph numbers are set in the margin, and the corrections of the printed Addenda are incorporated at the places they name.

CONTENTS

Treatise I. On the Sacraments in General	nn. 1–49	4
Dissertation I. On the Sacraments Considered in Themselves	nn. 1–11	5
Part I. On the Summary Notion, Existence, Essence, and Division of the Sacraments	... nn. 1–4	6
Part II. On the Efficacy, or Productive Power, of the Sacraments	n. 5	9
Part III. On the Effects of the Sacraments	nn. 6–11	10
Section I. On Grace	nn. 6–7	10
Section II. On Character	nn. 8–11	11
Scholion. On the Informity and Reviviscence of the Sacraments	nn. 10–11	11
Dissertation II. On the Ministration of the Sacraments	nn. 12–37	14
Part I. On the Person Ministering	n. 12	15
Part II. On the Mode of Ministering	nn. 13–37	16
Section I. On the Requisites for Valid Ministration	nn. 13–24	16
Chapter I. On Intention	nn. 14–18	16
Scholion. On the Simulated Administration of a Sacrament	nn. 17–18	19
Chapter II. On the Other Requisites	nn. 19–24	21
Section II. On the Requisites for Licit Ministration	nn. 25–33	24
Scholion I. On the Ministration of a Doubtfully Valid Sacrament	nn. 31–32	30
Scholion II. On the Repetition of a Sacrament Doubtfully or Doubtfully Validly Conferred	... n. 33	32
Section III. On the Obligation of Ministering	nn. 34–37	32
Dissertation III. On the Reception of the Sacraments	nn. 38–49	35
Part I. On the Person Receiving	n. 38	36
Part II. On the Mode of Receiving a Sacrament	nn. 39–45	37
Section I. On the Requisites for Valid Reception	nn. 39–41	37
Section II. On the Requisites for Licit Reception	nn. 42–45	41
Appendix. On Sacramentals	nn. 46–49	44
Treatise II. On Baptism	nn. 50–109	46
Dissertation I. On Baptism Considered in Itself	nn. 50–73	47
Part I. On the Existence of the Sacrament of Baptism	n. 51	48
Part II. On the Essence of the Sacrament of Baptism	nn. 52–60	49
Section I. On Remote Matter	nn. 52–53	49
Section II. On Proximate Matter	nn. 54–55	50
Section III. On the Form	nn. 56–60	53
Part III. On the Effects of Baptism	n. 61	57
Part IV. On the Necessity of Baptism	nn. 62–73	58
Section I. On Necessity of Means	nn. 62–72	58
Scholion I. On Baptism of Desire	nn. 63–67	58
Scholion II. On Baptism of Blood	nn. 68–72	59

Section II. On Necessity of Precept	n. 73	60
Dissertation II. On the Ministration of Baptism	nn. 74–90	61
Part I. On the Person Ministering	nn. 74–78	62
Part II. On the Manner of Administering Baptism	nn. 79–90	65
Section I. On the Rites and Ceremonies of Baptism	nn. 79–81	65
Section II. On Sponsors	nn. 82–86	66
Section III. On the Time and Place of Conferring Baptism	nn. 87–88	69
Section IV. On the Notation and Proof of Baptism Conferred	nn. 89–90	70
Dissertation III. On the Reception of Baptism	nn. 91–109	72
Part I. On the Person Receiving	nn. 91–105	73
Section I. On Infants	n. 91	73
Section II. On Abortive Fetuses	n. 92	73
Section III. On Fetuses Not Yet Brought Forth	nn. 93–97	74
Scholion. On Caesarean Section and Other Incisions	nn. 94–97	76
Section IV. On Monsters	n. 98	79
Section V. On Infants of Non-Catholics	nn. 99–100	79
Section VI. On Adults	nn. 101–102	81
Section VII. On the Insane and the Furious	nn. 103–105	82
Scholion. On the Doubtfully Baptized	nn. 104–105	83
Part II. On the Manner of Receiving Baptism	nn. 106–109	86

Treatise I. On the Sacraments in General

(St. Thomas, part 3, qq. 60-65; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis*, book VI, nn. 1-94; *Homo Apostolicus*, tract 14, nn. 1-6.)¹

We shall deal first with the sacraments considered in themselves, then with the administration, and finally with the reception of the sacraments. Those things, however, which are treated by dogmatic theologians we shall touch upon very briefly, especially for this end, that there may be had a view of the whole doctrine, and that the connection between dogmatic and moral doctrine may appear.

¹ Cf. Billuart, *Summa S. Thom.*, part 3, treatise III; De Smet, *De sacramentis in genere*; Rath, *De Sacramentis in genere*; Pourrat, *La theologie sacramentaire*; Schanz, *Die Lehre von den Sakramenten der kath. Kirche*; Billot, *De Ecclesiae sacramentis*.

Dissertation I. On the Sacraments Considered in Themselves

Having handed down a summary notion of a sacrament, we shall speak first of the existence, essence, and division of the sacraments, then of their efficacy, and then of the effects of the sacraments.

Part I. On the Summary Notion, Existence, Essence, and Division of the Sacraments

1 **I. Summary notion.** By force of the word, a sacrament signifies every sacred thing. Here, however, it is taken more strictly and is defined: a sensible sign of a sacred thing sanctifying man, that is, of grace. Sacraments of the Old Law and sacraments of the New Law are distinguished. The former only signify; the latter signify and produce grace. Hence a sacrament of the Old Law is defined: a sensible sign, but not an efficacious sign, of grace; but a sacrament of the New Law is called: a sensible and efficacious sign of grace.

2 **II. Existence of the sacraments.** In order that the existence of the sacraments may be rightly set forth, the various states of men must be distinguished, namely: 1. the state of innocence in paradise; 2. the state of the law of nature, so named not to the exclusion of grace, but to the exclusion of the written Mosaic law. This state prevailed for the Israelites until the written law, and for others until Christ; 3. the state of the Mosaic Law, which for the Israelites lasted until Christ; 4. the state of the new or Christian Law. Now:

1. In the state of innocence, by the consent of all, no sacrament existed.
2. In the state of the law of nature, more probably at least one sacrament existed. Namely, considering the will of God to save all, there certainly existed a remedy by which little children would be freed from original sin. That this was a sensible sign of sanctifying grace, or a sacrament, is more probable, as the dogmatic theologians explain (cf. St. Thomas, part 3, q. 61, a. 3; q. 60, a. 5, ad 3; q. 61, a. 1).
3. In the state of the Mosaic Law, several sacraments existed, as is deduced from the Council of Trent¹ and from the decree of Eugene IV for the Armenians. Moreover, it is commonly admitted that circumcision was a sacrament. Other sacraments of this Law are enumerated: the consecration of priests, the eating of the paschal lamb and of the loaves of proposition, and purifications (cf. St. Thomas, I-II, q. 102, a. 5; part 3, q. 61, a. 3, ad 2).
4. In the state of the New Law there are seven sacraments, and these were instituted by Christ; this is of faith from the Council of Trent: "If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or that there are more or fewer than seven, namely Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be anathema."² That the said sacraments were instituted immediately by Christ, not by the Apostles under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is certain doctrine, although it is disputed whether it was defined by the Council of Trent as a truth to be believed with Catholic faith.

It is disputed how Christ instituted the sacraments. Some teach that Christ determined the matter and form only in general, commanding only an apt gesture and suitable words, and leaving the more exact determination to the Church; this is the opinion of immediate institution in general. Others judge that Christ prescribed this gesture in species and these words in species, yet in such a way that there is room for some latitude, insofar as the Apostles or the rulers of the Church can, not indeed abrogate the matter and form established by Christ, but determine them more exactly or more strictly, or even increase them by new elements, so that the very sign-value is, within certain limits,

subject to the will of the Church; this is the opinion of immediate institution in a perfectible specific form. Others admit immediate institution in a fixed specific form, so that the Church can do nothing directly with respect to validity by changing or adding anything concerning the matter or form.

¹ Session 7, canon 2.

² Session 7, canon 1.

3 III. Essence of the sacraments. 1. The sacraments of the New Law consist of things and words; this doctrine is declared in the decree for the Armenians. It is clear: 1. from Sacred Scripture, which expressly affirms this about several sacraments, such as Baptism,¹ Confirmation,² and Extreme Unction;³ 2. from the doctrine and use of the Church. For the rest, words and things can be understood morally, so that it suffices for words and things to be had equivalently.

2. Things and words in the sacraments stand to one another as matter and form; this doctrine is proposed in the same decree for the Armenians. It is clear from the fact that the thing of a sacrament, which of itself can signify several things, for example washing in Baptism, and therefore of itself is indeterminate in the being of a sign, is determined by words to a special signification; so that the thing is like matter, the determinable part, while the words are like form, the determining part.

3. The matter of a sacrament is customarily distinguished as twofold, remote and proximate. The remote matter is the thing which is used in the sacred rite, as water in Baptism; or the thing about which the sacramental action is concerned, as sins in Penance. The former is called the remote matter from which, the latter the remote matter about which. The proximate matter is the application of the remote matter, as washing in Baptism; or the action which is concerned with the remote matter, as the acts of the penitent in Penance.

¹ Matt. 28:19.

² Acts 8:15, 17.

³ Jas. 5:14.

4 IV. Division of the sacraments. The sacraments of the New Law are distinguished into:

1. Sacraments of the dead and of the living, according as they were primarily instituted for giving grace, namely to the spiritually dead; or for increasing it, namely in the spiritually living. The grace which is conferred on a man deprived of every degree of grace, or spiritually dead, is called first grace; the grace which is conferred on a man constituted in the state of grace, or spiritually living, is called second grace. The sacraments of the dead are Baptism and Penance. The sacraments of the living are Confirmation, Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony.

2. Repeatable and non-repeatable, according as they can be conferred on the same person more than once or only once.

3. Necessary and non-necessary, according as they ought or ought not to be received by individuals. Of those which ought to be received, some are necessary by necessity of means and precept, others by necessity of precept alone. Baptism for all (can. 737), and Penance for all who have fallen into mortal sin after Baptism, are necessary by necessity of means and precept (can. 901 and 906). The Eucharist is certainly necessary by necessity of precept (can. 859, §§ 1 and 4; can. 864, § 1); concerning necessity of means, it is disputed. Confirmation and Extreme Unction are

not necessary by necessity of means; whether they are necessary by necessity of a grave precept is disputed. Finally, Matrimony and Order are necessary only to the community; each of these matters will be developed in its own place.

4. Formed and unformed, according as, as soon as they are received, they confer grace, or, on account of an obstacle, at least do not produce it immediately. Of the unformed sacraments, some, when the obstacle has been removed, revive, that is, confer grace; others do not revive (St. Alphonsus, VI, 6).
5. Finally, a sacrament is called valid or invalid according as nothing or something is lacking for constituting it.

Part II. On the Efficacy, or Productive Power, of the Sacraments

⁵ The question is whether the sacraments truly produce grace, etc.; concerning the effects themselves there will be discussion in the following part. Now:

I. The sacraments of the New Law confer grace *ex opere operato*, or are truly efficient causes of grace. This proposition is established against the Protestants and Modernists, and is of faith from these words of the Council of Trent: "If anyone shall say that grace is not conferred through the sacraments of the New Law themselves *ex opere operato* ... let him be anathema."¹

II. The sacraments concur in producing grace only as instrumental causes; the principal cause, which uses the sacraments as instruments, is God alone; for no creature can, as principal cause, produce an effect which exceeds the order of every creature.²

III. The mode by which the sacraments concur in producing grace is explained in different ways. Some teach that the sacraments, which morally are actions of Christ, move God by an infinite and infallible power to confer grace (the doctrine of moral causality). Others judge that the sacraments do not immediately produce grace, but effect in the subject a title which, so far as lies in itself, demands grace (the doctrine of intentional causality). Others teach that the sacraments physically and immediately produce grace (the doctrine of physical causality). This is the opinion of St. Thomas (I-II, q. 112, a. 1, ad 2; III, q. 62, a. 1, 3, 4, 6).

¹ Session 7, canon 8.

² Council of Trent, Session 6, chapter 7.

Part III. On the Effects of the Sacraments

The effects of the sacraments are grace and character. The former is common to all the sacraments; the latter is proper to three, namely Baptism, Confirmation, and Order.

Section I. On Grace

6 I. Grace conferred. The grace which the sacraments confer is sanctifying grace and sacramental grace.

1. **Sanctifying grace.** a) All the sacraments confer sanctifying grace on those rightly disposed. This follows from what has been said concerning the efficacy of the sacraments. Moreover, to sanctifying grace there is attached either the infusion of the supernatural virtues and of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, namely if first grace is conferred; or the increase of the aforesaid, namely if second grace is conferred.

b) Baptism and Penance of themselves confer first grace; accidentally, namely if someone in the state of grace receives them in the due manner, they confer second grace, that is, an increase of grace.

c) Extreme Unction of itself and primarily confers second grace; of itself, but secondarily, it confers first grace. The other sacraments of themselves confer second grace, and accidentally, at least much more probably, first grace. The case obtains if someone in the state of mortal sin receives a sacrament in good faith and with attrition, which extends itself to all the sins committed. The reason for this opinion is that, according to Trent, the sacraments confer grace on those who place no obstacle. Now one who is in good faith and attrite places no obstacle to grace, as is clear from the sacraments of the dead (St. Thomas, III, q. 72, a. 7; q. 79, a. 3; Supplement, q. 30, a. 1; St. Alphonsus, VI, 6, 269 and 731).

2. **Sacramental grace**, that is, a certain divine help for attaining the end proper to such a sacrament (St. Thomas, III, q. 62, a. 2). What end is proper to each sacrament will be stated where there is discussion of the individual sacraments. Further:

a) That sacramental grace is conferred through the sacraments is deduced first from the Council of Florence, which declares: "Each sacrament is ordered to a proper and distinct end." But a sacrament cannot attain its proper end unless it produces an effect or grace proper to itself, in other words, sacramental grace. Then, if all the sacraments conferred the same grace, they would differ only in the external rite; nor would there have been a reason for instituting diverse sacraments; nor would it be clear why one is more necessary than another.

b) There is not one opinion of theologians about that in which sacramental grace precisely consists. According to the defenders of intentional causality, sacramental grace consists in actual graces proper to some sacrament, which are demanded by the same title as sanctifying grace. According to others, sacramental grace is sanctifying grace itself, insofar as it is given through such a sacrament; but sanctifying grace, given through such a sacrament, is ordered to the ends of such a sacrament, and consequently gives a right to receive, namely in due time, the actual graces by which the end of such a sacrament may be obtained. Thus, for example, sanctifying grace conferred in Baptism is regenerative and preservative of spiritual life; in Confirmation, strengthening and perfective, etc. According to the Thomists, sacramental grace is sanctifying grace with an intrinsic modification, by

force of which sanctifying grace is ordered to the effects proper to the sacrament, together with a right to receive actual graces in order to those effects. Hence, according to them, for example, sanctifying grace conferred in Baptism, by force of the aforesaid modification, is regenerative and preservative of spiritual life, etc.

7 II. The measure according to which the sacraments confer grace. 1. Sacraments distinct in species more probably confer unequal grace on those equally disposed. For sacraments differ in dignity; and to a more worthy cause there corresponds a more worthy effect.

2. Sacraments distinct only in number confer equal grace on those equally disposed, and unequal grace on those unequally disposed. The Council of Trent¹ expressly teaches this concerning Baptism. Hence it must also be presumed concerning the others.

¹ Session 6, chapter 7.

Section II. On Character

8 I. Existence of sacramental character. Three sacraments, namely Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, imprint upon the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, whence they cannot be repeated. This is of faith from the Council of Trent: "If anyone shall say that in the three sacraments, namely Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, a character is not imprinted on the soul, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, whence they cannot be repeated, let him be anathema."¹ Canon 732, § 1, also teaches this.

¹ Session 7, canon 9.

9 II. Nature of sacramental character. The nature of sacramental character is explained in different ways by different authors. Yet all agree in this: that character is a spiritual quality, distinct from sanctifying grace, and is a power by which man becomes capable either of receiving sacred things, as in Baptism, or of handing on sacred things, as in Confirmation and Order (St. Thomas, III, q. 63, aa. 1 and 2). But they dispute, according as they defend either physical or moral causality, whether it is a physical power or only a moral one; wherefore consult the dogmatic theologians.

Scholion. On the Informity and Reviviscence of the Sacraments

10 I. Informity. 1. The informity of a sacrament consists in this: that the sacrament is validly received, but, on account of an obstacle, does not produce fruit, that is, grace. It is said to be on account of an obstacle, whether material or formal, according as it is placed inculpably or culpably.

2. Six sacraments certainly can be unformed; concerning Penance alone it is disputed whether it can be received informly, that is, validly but without fruit.

11 II. Reviviscence; concerning which several things must be explained.

1. **Notion.** Reviviscence consists in this: that a sacrament validly but fruitlessly received afterwards produces grace, when the obstacle has been removed and the sacramental sign has ceased. I said "when the sacramental sign has ceased." Hence, supposing that the Holy Eucharist, received with an obstacle, produces Eucharistic grace when the obstacle has been removed before the consumption of the species,¹ there would not be reviviscence of the sacrament, because the fruit would be produced while the sacramental sign remains.

2. The sacraments which revive are these:

- a) Baptism certainly can revive; this is clear from the fact that otherwise those who received Baptism without fruit would be unable to obtain the remission of original sin and of the other sins committed before Baptism. For original sin and the other sins committed before Baptism are not remitted except through Baptism received in reality or in desire. But those who have once received Baptism can no longer receive it: neither in reality, because Baptism cannot be repeated; nor in desire, because if a new Baptism is impossible, the desire for a new Baptism is also excluded.
- b) Confirmation, Order, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction much more probably can revive. Otherwise those who had received the said sacraments fruitlessly, even inculpably, would remain deprived of sacramental grace, which is so necessary to man in the various states of life; since Confirmation and Order cannot be repeated at all, Matrimony cannot be repeated while the same bond remains, and finally Extreme Unction, while the same danger persists, is at least not licitly repeated.
- c) Whether Penance can revive is doubtful: both because it is doubtful whether it can be unformed, that is, valid and fruitless; and because it can be repeated.
- d) The Holy Eucharist, at least if it has been received sacrilegiously, is almost commonly said not to revive: both because it can be repeated so often, and because there would follow the absurdity that one who had communicated very often sacrilegiously, if he afterwards truly repented, would immediately be heaped with grace.

3. **The time of reviving.** Baptism, Confirmation, and Order can always revive, since they can never be repeated, and by force of the character in some way continue in being. Matrimony can revive so long as the same matrimonial bond persists. Once it has been broken, sacramental grace either is no longer necessary, or can be acquired through a new marriage. Extreme Unction can at least revive so long as the same danger continues. Finally, Penance, if it must be numbered among the sacraments that revive, must be said to be able always to revive.

4. **The requisites for reviviscence.** If someone has sacrilegiously received a sacrament, or has sinned gravely after receiving it, there is required of itself contrition or attrition with sacramental absolution; accidentally, given good faith, attrition with a sacrament of the living received in good faith suffices, as is taught much more probably. The reason is that such a man is in the state of mortal sin. But in order that mortal sin may be remitted, and thus that place may be given for the reviviscence of the sacrament, there is required of itself contrition or attrition with sacramental absolution; accidentally, attrition with a sacrament of the living suffices (St. Alphonsus, VI, 6, 87, 444). Outside these cases:

- a) Attrition certainly suffices in order that Baptism and Penance may revive. For the disposition required in the very reception itself suffices.
- b) Of itself contrition is required, but accidentally attrition most probably suffices, in order that Extreme Unction may revive, because this sacrament, received in good faith with attrition, most probably produces fruit.
- c) Of itself contrition is required, but accidentally attrition more probably suffices, in order that Confirmation, Order, and Matrimony may revive, because those sacraments, received in good faith with attrition, more probably produce fruit (n. 6).

5. **The mode by which reviviscence has place** is explained in different ways, according as the causality of the sacraments is explained in different ways. Supporters of moral causality teach that the value of the sacrament received perseveres morally in divine acceptance, and, when the obstacle has been removed, moves God to the infusion of grace. Defenders of intentional causality say that there remains a title demanding grace, and that, when the obstacle has been removed, it produces grace. Defenders of physical causality attribute the reviviscence of Baptism, Confirmation, and Order to character; as for the reviviscence of the other sacraments, some of them deny it, others derive it from a certain habitual determination in the will, and others have recourse to moral causality for these cases.

6. **The degree of reviviscence** seems to correspond to the actual disposition of the subject.²

¹ Whether this has a place, see in the treatise on the Eucharist.

² Cf. Council of Trent, Session 6, chapter 7.

Dissertation II. On the Ministration of the Sacraments

Part I. On the Person Ministering

12 The minister of a sacrament is he to whom the administration of the sacraments belongs by legitimate authority. A twofold minister is distinguished, namely principal and secondary, according as the administration of the sacraments belongs to someone by his own authority, or by authority communicated by the primary minister. The principal minister is Christ as man. The secondary minister is only the priest of the first or second order. Except Baptism and Matrimony. Concerning these there will be fuller discussion in the treatise on the individual sacraments.

Part II. On the Mode of Ministering

Concerning the mode of ministering the sacraments, canon 731, § 1, notes these things in general: Since all the sacraments of the New Law, instituted by Christ our Lord, are the chief means of sanctification and salvation, the greatest diligence and reverence must be employed in administering and receiving them opportunely and rightly.

With these things premised, we shall speak first of the requisites for valid ministration, then of the requisites for licit ministration.

Section I. On the Requisites for Valid Ministration

13 I. For the valid ministration of the sacraments, faith and sanctity are not required in the minister. With respect to faith, this is of faith as regards Baptism;¹ certain as regards the other sacraments. With respect to sanctity, it is of faith.²

The reason is that "the ministers of the Church operate instrumentally in the sacraments ... but, as was said above, an instrument does not act according to its own form or power, but according to the power of him by whom it is moved" (St. Thomas, III, q. 64, a. 5). Hence the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend on the disposition of the minister (St. Alphonsus, VI, 13).

II. For the valid ministration of the sacraments there are required intention, and certain other things, concerning which we shall treat individually.

¹ Council of Trent, Session 7, On Baptism, canon 4.

² Council of Trent, Session 7, On the Sacraments, canon 12.

Chapter I. On Intention

14 I. Notion. Intention is here understood as the deliberate will of confecting a sacrament.

15 II. Division. Intention is distinguished:

- 1. By reason of itself** into actual, virtual, habitual, and interpretative. Actual intention is had when the minister, at the time at which he confects the sacrament, actually wills to confect it. It is reflex, or rather *in actu signato*, if there is had an express and formal volition of confecting the sacrament; it is *in actu exercito* if someone actually wills indeed, but nevertheless less expressly and formally, to confect the sacrament, as if someone, recognizing a rite as a sacrament, administers it under this recognition. Virtual intention is had when someone has actually and explicitly willed to confect a sacrament, and that will, though not actually, nevertheless perseveres virtually, so that he operates by force of the will once had, as if someone, from the intention of celebrating Mass, puts on the vestments and performs the other things, even if perhaps at the time of the ministry he is wholly distracted. Habitual intention exists if someone has actually and explicitly willed to confect a sacrament and that will has not indeed been retracted, but nevertheless does not persevere virtually. Interpretative intention is had when someone neither actually and explicitly wills nor actually and explicitly has willed to confect a sacrament, but is presumed to be going to will it if thought about it should occur.¹ (St. Alphonsus, VI, 15.)

2. **By reason of the object** into merely external and internal. Merely external intention is had when someone wills and outwardly seriously performs only the external rite, but lacks the mind of confecting a sacrament, or even intends the contrary. It is called merely external because, although in itself it is internal, nevertheless its whole object is external, namely only the placing of the external rite. Internal intention is had when someone wills the external rite insofar as it is sacred, or at least insofar as it is held as such by the Church.

By reason of the object, intention is further distinguished into determinate and indeterminate, according as the thing intended is certain and defined; or is uncertain, as if someone intends to consecrate only ten hosts out of a multitude of hosts.

3. **By reason of mode** into explicit and implicit, according as someone expressly wills such a sacrament known and thought of, or by a more general will wills such a sacrament, whether not known, or known but not thought of.

By reason of mode it is also distinguished into absolute and conditioned, according as someone intends to confect a sacrament independently of, or dependently upon, some circumstance or event; as if someone absolves another under the condition: if you are attrite; or: if you make restitution.

¹ Some call interpretative the intention which others call implicit habitual intention.

16 **III. The intention required.** It is of faith that intention is required, and indeed intention "at least of doing what the Church does."¹ In order that these things may be unfolded and completed, observe the following:

1. **In itself, actual intention is not required, but virtual intention suffices; habitual intention does not suffice, much less interpretative intention; fear, however, does not hinder intention.** I said:

a) Actual intention is not required, but virtual intention suffices. For it must be judged that the intention suffices which truly flows into the act or sacramental rite, and therefore can be called its cause. Such is not only actual intention, but also virtual intention. There is added the fact that actual intention is not always within man's power, and its necessity would give occasion for anxieties about the validity of the sacraments (St. Thomas, III, q. 64, a. 8, ad 3;² St. Alphonsus, VI, 17, 18).

Corollary. A priest validly acts who, in the customary way, betakes himself to the baptistery, confessional, or altar and there baptizes, absolves, or consecrates; for there is had at least virtual intention; indeed practically everywhere actual intention is present, even if remiss. Likewise, a priest validly consecrates who has placed on the corporal the hosts to be consecrated, even if at the time of consecration he does not think of them. Indeed, in general it must be said that one imprudently doubts the value of the act who has placed the required rite, unless he has expressly excluded the due intention (St. Alphonsus, VI, 18).

b) Habitual intention does not suffice; since it cannot be admitted that an intention suffices which in no way flows into the action of the minister; such is habitual intention (St. Alphonsus, VI, 16). Much less, as is clear, does interpretative intention suffice (St. Alphonsus, VI, 16).

c) Fear does not hinder, because, as we posit, it does not take away the voluntary (St. Alphonsus, VI, 19). Except, however, Matrimony, as will be said in its place.

2. **As regards the object, there is required the intention or will of confecting a sacrament.** This is established against those who judge that external intention suffices; in other words, that it suffices for someone outwardly and seriously to place the external rite, even if inwardly he does not will to confect the sacrament. This doctrine, first defended by Roland Bandinelli, and afterwards revived by Ambrosius Catharinus (1553), is today almost commonly abandoned and rightly seems to be rejected. For: 1. as we have said, it is of faith that intention is required in the minister, "at least of doing what the Church does." But these words seem to have to be understood according to the sense which they had in the schools, in other words, of the intention of doing what the Church intends to effect through the rite. 2. Proposition 28 was condemned by Alexander VIII: "Baptism conferred by a minister who observes every external rite and the form of baptizing is valid, even though inwardly in his heart he resolves within himself: I do not intend what the Church does."³ Here it seems entirely that there is discussion of one who outwardly and seriously places the external rite. Therefore this does not suffice. 3. The Roman Missal has these words: "If someone has before him eleven hosts and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining which ten he intends, ... he does not consecrate, because intention is required,"⁴ namely, as the Missal, according to the obvious sense, supposes, the intention of consecrating, and that a determinate one (St. Alphonsus, VI, 23).

It suffices, however, that the minister implicitly will to confect the sacrament, for example, that he will the rite as sacred, that he will to do what Christ instituted, what the Church does, what is asked by a Christian, etc.

Corollary I. A sacrament is not valid: 1. if someone places the external rite without any intention; this, for example, will have place if someone does not place a human act, as if he baptizes someone in sleep or drunkenness; 2. if someone performs the external rite for the sake of jest, mockery, or mere exercise.

Corollary II. A sacrament can be valid, even if someone does not regard the rite placed by himself as sacramental, provided he truly wills, for example, what Christ instituted, what he who admits the sacrament asks, etc. Hence heresy or infidelity of itself is not a reason for doubting the required intention;⁵ otherwise if there is added hatred of the Christian name, which, for example, we can easily suspect in a Jew.

3. **As regards the term, intention must be borne toward a determinate person or matter;** yet it suffices that the intention be directed to the person or to the whole matter present, without being directed to the parts individually. But he consecrates invalidly who would will to consecrate ten hosts out of eleven and would not determine those ten.

4. **As regards the mode, especially as regards a sacrament to be confected under a condition, several things must be noted:**

a) A sacrament conferred under a condition concerning the present or the past generally is valid or not valid at once, according as the condition is verified or not verified. I said "generally," because it is disputed whether a sacrament conferred under a condition naturally unknowable is valid; as if someone were to absolve another if he were predestined. Further, it seems this must be denied, because "since God has committed the administration of the sacraments to the knowledge and will of

men, a condition cannot be placed which cannot fall under human knowledge" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 26).

b) A sacrament conferred under a condition concerning the future, for example: I absolve you, if you will make restitution, that is, as soon as you shall have made restitution, generally is not valid, neither before nor after the condition has been fulfilled. Not before the condition is fulfilled, because there is not had the intention of confecting the sacrament before the fulfilled condition; not after the condition is fulfilled, because then the matter and form no longer exist (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). I said generally, because Matrimony is excepted, which follows the nature of a contract. But a contract entered into under a condition is perfected when the condition has been fulfilled.

¹ Council of Trent, Session 7, On the Sacraments, canon 11.

² St. Thomas in the cited place indeed says: "Although he who is thinking of something else does not have actual intention, nevertheless he has ... habitual intention, which suffices for the perfection of the sacrament." But St. Alphonsus responds: "By habitual intention here the holy Doctor without doubt understands virtual intention; for immediately after he adds thus: Suppose that when a priest approaches to baptize, he intends to do with respect to the one to be baptized what the Church does; hence if afterwards in the very exercise of the act his thought is carried off to other things, the sacrament is perfected from the force, note well, of the first intention" (VI, 18).

³ Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 1318.

⁴ *De Defectibus*, title 7, n. 1.

⁵ Holy Office, 18 December 1872 (*Collectanea*, n. 1392).

Scholion. On the Simulated Administration of a Sacrament

Authors do not agree in explaining the nature and morality of simulated or fictitious administration of a sacrament. It seems to us that the following must be said:

17 I. Notion. 1. Simulated administration of a sacrament, taken in the full sense, consists in this: that someone uses the matter and form of a sacrament, and this in such a way that he signifies the will of confecting a sacrament, which nevertheless he does not actually have (St. Alphonsus, VI, 60 and 61, where he denies simulation because matter and form are lacking).

2. Simulated administration, accepted in a less full sense, is had when someone uses the matter or form of a sacrament, and this again in such a way that he signifies the will of confecting a sacrament, which in reality he does not have (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

Each simulated administration is called formal or material, according as deception of one's neighbor is intended as an end, or is chosen as a means.

3. Simulated administration of a sacrament, taken improperly, consists in this: that someone applies something which bears the appearance of the matter and form of a sacrament, or of either one, and this for the end that he may be judged to confect a sacrament.

From every simulated administration there differs the dissimulation of a denied sacrament, which has place when someone applies something which bears the appearance of the matter and form, or of either one, for the end that he may hide the denial of the sacrament; for example, if someone gives a blessing instead of absolution to one who is indisposed, lest the denial of absolution be disclosed to others (St. Alphonsus, VI, 59).

18 **II. Morality.** 1. Simulation of a sacrament, accepted in the full sense, is gravely evil, because it contains a sacrilegious lie, that is, a lie which, as having been committed through a sacramental rite, redounds upon the sacrament itself and inflicts grave injury upon it. Add that the said lie will often be gravely harmful. There is added proposition 29 condemned by Innocent XI: "Urgent grave fear is a cause for simulating the administration of the sacraments";¹ concerning which note: 1. by that proposition at least the simulation of a sacrament accepted in the full sense is condemned; 2. the authors of the said proposition understood it of material simulation (St. Alphonsus, VI, 59); hence formal simulation is to be rejected *a fortiori*.

2. Simulation of a sacrament accepted in the less full sense likewise seems gravely illicit, because the argument just brought forward also has force if the lie is committed through the partial rite of a sacrament.²
3. Simulation of a sacrament taken improperly of itself is quite probably not gravely illicit; for since the rite of the sacrament is applied neither wholly nor partially, the injury inflicted on the sacrament seems to be lacking, so that only a lie remains. I said of itself, because grave sin can be committed from another source, for example against charity or even against justice with respect to the subject to whom the sacrament, owed by charity or by justice, is thus denied.
4. The dissimulation of a denied sacrament, when there is a just cause, is of itself licit. For in the case neither is injury inflicted on the sacrament, nor is a lie committed, but only the truth is hidden (St. Alphonsus, VI, 59). I said of itself, because again grave sin can be had from another source, for example with respect to the subject, who can have a grave right that the truth not be hidden from him.

And these things which we have said concerning simulated administration of a sacrament, with the necessary adjustments, should also be applied to simulated reception.

Corollary I. It is neither simulation of a sacrament nor sin:

1. To place the matter and form for the sake of practice, because it is not signified that the sacrament is being confected, and therefore a lie is lacking; nor does the placing of the rite for the sake of practice inflict any injury upon the sacrament.
2. For the sake of avoiding infamy, to pronounce the customary words before one pretending to receive Communion, while not handing over the host but replacing it in the ciborium (St. Alphonsus, VI, 61). Nevertheless the case is little practical.
3. To enter the confessional and there speak to the confessor about some business. "For since matter and form are lacking there, I do not know how to understand where there is simulation of a sacrament" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 60). Nor is there a lie, unless someone "approached with the intention that bystanders believe that he is confessing" (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.); otherwise if he did it in order to hide from others the fact that he was not confessing.
4. In contracting Matrimony, to which someone is compelled, to simulate consent; since consent of this kind is invalid, so that the matter and form of the sacrament are lacking. Nor is there sin because consent is simulated, since, on account of the opposing impediment, the words of consent can be uttered with a restriction that is not purely mental, so that a lie also is lacking (St. Alphonsus, VI, 62).

Corollary II. It is simulation of a sacrament, or at least grave sin:

1. To pronounce without intention the words of absolution over one who is indisposed, or the words of consecration over bread, or in the celebration of Mass to omit the words of consecration; indeed, also from chapter *De homine*, 7, *de celebratione missarum*, the priest who in Mass did not consecrate would sin more gravely than one who consecrated and communicated sacrilegiously (St. Alphonsus, VI, 59, 61).
2. To hand over a non-consecrated host as consecrated; here indeed there is not simulation of a sacrament, but cooperation in idolatry, at least material idolatry (St. Thomas, III, q. 80, a. 6, ad 2; St. Alphonsus, VI, 61).

¹ Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 1179.

² Cf. Holy Office, 6 September 1625 (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 1489).

Chapter II. On the Other Requisites

In order that a sacrament be validly confected, besides intention these things are required:

19 I. The minister must place the external rite in a human manner, or by a human act. For it cannot be admitted that Christ instituted a sacrament in such a way that it can be confected by an act which is not human; as if someone wholly drunk or sleeping were to baptize. For the rest, in the case, at least practically, the required intention will also be lacking (St. Alphonsus, VI, 16).

20 II. The same minister must apply the matter and pronounce the form. If there is discussion of Baptism, this seems certain, both because otherwise the words of the form are not verified, and because the Sacred Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments¹ declared Baptism conferred in another way invalid, adding these words: Catholic doctrine holds most certainly that the matter must be placed by one and the same minister and at the same time the form of Baptism must be uttered; otherwise the form *I baptize you, I wash you* would labor under falsity (St. Thomas, III, q. 67, a. 6, ad 3). The same seems almost certain with regard to Confirmation, Extreme Unction, and Order, considering namely both the analogy with Baptism and the doctrine of theologians and the practice of the Church. There is added that otherwise the moral union in the sacrament does not seem to be sufficiently preserved. Except the sacrament of Penance, whose nature requires the contrary. With regard to the sacrament of the Eucharist, the question cannot be posed. For the rest, note:

1. Different ministers can validly minister a sacrament which consists of parts, if you grant that this occurs; concerning which consult the treatise on Extreme Unction, provided that the individual parts are placed whole by one and the same minister, that is, with their own matter and form. This is clear from what will be said in the treatise on Extreme Unction. Nevertheless, since that is gravely contrary to the rite, it is forbidden under grave obligation outside a case of necessity.
2. Even if a sacrament does not consist of parts, nevertheless several ministers can validly confect one and the same sacrament, provided that each places everything which is required for the sacrament. This is urged first, with regard to other sacraments, from the analogy with the sacrament of the Eucharist, which can certainly be confected by several at the same time. The reason is that the individual ministers do not confect the sacrament except in the person of Christ, and therefore in and with Christ they are one. Then, since the individuals, as we suppose,

possess the power of confecting the sacrament and exhibit all the requisites, it does not appear that anything is lacking to the conferral of the individuals (cf. St. Thomas, III, q. 67, a. 6; q. 82, a. 2, ad 2; St. Alphonsus, VI, 120, 232; can. 803). But this also is gravely illicit, except the consecration in the ordination of priests and the consecration of Bishops.

Even if several confect a sacrament, nevertheless it will be one sacrament, because Christ, who is the one principal minister, effects one thing through several (St. Thomas, III, q. 67, a. 6).

3. Finally, one and the same person can confer a sacrament on several at the same time, for example baptize or absolve several. Yet this too is illicit outside a case of necessity (St. Alphonsus, VI, 29).

¹ 17 November 1916 (A.A.S. 1916, p. 479); cf. Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 1, n. 10.

21 III. The minister must confer the sacrament on a subject distinct from himself. This is drawn both from the common doctrine of theologians and the constant practice of the Church, and from the form of several sacraments. There is added that Innocent III declared null the Baptism which a certain Jew had ministered to himself in danger of death, adding this reason: "Since there ought to be a distinction between the one baptizing and the one baptized, as is clearly gathered from the words of the Lord, saying to the Apostles: Go, baptize all nations in the name, etc." (St. Thomas, q. 66, a. 5, ad 4; q. 82, a. 4, ad 2).¹ Except the Most Holy Eucharist and Matrimony.

¹ Cf. Decretals, IV, III, 42.

22 IV. The minister must duly unite matter and form, because they must constitute one sign. A moral union suffices, or rather that union by which the words of the form, according to common estimation, affect the matter and so constitute one thing with it (St. Alphonsus, VI, 9). Now:

1. In Baptism, Confirmation, Order, and Extreme Unction it certainly suffices that matter and form coexist in some part of themselves, or that one be begun before the other is completed. Likewise, it seems to suffice that the form be pronounced immediately before or immediately after the application of the matter. The reason is that even on this supposition the words "I baptize you," etc., "I sign you," etc., still seem to signify the actual application of the matter. There is added that the Holy Office several times resolved that the sacrament of the priesthood was not to be repeated in the case in which the Bishop had had his extended hand over the ordinands immediately before the prayer *Oremus*;¹ likewise in the case in which the ordinand had touched the instruments after the form had been uttered.² These resolutions seem also to be applicable to Baptism, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction. Nevertheless, the reason for doubting with regard to these three sacraments, especially with regard to Baptism, is taken from the fact that the Holy Office on 2 May 1858 declared that Baptism is always to be repeated under condition whenever "after the washing has been wholly completed, the form is pronounced, or conversely, when the pronouncing of the form has been completed, one proceeds to the washing."³ For the rest, a very brief delay would render the sacrament doubtful, but the delay of one *Our Father* would render it null (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). For liceity it is required that matter and form perfectly coexist.⁴
2. In Penance, because it was instituted after the manner of a judgment, a greater interval can intervene.
3. In Matrimony there is always had union of matter and form when the consent of one is placed, the consent of the other not having been retracted; for it has and follows the nature of a contract

(St. Alphonsus, VI, 9).

4. In the Eucharist there is discussion rather of the presence of the matter than of its union with the form; here, however, it is required that the matter be physically present, because otherwise the words "this" and "here" are not verified (St. Alphonsus, VI, 9).

¹ 12 September 1877; 30 November 1898; 14 December 1898.

² 17 March 1897.

³ Note, however, that at the time the response was given, the value of Baptism conferred in this way was doubted more than today. Considering this together with the declarations afterwards issued concerning Order, it is permissible to doubt whether the Sacred Congregation, if again consulted, would give the same response.

⁴ Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 1, n. 8; title 5, chapter 1, n. 18.

23 V. The minister must use neither matter nor form substantially vitiated. Now:

1. A substantial change of matter is had when a thing is used which, according to common estimation, differs from the thing which the Church uses, as if in Baptism you should use wine instead of water. If, however, the matter is the same thing in reality, either wholly or as to the greater quantity, but is called by a different name and is used for a different use, it is rather doubtfully valid than certainly invalid, as if someone were to baptize with moisture flowing from a vine (St. Alphonsus, VI, 11).
2. A substantial change of form is had when the words, according to common estimation, have a meaning different from that which must be expressed according to the mind of Christ (St. Alphonsus, VI, 11, 221). If the change is made into words which can be taken in a twofold sense, namely a sacramental one and a foreign one, the change is substantial or accidental according as the minister intends the foreign or the sacramental sense; since even in the common intercourse of men an ambiguous sense must be determined by the speaker himself. Besides, it can happen that a change which, considering only the grammatical sense, is substantial, is in fact accidental or substantial according as it proceeds from inadvertence or ignorance, or from a heretical mind. Thus if someone in consecration, from inadvertence, were to say, "Here" in place of "This is My Body," the consecration would be valid; otherwise if he intended the word "here" in the sense of Luther, or adverbially (St. Alphonsus, VI, 110). For the rest, a change of form can occur:
 - a) By substitution of words, as if in Baptism it were said: I wash you, etc. But it is accidental or substantial according as the substituted words are synonymous or not synonymous.
 - b) By transposition, as if someone says: I baptize you, etc. This will generally be accidental.
 - c) By omission, as if in consecration the word *for* is omitted. It must be seen whether or not an essential word is omitted, namely one by which the due sense is taken away.
 - d) By corruption, as can happen because of stammering, haste, or inexperience, as if someone says: This is my *boby*. In the case the change is generally accidental.
 - e) By addition, as if in Baptism it is said: I baptize you in the name of the Father, who created you, etc. Further, a change of this kind is more easily substantial if what is false is added than if what is true is added; likewise if the change is made with a heretical mind than otherwise.
 - f) By interruption. Further:

a) Interruption of the words of the form is substantial or accidental according as it is or is not so great that the words before those hearing no longer effect the complete sense intended by Christ.

b) Interruption of the syllables of the same word, if it occurs by the interposition of several words or of one word, as if it were said: I bap- (be silent) -tize you, etc., renders the value doubtful. Otherwise if it occurs by a cough or a similar way and is very brief (St. Alphonsus, VI, 11, 221).

3. A substantial change, as one which renders the sacrament invalid, is a grave sin; an accidental change is gravely or lightly forbidden according as it greatly or lightly opposes the use and precept of the Church.

24 VI. The minister must utter the sacramental form by voice, that is, by the organs ordered to speaking. Therefore vocal pronunciation is required. Besides, at least practically, the pronunciation ought to be audible of itself, because it is doubtful whether pronunciation which of itself is not audible can be called vocal (St. Alphonsus, VI, 414).

Section II. On the Requisites for Licit Ministration

In order that the minister of a sacrament proceed licitly, first indeed he must minister validly; concerning this there has already been discussion. Then it is required that he minister legitimately, holily, according to the rite, to the worthy, and absolutely or under condition according to the circumstances.

25 I. Legitimately; namely, it is required that the minister have received from the Church a mission or some jurisdiction, in other words authorization, and that he not have contracted a penalty which deprives him of the use of order. Concerning the jurisdiction required there will be fuller discussion in the treatise on the individual sacraments.

26 II. Holily, that is, in the state of grace. Now:

1. The obligation of ministering the sacraments in the state of grace is clear from the reverence due to an action so holy. Nevertheless, a necessity excuses which is so urgent that not even an act of contrition can be elicited, for example if absolution must be granted immediately to one dying. For since the sacraments are for men, the harm of one's neighbor to be averted prevails over the reverence due of itself to the sacrament, and thus, when the higher law of charity urges, the irreverence is taken away.

Here, however, it is asked by some whether the minister also is excused who cannot elicit an act of contrition in time without danger of infamy or scandal. Further, theoretically this must be affirmed, because, granted the good will of the minister and his moral inability to repent in time, even the right of preserving reputation and, *a fortiori*, the obligation of avoiding scandal prevail over the reverence due of itself to the sacrament. But since practically sufficient time for eliciting an act of contrition is available, it can be said that the said excusing cause in fact scarcely exists (St. Alphonsus, VI, 33).

2. As regards the gravity of the obligation, receive the following:

a) The obligation of the state of grace is certainly grave if these three things occur, namely if: 1. the minister is consecrated; 2. he confects the sacrament; and 3. he does this by office, or as consecrated, or solemnly.¹ This is clear from the Roman Ritual, which declares: "Those ministering these things impurely and unworthily incur the guilt of eternal death";² and these words must at least be applied

to those of whom we are speaking. So also the Roman Catechism.³ The reason is that grave irreverence is had in this, that someone exercises an act so holy in a state so foul, whether as consecrated and furnished with sacramental grace, or as acting as minister and instrument of Christ and in His name, or with the said titles considered together (cf. St. Thomas, III, q. 64, a. 5, ad 3 and a. 6; St. Alphonsus, VI, 31, 32, 884).

b) It is disputed whether the following sin gravely: 1. a non-consecrated minister who confects a sacrament in mortal sin, namely a layman baptizing and those contracting Matrimony;⁴ 2. a consecrated minister who confects a sacrament, but not by office or not as consecrated, namely a deacon or priest baptizing in a case of necessity. Some affirm, because there is grave irreverence in this, that someone, whether he is consecrated or is not consecrated, whether he acts as consecrated or does not act as such, performs such sublime things in the name of and as an instrument of Christ. Others deny it, and judge that for grave irreverence it is required that someone act by office, and therefore confect the sacrament as public minister of Christ and of the Church. Thus St. Thomas teaches (loc. cit.), nor does St. Alphonsus seem to reject this for practice (VI, 32; *Homo Apostolicus*, tract 14, n. 6); all things considered, it can be held as practically safe. Likewise, a priest does not sin gravely who, while in mortal sin, only hears confession, yet in such a way that he resolves to elicit an act of contrition before absolution is to be given (St. Alphonsus, VI, 36).

c) It is further disputed whether a priest or deacon sins gravely who, while in mortal sin, does not confect, but only administers a sacrament. This question regards only the distribution of the Holy Eucharist. Further, St. Alphonsus, against many, affirms it, "because," he says, "a priest ministering the Eucharist in mortal sin inflicts grave injury on this sacrament, because, as a minister consecrated for dispensing it, he ministers it unworthily (cf. can. 845). And just as in the other sacraments the minister proximately concurs in the sanctification of those receiving through confection, so here he proximately concurs through dispensation, since the minister of the Eucharist cannot exhibit himself as minister otherwise than through dispensation" (VI, 35). There is added that Nicholas II compares a dispenser in the state of sin to a burning torch, which, while it illuminates others, consumes itself.⁵ Finally, the Roman Catechism favors this opinion.⁶

d) He does not sin gravely who, while in mortal sin, exercises other sacred functions, for example: 1. one who performs the functions of the Diaconate, Subdiaconate, or minor Orders; 2. one who performs consecrations, for example of Sacred Oil, and blessings; 3. one who touches or carries the Holy Eucharist or gives Benediction with the Most Holy Sacrament; 4. a priest who assists at Matrimony; 5. finally, one who preaches while in mortal sin does not sin gravely (St. Alphonsus, VI, 37-40).

Corollary. A minister who in mortal sin confects several sacraments in one continuous act commits as many sins as the sacraments he confects. The contrary must be said of him who by one moral action distributes the Holy Eucharist to several. Finally, he who celebrates while in mortal sin more probably commits four sins, namely he unworthily confects the sacrament, unworthily receives the sacrament, unworthily administers the sacrament to himself, and administers the sacrament to an unworthy person, again to himself (St. Alphonsus, VI, 35; vol. I, p. 201).

3. As regards the mode of recovering lost grace, one about to confect or administer a sacrament while constituted in mortal sin can recover grace either by an act of perfect contrition or by confession. If, however, there is question of confecting the Holy Eucharist, Confession is required

of itself; this is clear from canon 807, to be explained later. Besides, the confectio of this sacrament has its reception annexed to it. Further, he who has sinned mortally cannot receive the Holy Eucharist unless he has first received the sacrament of Penance (n. 179). With regard to the confectio of the other sacraments, it is indeed fitting to confess,⁷ but there is no obligation.

¹ The word *solemnly*, which in the case is commonly used, does not regard external rites, but signifies the same as *by office*.

² Title I, single chapter, n. 4.

³ Part 2, chapter 1, q. 17.

⁴ Nevertheless, they sin gravely insofar as they receive Matrimony in mortal sin.

⁵ Chapter 5, cause 15, question 8.

⁶ Part 2, chapter 1, question 17.

⁷ Roman Ritual, title I, n. 4.

27 III. According to the rite, that is, according to the rites prescribed by the Church. Rites, however, are customarily distinguished as essential and accidental, according as they belong to the essence of the sacraments or do not belong to it. Concerning the essential rite, that is, concerning the use of matter and form, there has already been discussion, so that it remains to speak only of the accidental rite. Concerning this, let these things be observed:

1. That there is an obligation of observing the rites is of faith from these words of the Council of Trent: "If anyone shall say that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, customarily used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, can either be contemned, or omitted by the ministers at their pleasure without sin, or changed into other new rites by any pastor of churches whatsoever, let him be anathema."¹ The obligation is likewise drawn from the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedi* of Paul V,² placed at the head of the Roman Ritual; likewise from canon 733, § 1, which establishes: "In confecting, administering, and receiving the sacraments, the rites and ceremonies which are prescribed in the ritual books approved by the Church are to be accurately observed." Yet this does not prevent certain rites from being called directive rather than preceptive; this is drawn both from the words of the Ritual and from the thing itself, as will be noted in its place.
2. The obligation of observing the rites is grave by its genus, so that he sins gravely who neglects the law in grave matter; this is drawn both from the importance of the matter being treated and from the penalties to be inflicted on incorrigible transgressors (cf. can. 2378).
3. Each person is bound to follow his own rite (can. 733, § 2). Now the rite to be observed in the Latin Church is contained in the Missal and Roman Ritual, the Roman Pontifical, the Ceremonial of Bishops, and the *Memoriale Rituum*.³

Note 1. The sacred oils which serve for administering certain sacraments must have been blessed by the Bishop on the most recent Thursday in the Lord's Supper; and old oils are not to be used unless necessity urges. When the blessed oil is nearly lacking, other unblessed olive oil is to be added, even repeatedly, but in a smaller quantity (can. 734). The pastor must request the sacred oils from his Ordinary and diligently preserve them in the church in safe and decent custody under key; nor is he

to retain them at home, unless because of necessity or another reasonable cause, with the permission of the Ordinary (can. 735).

Note 2. The reverence due to the sacraments also requires that they be conferred with the decency which the nature of the sacrament demands; to this also belongs due attention. Nevertheless, voluntary distraction is only venial, unless there is added danger of a substantial or at least notable defect. Yet voluntary distraction of a priest during consecration and communion is held by many as grave irreverence, namely because of the eminent dignity of the Sacrifice (cf. St. Alphonsus, VI, 14, 224, 410, dub. 5).

¹ Session 7, On the Sacraments in general, canon 13.

² 17 June 1614.

³ The *Memoriale Rituum* is a small book of rites given for the City by Benedict XIII (1723) and promulgated for the whole world by Pius VII (1827).

28 IV. To the worthy. The sacraments can be ministered only to the worthy, at least of themselves. But it suffices that worthiness be established as will be explained below. I said:

1. **They can be ministered only to the worthy.** He who ministers them to an unworthy person commits: 1. the sin of sacrilege, on account of the irreverent treatment of a sacred thing, that is, of a sacrament; 2. the sin of scandal, on account of cooperation in the sin of one's neighbor (St. Alphonsus, VI, 43).

2. **At least of themselves;** because, as if accidentally, the sacraments can be ministered to an unworthy person if there is present a cause by which both the irreverence which is contained of itself in ministration to the unworthy is removed, and cooperation in the sin of one's neighbor is made honorable. Causes of this kind are: violation of the sacramental seal, infamy, scandal, and other inconveniences to be avoided. From these things follow:

a) A sacrament must be ministered to an unworthy person if his unworthiness is known only by sacramental knowledge. For the rest, the following rules hold:

b) The sacraments are to be denied to a public sinner whether he asks secretly or publicly. The reason is that neither scandal nor infamy to be avoided makes the ministration honorable¹ (can. 855, § 1; St. Thomas, III, q. 80, a. 6; St. Alphonsus, VI, 44). A public sinner, however, is one whose crime is notorious either by fact, by law, or by reputation; he is occult as long as there is hope that the crime can be hidden.

c) The sacraments are to be denied to an occult sinner if he asks for them secretly, that is, before the priest alone, or before a few others who do not understand what is being done and will not spread the matter; they are not to be denied if he asks for them publicly. It is said:

a) They are to be denied if he asks for them secretly (can. 855, § 2; Roman Ritual):² the reason is that from denial there does not follow the inconvenience mentioned above (St. Thomas, loc. cit.; St. Alphonsus, VI, 44). Except if the priest knew the state of the sinner from confession alone; for he cannot use knowledge from confession with the burden of the penitent (St. Alphonsus, VI, 51, 658).

b) They are not to be denied if he asks for them publicly (can. 855, § 2; Roman Ritual).³ The reason is that from the fact that a minister could publicly deny the sacraments from private knowledge, the

greatest inconveniences would follow: namely, not only the loss of the reputation⁴ of the one asking, but especially disputes, disturbances, scandals, and the danger that many would abstain from the sacraments, namely from fear lest they be kept away by an imprudent or malicious minister (St. Thomas, loc. cit.; St. Alphonsus, VI, 49). Except, however, the sacrament of Order, from which even one occultly unworthy must be kept away (Council of Trent;⁵ can. 970). "The reason is certain, because he who thrusts himself into public offices for which he is not suitable must be repelled, even with infamy, on account of the public good to be preferred to the private good" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 52; cf. St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 36, a. 4). Besides, "it must be noted that in that case the Bishop is not bound to manifest the cause why he repels him from ordination; according to the declarations of the Sacred Congregation of the Council issued on 21 March 1643 and on 21 April 1668, which the Supreme Pontiff Benedict XIV brings forward at length"⁶ (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

If the crime is public in another place, but occult in the place where the sacrament is asked, the sacrament should not be denied unless knowledge of the crime will easily reach there (St. Alphonsus, VI, 46; cf. can. 855, § 2).

d) It is forbidden to minister the sacraments of the Church to heretics, even those erring in good faith and asking for them, unless first, having rejected their errors, they have been reconciled to the Church (can. 731, § 2). It is forbidden both because the sacraments generally cannot be ministered to heretics and schismatics without scandal,⁷ and because ministration of the sacraments to non-Catholics fosters indifferentism.

Insofar as these things are also to be applied to the dying, see in the treatise on Penance and on Extreme Unction.

3. It suffices that worthiness be established as follows:

a) With regard to Baptism of adults, Penance, Order, and Matrimony, the worthiness of the recipient must be established more or less positively, and therefore inquiry must be made into it, as will be explained more fully in the treatise on the said sacraments. Meanwhile consult, with regard to Baptism, canon 752, § 1; with regard to Penance, canons 886 and 888; with regard to Order, canon 973, § 3; with regard to Matrimony, canons 1020, 1021, § 1, and 1033.

b) With regard to the other sacraments, worthiness must be presumed, while unworthiness must be proven in some measure, so that in doubt the sacraments ought rather to be granted. The reason is that all the faithful have a right to these other sacraments, and ministers are not judges but dispensers; whence in these cases they do not have the right of inquiring, but only the duty of dispensing to all who ask, provided that they are not positively unworthy (St. Alphonsus, VI, 43). If, however, unworthiness has been established, amendment must be proven, and sometimes, besides, the satisfaction performed must be established. Concerning this the Roman Ritual has these words: "All the faithful are to be admitted to sacred Communion, except those who are prohibited for a just reason. But the publicly unworthy are to be kept away, such as the excommunicated, the interdicted, and the manifestly infamous: as prostitutes, concubinarians, usurers,⁸ magicians,⁹ sorcerers, blasphemers,¹⁰ and other public sinners of that kind, unless their penitence and amendment are established, and they have first satisfied for public scandal."¹¹ Canon 855, § 1, inculcates the same for the same reason. With these things considered, the following can be drawn:

¹ Roman Ritual, title IV, chapter 2, n. 3.

² Title IV, chapter 1, n. 9.

³ Title IV, chapter 1, n. 9.

⁴ This reason is not adequate, because the reverence to be shown of itself to the sacrament prevails over the private good of the reputation of the sinner, who, as is supposed, is not of good will; but it does not prevail over the common good.

⁵ Session 14, on reform, chapter 1; Session 23, chapters 5 and 7.

⁶ *De Synodo*, book 12, chapter 8, n. 2.

⁷ Holy Office, 20 July 1898 (*Collectanea*, n. 2012).

⁸ That is, those judicially convicted as such.

⁹ That is, those who publicly practice true and certain magic.

¹⁰ That is, those who from a spirit of impiety are accustomed by mouth or writing to utter injurious things against God, against the Saints, or against the Church.

¹¹ Title IV, chapter 1, n. 8.

29 Corollary I. If unworthiness arises from sin alone, generally it suffices that the sinner has confessed publicly; indeed, the very approach to the Holy Eucharist seems generally to suffice that he be judged amended. If, however, a public sinner of this kind, notwithstanding confessions and communions, does not cease falling back into the same habit, and the relapse is notorious, then the ministration of the sacraments should be deferred for some time, so that amendment may be sufficiently proven, unless now particular signs of amendment appear, as can occur especially on the occasion of a Mission.

Corollary II. If someone has publicly lived in a proximate occasion; likewise, if some resignation of office, or retraction, or satisfaction must be imposed, for example if someone has performed a wicked office, or has publicly enrolled in a wicked society, or has spread pernicious errors, or has publicly and unjustly stripped another of reputation, generally the occasion must be abandoned or the other obligation fulfilled before the sinner is publicly¹ admitted to the sacraments.

Corollary III. If someone has been publicly excommunicated, or has notoriously adhered to a heretical sect, before he communicates he must be reconciled with the Church in the external forum and absolved from the censure.

Corollary IV. If the crime is doubtful, the sacrament should not be denied, unless nevertheless someone is so suspected that by charity he is bound to remove the suspicion. If the crime is certain, but penitence doubtful, the sacrament should be denied, because penitence is not established; which the Roman Ritual cited above and canon 855 require (cf. St. Alphonsus, VI, 48).

Corollary V. If a doubt remains whether the sacraments must be denied to someone, the Ordinary should be consulted; or, if there is not time, after the sacrament has been granted, recourse should be had to him for the future.

For the rest, if the sacraments are to be denied, one should proceed most prudently. As far as can be done, the sinner should be warned in time, so that the request itself may be forestalled. If the matter does not succeed, the denial should be made without disturbance. The ordinary circumstances are especially regarded by the things said above; concerning the things to be observed in urgent danger of death there will be discussion in its own place.

Finally, here it is customary to ask whether the minister can administer a sacrament to an unworthy person in order to avoid harm threatening himself, for example death. Some affirm, provided that the one asking can here and now validly receive the sacrament and does not ask for it in contempt of God or of religion. They affirm this because there is had only material cooperation, which is licit for a cause of this kind. But with St. Alphonsus (VI, 49) it seems it must be denied; since the conferral of a sacrament on an unworthy person, and this in the supposed circumstances, carries with it so great an injury to the sacrament that it does not seem it can be admitted for averting private harm from the minister, but only for preventing inconveniences that would follow for the community from the denial (St. Alphonsus, VI, 49). As we already noted above, the adequate reason why it is permitted to confer a sacrament on an occult sinner is not the avoidance of infamy for a contumacious sinner, but the inconveniences which would arise for the community from the denial (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

¹ Of themselves, the sacraments can be ministered at least secretly to all who are truly penitent, but according to the Sacred Penitentiary (1856) it is not fitting "to admit to secret participation in the sacraments those who have not made retraction, on account of the scandal of the weak, who can believe that the penitent has persevered in obstinate pertinacity."

30 V. Absolutely or conditionally, according to the circumstances. The sacraments are to be conferred absolutely if there is no serious doubt about validity; otherwise under condition. Yet he who, being certain of validity, places a condition, seems of himself to sin only lightly, because grave irreverence is not evident.

Scholion I. On the Ministration of a Doubtfully Valid Sacrament

31 I. The morality of doubtfully valid ministration. 1. Of itself it is illicit to minister a sacrament with doubt about its validity; in other words, moral certainty about the validity of the sacrament is required of itself. The reason is that of itself it is injurious to Christ, the Author of the sacraments, to place the external rite instituted by Him, wholly or at least partially, and indeed in order to constitute a sacrament, with grave danger of not truly constituting the sacrament. There is added proposition 1 condemned by Innocent XI: "It is not illicit in conferring the sacraments to follow a probable opinion about the validity of the sacrament, the safer one being left aside, unless law, agreement, or danger of incurring grave harm forbids it. Hence one must not use only a probable opinion in the conferral of Baptism, priestly Order, or episcopal Order."¹ Therefore of itself it is illicit: 1. to use doubtful matter or form; 2. to minister a sacrament in doubt whether another requisite for validity is present, for example the presence of the penitent due in the sacrament of Penance. Consequently, of itself it is also not licit to minister a sacrament under a condition which, according to what was said in n. 32, renders the validity of the sacrament doubtful (St. Alphonsus, VI, 28, 46).

Note. The moral certainty about validity which is required must be taken more strictly or more broadly according to the diversity of the sacraments; more broadly, for example, for the sacrament of Penance, as will be explained in its place.

2. Accidentally, a sacrament can sometimes, or even must, be conferred with doubt about its validity, namely if on the one hand it cannot certainly be conferred validly, and on the other hand there is a grave reason for conferring it. For since the sacraments are for men, the salvation of men to be procured prevails over the obligation of taking care lest the sacrament be exposed to

the danger of nullity. A sufficient reason is present the more easily in proportion as the sacrament is more necessary (St. Alphonsus, VI, 28, 29).

Corollary I. A doubtfully valid sacrament can be conferred if the validity is at least probable and, from the sacrament not being conferred, grave spiritual harm threatens someone. Hence, for example, one doubtfully disposed can be absolved if there is fear lest otherwise he be alienated from the sacraments. But scarcely ever is it licit to consecrate doubtful matter (St. Alphonsus, VI, 28, 29, 432).

Corollary II. In danger of death, even with slight probability about validity, the necessary sacraments must be conferred, namely Baptism and Penance; likewise Extreme Unction, at least if Penance certainly cannot be conferred validly (St. Alphonsus, VI, 103).

¹ Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 1151.

32 II. The mode of doubtfully valid ministration. If a sacrament is ministered with doubt about validity, it must be conferred under condition; namely, the reverence due to the sacrament requires that the minister, in a doubt of this kind, protest that he does not will to confer the sacrament if the necessary condition is lacking.¹ Besides, observe:

1. Let the condition be placed on which validity depends, not that on which only the fruit depends. The reason is that a sacrament conferred under a condition on which only the fruit depends, for example, if you are disposed to receive grace, cannot revive; for if the condition is verified, the sacrament is immediately received validly and fruitfully; if it is not verified, it is not even validly received, and therefore cannot revive (n. 11). On the contrary, a sacrament conferred under a condition on which validity depends, for example, if you are capable of receiving the sacrament, is validly conferred if the condition is verified; and if perhaps it is now received without fruit, afterwards, when the due disposition is added, it can revive.
2. It is not required that the condition be expressed by mouth, but it suffices that it be expressed mentally, except in the cases in which, according to the Roman Ritual,² it must be expressed by mouth, namely: 1. in doubt whether the one to be baptized has already been baptized, or whether that which has been born is a human being; 2. in doubt whether the one to be anointed is still living (St. Alphonsus, VI, 29). The reason is that a condition placed mentally suffices for the sacrament truly to be conferred conditionally, in other words, for the intention to be restricted to the case of valid confectio. This is confirmed by these words of the Roman Missal: "If he doubts very probably that he has omitted something essentially in the consecration, let him repeat the form at least under a tacit condition."³ Indeed, it is enough to place the condition, whether by mouth or only mentally, implicitly; for example by ministering the sacrament according to the institution of Christ or the intention of the Church.

¹ If doubt about validity is removed by the Church supplying the defect, if it exists, the sacrament must be conferred absolutely. If someone places the condition: if you are disposed, it can seem doubtful whether there is intended a disposition required for the fruit alone or, at least confusedly or predominately, for validity. Hence it is safer not to express the condition in this way.

² Title 2, chapter 1, nn. 9, 22; title 5, chapter 1, n. 14.

³ *De defectibus*, title 5, n. 2.

Scholion II. On the Repetition of a Sacrament Doubtfully or Doubtfully Validly Conferred

33 We speak of the repetition of a sacrament which is done under this condition, or an equivalent one: If the former sacrament was not conferred, or was not validly conferred; and which therefore effects nothing if the former sacrament was validly conferred. Now:

I. It is illicit to repeat a sacrament under condition if the doubt about the ministration or its valid ministration lacks reasonable foundation. In the case, repetition is gravely illicit, because it is grave irreverence to repeat the sacramental rite without reason. Nevertheless, the scrupulous are excused from sin, at least grave sin; yet they must be seriously admonished to abstain from repeating the form. Likewise, it is venial uselessly to repeat the same word, by which manner of acting Christ is introduced as speaking ridiculously. Stammerers, however, are excused, provided that, as far as can be done, they try to pronounce the words rightly the first time.

II. It is licit to repeat the sacraments under condition if both a prudent doubt about ministration, or about valid ministration, exists, and the usefulness of one's neighbor recommends reception of the sacrament.

III. A sacrament must be repeated under condition if there is prudent doubt about the ministration or its validity, and reception of the sacrament is necessary by necessity of means or of precept; even more if the common good requires that the sacrament be certainly conferred validly. Moreover, the more necessary the sacrament is, the more easily a sufficient doubt is present.

Corollary I. The sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Order are to be repeated under condition if a prudent doubt exists whether they were really conferred or whether they were validly conferred (can. 732, § 1). If it is prudently doubted whether absolution was imparted or rightly pronounced, and the penitent is still sufficiently present, absolution must be repeated if there is question of a penitent constituted in mortal sin; otherwise it can at least be repeated.

Corollary II. Baptism, Order, absolution of one dying, and Extreme Unction conferred on one deprived of the senses must be repeated, even if the reason for doubting the validity of the former sacrament is slight.

Corollary III. It can happen that doubt about the ministration or the valid ministration of a sacrament, even a necessary one, is so slight that it can indeed be repeated, but need not be repeated. Thus, for example, to quiet anxiety Order could be repeated if the words of the form had been uttered immediately after the matter was placed.

Corollary IV. Finally, it can happen that a sacrament can and must be repeated several times under condition, for example that an infant must first be baptized while still existing in the womb; then, when some member has emerged, be rebaptized under condition; finally, once brought into the light, be rebaptized again under condition (n. 93; cf. can. 746, § 3).

Section III. On the Obligation of Ministering

34 I. Bishops and pastors are bound in this way:

1. They must, by justice, minister the sacraments to their subjects; and indeed not only in true necessity, but as often as they reasonably ask for this. They are bound by justice because, in accepting their office, they entered into a tacit contract. There is added the reason of salary or

honorable support accruing to them by reason of their office (St. Alphonsus, VI, 58; cf. vol. I, n. 572; canons 464, § 1; 467, § 1; 785; 892, § 1; 939).

2. The aforesaid obligation is grave by its genus, namely so that they would sin gravely: 1. if they did not aid a subject constituted in grave or extreme necessity; 2. if by custom they showed themselves difficult or slow, for example if they heard confessions only on a few days in the month, or assigned notably inconvenient times for the distribution of the Holy Eucharist.

3. If the necessity is grave or extreme, grave inconvenience does not excuse, indeed not even danger on the way (cf. vol. I, n. 572). Nevertheless, concerning the obligation of ministering the sacraments with danger to life, let these things be noted:

a) The obligation regards only the sacraments necessary for salvation according to the circumstances, namely Baptism, Penance, and, if the sick person were deprived of the senses before he could have been absolved, Extreme Unction.

b) In order that the said obligation exist, it is required: 1. that there be no other who will certainly minister the sacraments; 2. that there be hope of fruit; 3. that from the sacrament ministered with danger to life there not threaten a greater harm, for example a common harm or the harm of many for whom the minister is necessary.

Corollary I. Pastors can provide many things through others, unless nevertheless they are requested by name. Bishops, however, can, at least today, fulfill ordinary offices entirely through others.

Corollary II. Benedict XIV concludes from rescripts of the Sacred Congregation of the Council that a pastor cannot withdraw in time of plague, even if he leaves behind a suitable vicar; nevertheless he can reserve to himself the care of the healthy if the vicar is ready to provide for the sick, lest the healthy, from fear of infection, flee both of them.¹ The same Sacred Congregation declared that this prohibition has much more force for Bishops.² Moreover, the things said about time of plague are certainly to be applied generally to a time of common danger, such as war or any contagious disease. Finally, pastors and bishops in a time of common danger cannot resign unless someone else can be substituted into their office.

¹ *De Synodo dioeclesiana*, book 13, chapter 19, n. 2.

² 18 December 1576.

35 II. Assistants who by reason of office supply the place of the pastor are held by almost the same obligation as pastors (cf. can. 476, § 6).

36 III. Other priests are obliged by charity alone (cf. can. 892, § 2; 939). They are bound under grave obligation if their neighbor is in extreme or grave necessity. If there is question of grave necessity, grave inconvenience excuses. If there is discussion of extreme necessity, or of grave common necessity, not even danger of life excuses. But concerning the obligation of ministering the sacraments with danger to life, let the things noted above concerning it be noted (St. Alphonsus, VI, 624; II, 27; *Homo Apostolicus*, tract 4, n. 14; tract 16, n. 125).

Corollary. If the people, because of a scarcity of ministers, are in grave necessity, a simple priest cannot abstain from hearing confessions and administering the Holy Eucharist; and if he is not suitable for hearing confessions, he is bound, if he can, to render himself suitable (St. Alphonsus, VI, 625).

37 **IV. Superiors of religious, toward their subjects, are held by an equally grave obligation as pastors** (cf. can. 514, § 1); nevertheless practically they are not held by justice, because there is no established tacit contract, nor is a salary assigned. There is added an obligation of religion, because superiors seem to be obliged from this motive.

Dissertation III. On the Reception of the Sacraments

We must speak first of the person receiving, then of the mode of receiving a sacrament.

Part I. On the Person Receiving

38 I. Only man as a wayfarer is capable of receiving the sacraments. Therefore angels and the dead are excluded. Nevertheless not every wayfaring man is capable of receiving all the sacraments; namely:

1. Every man not yet baptized is capable of Baptism (can. 745, § 1).
2. Every baptized person is capable of Confirmation and the Eucharist (canons 786, 853).
3. Every baptized male is capable of Order (can. 968).
4. Every baptized person who has fallen after Baptism is capable of Penance (can. 902).
5. Every baptized person able to enter into a contract is capable of Matrimony (cf. can. 1035).
6. Every baptized person who, after having attained the use of reason, is in danger of death because of illness or old age is capable of Extreme Unction (can. 940, § 1).

Part II. On the Mode of Receiving a Sacrament

In order that the sacraments produce the twofold effect concerning which there was discussion (n. 5), namely character and grace, they must be received validly and licitly. I said "in order that they produce the twofold effect," since valid reception suffices for producing character alone. In order, moreover, that grace be received, valid and licit reception is required.

Section I. On the Requisites for Valid Reception

39 For validly receiving a sacrament neither faith nor uprightness is required, as is clear from the sense and practice of the Church, which has always held as valid a sacrament received according to the rite of the Church in heresy. Penance is excepted, for which the good acts of the penitent are required, as will be explained in its own place.

Baptism, however, is required for the other sacraments. This is established, namely, from tradition, that the other sacraments were instituted only for those who through Baptism have been made members of the Church (St. Alphonsus, VI, 79).

Finally, for the valid reception of all the sacraments there is required, at least in adults, intention, that is, the will of receiving the sacrament; concerning which intention we must speak more fully (St. Alphonsus, VI, 80, 139).

40 **I. Necessity of intention.** 1. In little children and in the perpetually insane, that is, in those who have never enjoyed the use of reason, no intention is required, but the will of the Church supplies. This is of faith with regard to Baptism,¹ certain with regard to Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist, namely from the most ancient practice of the Church; likewise with regard to Order from the Constitution *Eo quamvis tempore* of Benedict XIV² (St. Thomas, III, q. 68, a. 9; a. 12, ad 1; St. Alphonsus, VI, 80, 139). Further, little children and the perpetually insane are capable of the sacraments which we have indicated, but incapable of the others (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

2. In adults intention is required, as follows:

a) He who both internally resists the reception of the sacrament and is forced to the external rite, by the consent of all, does not receive the sacrament.

b) He who internally resists the reception of the sacrament, but voluntarily admits the external rite, does not receive the sacraments which do not imprint character. Thus authors commonly teach, relying on this reason: that it is not fitting that the gifts of God be conferred on one who positively does not will to receive them. There is some dispute about those sacraments which confer character, that is, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order. Those few who judge that the latter sacraments are received in the case rely especially on the fact that Innocent III³ declares that it is not absurd to teach that he who fictitiously approaches Baptism, that is, externally consenting but dissenting in heart, receives the impressed character of Christianity. Nevertheless, the more common opinion teaches that even the sacraments which imprint character are not received by one who internally dissents, although he externally consents. The reason alleged is that it seems especially unfitting that sacraments which carry special burdens with them should be received by a subject who does not will to receive them. For the rest, the words of Innocent III, considering their tenor, are of a kind to move anyone little.

c) He who neither consents nor dissents, but holds himself merely passively, much more probably does not receive the sacraments any more than one who positively resists reception; because it is not fitting that the gifts of God be conferred on one who does not positively will to receive them (St. Thomas, III, q. 68, a. 7; St. Alphonsus, VI, 81).

St. Thomas says thus in the cited place: "I answer that through Baptism someone dies to the old life of sin and begins a certain newness of life ... And therefore, just as in order that a man die to the old life there is required, according to Augustine, in one having the use of free will, the will by which he repents of the old life; so there is required the will by which he intends newness of life, whose beginning is the very reception of the sacrament; and therefore on the part of the one baptized there is required the will or intention of receiving the sacrament." And again: "If in an adult the intention of receiving the sacrament were lacking, he would have to be rebaptized; if however this were not established, it would have to be said: If you are not baptized, I baptize you."

With this doctrine of St. Thomas there cannot be reconciled the opinion of those who teach that the will which is required in the recipient is rather that of one not placing an obstacle than of one positively consenting.⁴

Corollary I. He validly receives a sacrament who, from fear, consents to reception; for fear does not take away freedom. Except Matrimony, which is invalid if consent has been extorted by grave fear, as will be explained in its own place.

Corollary II. The question treated concerning the intention of one receiving a sacrament does not regard the Holy Eucharist; concerning this, namely, it is not asked whether it is valid without the intention of the recipient, but whether without the said intention it is received sacramentally, or only materially, so that it does not produce fruit.⁵

¹ Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 13 on Baptism.

² 4 May 1745, article 1.

³ Chapter 3, *De Baptismo* (III, 42).

⁴ Cf. also, with regard to Baptism, canons 745, § 2, and 752; Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 3, n. 1; with regard to Penance, Roman Ritual, title 3, chapter 1, n. 24; with regard to Extreme Unction, canon 943; Roman Ritual, title 5, chapter 1, n. 6.

⁵ Cf. the treatise on the Holy Eucharist.

41 II. Nature of the required intention. 1. In itself actual intention is not required, nor virtual intention, but even habitual intention suffices; interpretative intention does not suffice. I said:

a) Habitual intention suffices, in other words, it suffices that someone positively had it and has not retracted it.¹ The reason is that intention is required in the recipient only so that he may not be said to be sanctified against his will. But this cannot be said of one who enjoys habitual intention. Others except Penance and Matrimony. But as regards Penance, habitual intention suffices insofar as there is question of receiving absolution. It is another question, however, whether the acts of the penitent must be placed from an at least virtual intention, that is, by force of the intention of receiving the sacrament, in other words, whether they must be referred by the penitent, actually or virtually, to absolution.² With regard to Matrimony, which the recipients themselves minister, actual or virtual

intention is necessary to this extent: that it is required that consent begin to exist from an actual or virtual intention of contracting Matrimony (St. Alphonsus, VI, 81, 82, 139).

b) Interpretative intention does not suffice, because intention of this kind, at least as it is understood by us (n. 15), in reality has not existed.³

Objection. The Roman Ritual⁴ and canon 943 establish that Extreme Unction is to be conferred absolutely on the sick who, when they were in possession of their mind, at least implicitly asked for it or probably would have asked for it. Therefore with regard to Extreme Unction interpretative intention suffices, or rather a mind inclined toward the said sacrament, which interpretative intention indicates.

Response. I deny the consequence. And indeed the Roman Ritual and canon 943 do not speak of sick persons, faithful, who would probably have willed Extreme Unction, but who would probably have asked for it. But a faithful person who, while master of himself, would probably ask for Extreme Unction also, with sufficient certainty, willed the said sacrament more or less explicitly, just as the request which probably would have place indicates with sufficient certainty a mind inclined toward the sacrament.

2. With regard to the object, the intention of receiving such a sacrament is required, or of receiving what the Church intends through such a rite. But an intention more or less explicit of receiving such a sacrament suffices. A merely implicit intention, as for example the will of using the means of salvation, does not suffice if there is an explicit contrary intention; if no such contrary intention is had, the matter seems doubtful. With these things noted in general, receive the following in particular:

a) With regard to Baptism, the will of embracing the Christian religion suffices for receiving it, at least in danger of death. It is disputed whether the same can be said of the will of using the means of salvation, likewise of attrition or contrition. Many hold this as probable, because there is an implicit intention. But we judge that one must speak thus:

a) It seems it must be denied if there is question of those who reject Baptism at least more or less explicitly; of this kind are Jews, Mohammedans, and many Protestants today. But it seems it must be denied because, besides the fact that it is not proven that implicit intention suffices, explicit rejection seems to prevail over implicit admission.⁵ There is added that the Holy Office on 30 March 1898 declared: "Concerning dying Mohammedans deprived of the senses, one must respond as in the decree of the Holy Office of 18 September 1850 to the Bishop of Perth, that is: If previously they had given signs of wishing to be baptized, or in their present state either by nod or in another way have shown the same disposition, they can be baptized under condition, insofar nevertheless as the Missionary, having inspected all the circumstances of things, has so prudently judged"; which at least proves that it is illicit to confer Baptism on those who reject it, and suggests that such conferral is invalid, because, if validity were posited, at least in extremis it does not seem it should be excluded. There are added canons 752, § 3, and 754, § 3, compared with the Holy Office of 30 March 1898, which seem to require a more or less explicit will. There is added finally that a practice conforming to the contrary doctrine never seems to have existed in the Church (St. Alphonsus, VI, 82; cf. VI, 483). Practically, the contrary opinion can be called licit, but not obligatory.

b) If there is discussion of those who do not explicitly reject Baptism, the probability of the opinion which teaches that the general will of admitting the means of salvation suffices, likewise attrition and contrition, the probability of that opinion, I say, seems rather slight: both because, as we said, canons 752, § 3, and 754, § 3, compared with the Holy Office of 30 March 1898, seem to require that the one to be baptized have signified an intention more or less explicit of receiving Baptism; and because the practice of baptizing those who enjoy only an implicit intention seems truly new in the Church. Practically, however, the contrary opinion seems licit, and, according to circumstances, obligatory.

b) With regard to Extreme Unction, likewise for receiving Viaticum sacramentally, the will of dying Christianly suffices; the same will in danger of death suffices for Confirmation; likewise for receiving sacramental absolution, at least considered by itself alone.

The will of dying Christianly, likewise the will of using the means of salvation, or contrition or attrition, according to the things explained above, do not seem to suffice in those who reject the mentioned sacraments more or less explicitly. With regard to non-Catholics who do not explicitly reject the said sacraments, it is not so proven that the will of dying Christianly, etc., does not suffice for valid reception.

c) With regard to Matrimony and Order, explicit intention is required; since, at least practically, there will not be had an implicit intention which includes the will of entering Matrimony or of receiving Order. There is added that the said sacraments carry special burdens with them, so that for that reason also a general will does not sufficiently contain the will of receiving them (St. Alphonsus, VI, 82).

Question. Whether the conceived intention of receiving a sacrament effects that it is validly received, even if it is ministered to one not master of himself, for example sleeping, drunk, or fallen into insanity.

Response. A few deny it;⁶ but it seems it must entirely be affirmed, both because Innocent III teaches thus with regard to Baptism,⁷ likewise Benedict XIV;⁸ and because intention is not judged restricted unless a restriction is expressly placed, or is drawn from a contrary will once had (St. Thomas, In IV, dist. 6, q. 1, a. 2, sol. 3, ad 2; St. Alphonsus, VI, 81).

¹ Innocent III, chapter *Maiores*, § *Item quaeritur, de baptismo*; Instruction of Benedict XIV, *Postremo mense*, n. 46.

² Cf. the treatise on Penance.

³ St. Alphonsus (VI, 82) and others teach that interpretative intention suffices; but they understand that intention which others call implicit habitual intention. The holy Doctor indeed calls it interpretative intention which was never had; but he intends the one which was never had explicitly, as follows from the context, namely both from the fact that he also calls interpretative intention general, that is, such by which someone implicitly wills the sacrament, and from the fact that he opposes interpretative intention to explicit intention.

⁴ Title V, chapter 1, n. 6.

⁵ It seems to others that in the will of using the means of salvation there is not included the implicit will of receiving the sacrament, but rather a merely conditioned will; in other words, he would will to receive it if he recognized it as a means of salvation; but this condition not being fulfilled, he in no way wills it (cf. Ter Haar, *De occasionariis et recidivis*, n. 503).

⁶ Roncaglia, *De Sacramentis in genere*, chapter 5, question 2, response 2; Billuart, *De Sacramentis in communi*, dissertation VI, article I; Lehmkühl (II, 65 note) doubts.

⁷ Book 3 of the Decretals, title 42, chapter 3, *Maiores*.

⁸ Instruction *Postremo mense*, n. 46.

Section II. On the Requisites for Licit Reception

42 In little children and the perpetually insane no disposition is required. In adults these things are required:

43 **I. They must have the disposition by which they become proximately capable of the effect to which the sacrament is of itself ordered.** Hence:

1. For the sacraments of the dead, that is, for Baptism and Penance, besides acts, at least implicit, of faith and hope, at least attrition is required.¹ That attrition suffices is clear from the fact that those sacraments are of themselves ordered to remitting mortal sins, and therefore cannot demand a disposition which already of itself remits mortal sins (St. Alphonsus, VI, 440). He who receives the sacrament of Penance without attrition sins gravely, because the sacrament is rendered invalid. Likewise, he sins gravely who, guilty of personal mortal sin, receives Baptism without attrition; for he inflicts grave injury on the sacrament who receives it in such a way that it is frustrated of its grave end, that is, the remission of mortal sins. If one guilty only of personal venial sin receives Baptism without attrition, he indeed effects that Baptism does not remit the venial sin; but only venial sin is committed.

2. For the sacraments of the living, the state of grace is required.

a) The existence of the obligation is clear from the fact that those sacraments are ordered to increasing grace; hence grace must already be present. Nevertheless, as was said concerning the minister, a necessity excuses which is so urgent that not even an act of contrition can be elicited; for example, "if a consecrated host were about to be profaned by heretics and someone, because of that sudden incursion, could not be contrite so quickly"; or if "a layman were reclining at the communion rail who remembered a mortal sin and could not elicit contrition because of the narrowness of time" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 86).

b) Gravity of the obligation. He who receives a sacrament of the living in mortal sin sins gravely, because he is guilty of grave injury who receives a sacrament of this kind without the disposition which its nature demands, or without the disposition required for the end or fruit to which it is of itself ordered, which is the increase of grace. There is added that a sacrament of the living received in mortal sin, even with attrition, according to some produces no fruit at all except character (n. 6; St. Alphonsus, VI, 86).

c) The certainty required concerning the state of grace. In order that someone licitly receive a sacrament of the living, at least broad moral certainty concerning the state of grace is required; but this also suffices. It is required because otherwise the one receiving exposes the sacrament to grave danger that it be received without the disposition which its nature demands, or without the disposition required for the fruit to which it is of itself ordered, to pass over the danger that it be received without any fruit at all; and this contains grave irreverence (St. Alphonsus, *Homo Apostolicus*, tract 15, n. 34). There is added that most authors, especially the more distinguished, adhere to this opinion. It suffices because these things must be taken in a human manner.

Objection. In order that someone who has sinned gravely be morally, although broadly, certain of the state of grace, he must either confess or elicit contrition with exquisite diligence. But the reverence due to the sacrament cannot oblige to so great a burden.

Response. I deny the assertion. Namely, in order that someone acquire broad moral certainty concerning the state of grace, it suffices that he either confess or elicit an act of contrition with moral diligence. God Almighty will not deny His help to one applying serious effort. For the rest, granted, though not conceded, the assertion of the adversaries, the burden set forth does not seem so great that, in order to avoid it, it would be licit to expose the sacrament to grave danger that it be received without the disposition required for the fruit to which it is of itself ordered, to say nothing of the danger that it be received without any fruit at all.

d) The mode of recovering lost grace. He who, constituted in mortal sin, wishes to receive a sacrament, can recover grace through an act of perfect contrition or through confession. If, however, there is question of receiving the Holy Eucharist, confession is required of itself; this obligation will be explained more fully in the treatise on the Eucharist. With regard to receiving the other sacraments, it is indeed fitting to confess, but there is no obligation.

Note. Besides the state of grace, the reverence due to the sacraments requires that the sacraments be received according to the rite perhaps prescribed in reception, and with that decency which the nature of the sacrament demands. To this especially belongs due attention, neglect of which nevertheless is only venial.

¹ Council of Trent, On Justification, Session 6, chapter 6; On Penance, Session 14, chapter 4.

44 **II. They must ask for the sacrament from a minister:** 1. enjoying legitimate faculty; 2. not censured, that is, not excommunicated, interdicted, or suspended, not irregular, or not canonically simply impeded; and 3. worthy, that is, living in the state of grace. Observe, however, that every minister is presumed suitable unless the contrary is established. But in order that the contrary be established, rumors do not suffice; indeed, one who has been a sinner is generally presumed amended, unless the contrary is evident, for example from a manifest voluntary proximate occasion not left behind. For the rest, receive these things:

1. It is a grave sin to ask for a sacrament from a minister here and now lacking legitimate faculty.
2. Of itself it is a grave sin to ask for a sacrament from a minister who is censured, irregular, canonically simply impeded, or unworthy because of grave sin, because it is proximate cooperation in the grave sin of the minister. Accidentally it is licit when a cause proportionate to the case and circumstances is present. This is clear from the things said concerning cooperation (n. 556) and from the canons soon to be cited. Hence:

a) From excommunicates to be avoided, and also from other censured persons after a condemnatory or declaratory sentence has intervened, the faithful can ask, in danger of death alone, both sacramental absolution according to the norm of canons 882 and 2252,¹ and also, if other ministers are lacking, the other sacraments and sacramentals (can. 2261, § 3; 2275, 2; 2284).

b) From tolerated excommunicates, and also from other censured persons before a condemnatory or declaratory sentence has intervened, the faithful can ask for the sacraments and sacramentals for any just cause, especially if other ministers are lacking; and then the censured person who is requested

can minister the same and is held by no obligation to inquire of the requester about the cause (can. 2261, § 2; 2275, 2; 2284).

c) Concerning irregular persons and those canonically simply impeded, almost the same seems to have to be said as concerning excommunicates to be avoided (cf. can. 968, § 2).

d) Sacraments can be asked from a minister unworthy because of sin: 1. if the precept of confession or communion urges; 2. "if from delaying reception there threatens danger of a fall; 3. if you must fulfill the precept of hearing Mass; 4. if one is in mortal sin and does not wish to wait even an hour, because it is not a small usefulness to be freed from sin as soon as possible; 5. if you would have to lack, at least for a long time, communion or the fruit of confession, even if you do not have mortal sin; 6. if otherwise you cannot gain a jubilee; 7. if you need a skilled director and do not have another; 8. if you wish to apply Mass for a deceased friend" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 89). Indeed, for any just cause a sacrament can be asked from one whose office it is to administer such a sacrament, for example from one's own pastor (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

¹ The cited canons will be explained in their own place.

45 Note. It is pleasing to explain briefly how far the sacraments can be ministered to little children, the insane, and the partially insane, and received by the aforesaid.

I. Little children and the perpetually insane, as was already said (n. 38), are capable of receiving Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, and Order. Yet not all are conferred on them.

II. To the insane who previously possessed the use of reason, those things must be applied which we said generally concerning adults. Hence, for example, for valid reception it is required that before insanity they had the intention and did not retract it. For the rest, consult what is to be said concerning the individual sacraments.

III. The partially insane are not of themselves to be kept away from the sacraments. Namely:

1. Baptism must be conferred on them even outside danger of death; nor is so much instruction prerequired in them as in others.
2. Confirmation can be conferred, even if they have been instructed less than others.
3. Absolution should be granted, in doubt about sufficient use of reason or disposition under condition: 1. in danger of death; 2. at Easter; 3. as often as they have confessed a doubtfully grave sin; indeed, 4. several times, even if they have declared only light sins (St. Alphonsus, VI, 432; IV, 3).
4. The Holy Eucharist should be conferred: 1. in danger of death; 2. at Easter; 3. several times, if they show devotion (St. Alphonsus, VI, 303).
5. Extreme Unction should be furnished to those lying dangerously ill; under condition if there is doubt about the use of reason had both now and previously.
6. Order is not to be administered to them.
7. They can indeed enter Matrimony if they understand the substance of the contract; nevertheless they are generally to be turned away from it.

Appendix. On Sacramentals

46 **I. Notion.** Sacramentals are things or actions which the Church, in some imitation of the sacraments, is accustomed to use for obtaining from her own impetration effects, especially spiritual effects (can. 1144). This notion handed down by the Code will become clearer from what is to be said. Sacramentals are, for example, consecrations and blessings to be performed in the name of the Church, exorcisms, prayers prescribed by the Church and to be recited in her name, such as the breviary, and blessed things, such as water, Agnus Dei, ashes, palms, etc.

47 **II. Institution.** With regard to the institution of sacramentals, it seems more probable that one must speak thus: most derive their origin from ecclesiastical institution; but certain ones of them, such as exorcisms and blessings, were instituted by Christ at least in a general way and entrusted to the Church, yet in such a way that afterwards they were more determinately circumscribed by the Church both as to mode and as to effect.¹ To add new things to the sacramentals, or to change anything in them, belongs to the Apostolic See alone, as is clear from canon 1145. The reason is that sacramentals draw their force from the impetration of the Church alone. Therefore it belongs to the Head of the Church alone to constitute or change them.

¹ Cf. Schmid, *Die Sacramentalien der Katholischen Kirche*, p. 149.

48 **III. Effects.** 1. The effects of sacramentals are either the special deputation of some person or thing to divine worship, as, for example, the blessing of an abbot or the administration of minor orders, supposing that these do not enjoy the character of a sacrament, and the consecration of a church or chalice; or the attainment of some good, whether spiritual, such as actual grace, the removal of venial guilt and temporal punishment, or bodily, such as health of body or immunity from calamity by which the person himself or his goods can be affected. Special deputation to divine worship is the effect of those sacramentals which consist in consecrations and constitutive blessings; the attainment of a good, whether spiritual or bodily, is obtained by the sacramentals of exorcism, prayer, and blessed objects.

2. As regards the mode by which diverse sacramentals produce their diverse effects, it can generally be established that they produce them by way of impetration, as if *ex opere operato*, that is, from the work of the working or praying Church, and this independently of the disposition either of the minister or of the subject, and indeed with that infallibility by which God promised to hear the prayer of His most beloved spouse, namely the Church. Some effects, however, are received immediately, others mediately through the sacramentals; wherefore concerning the individual effects in species one can speak thus:

- a) The special deputation of some person or thing to divine worship is obtained by way of impetration *ex opere operato*, infallibly and immediately.
- b) Actual graces are obtained in the same way, and through acts placed by means of these graces, the remission of sins and other goods which the just man can acquire for himself supernaturally.
- c) The expulsion and restraint of demons is obtained both by way of impetration and by way of adjuration or command.
- d) Finally, temporal goods, such as health, fertility of the earth, and the removal of threatening evil, are obtained both by way of impetration and by way of adjuration directed against demons.

49 **IV. Ministration or use.** 1. In general, the legitimate minister of sacramentals is a cleric to whom power has been granted for this and who has not been prohibited by competent ecclesiastical authority from exercising the same power (can. 1146). In species, with regard to legitimate ministers, the following are established:

a) No one who lacks the episcopal character can validly perform consecrations unless this is permitted to him either by law or by apostolic indult (can. 1147, § 1).¹

b) Any priest can impart blessings, except those which are reserved to the Roman Pontiff or to Bishops or others.² A reserved blessing which is given by a priest without the necessary permission is illicit but valid, unless in the reservation the Apostolic See has expressed otherwise (can. 1147, §§ 2 and 3). Deacons and lectors can validly and licitly give only those blessings which are expressly permitted to them by law (can. 1147, § 4).

c) With regard to exorcisms, see vol. I, n. 700.

2. In confecting or administering sacramentals, the rites approved by the Church are to be accurately observed (can. 1148, § 1). Consecrations,³ and blessings whether constitutive or invocative,⁴ are invalid if the formula prescribed by the Church has not been used (can. 1148, § 2).

3. Blessings, which are chiefly to be imparted to Catholics, can also be given to catechumens, indeed, unless a prohibition of the Church stands in the way, even to non-Catholics, for obtaining the light of faith or, together with it, health of body (can. 1149).

4. Things consecrated or blessed with a constitutive blessing are to be treated reverently and not applied to profane or improper use, even if they are in the ownership of private persons (can. 1150).

Note. Let the ministers of the Church explain to the faithful the nature and efficacy of sacramentals. Moreover, let the ministers of the Church show themselves ready in ministering sacramentals, and prudently accustom the faithful who neglect sacramentals to the use of them. Yet let them beware lest they apply ecclesiastical blessings, under whatever pretext, to ends other than those for which they were instituted by the Church, and lest by an imprudent use of them they expose this most holy institution to contempt, or stain it with the reputation of superstition or of dishonest gain.

¹ That law permits this to Cardinals (can. 239, § 1, n. 20); Vicars and Prefects Apostolic (can. 294, § 2); Pro-vicars and Pro-prefects (can. 310, § 2); Abbots and Prelates nullius (can. 383, § 2), according to the norm of the cited canons.

² Cf. with regard to blessings reserved to the pastor, can. 462, 6 and 7; with regard to sacred furnishings to be blessed, can. 1304; with regard to exorcisms to be pronounced, vol. I, n. 700.

³ Consecrations are made by anointing with chrism or sacred oil.

⁴ A constitutive blessing is one which orders a person or thing to divine worship, and so constitutes it sacred; an invocative blessing regards things, for example a ship, destined for profane use.

Treatise II. On Baptism

(St. Thomas, part 3, qq. 66-69; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis*, book VI, nn. 95-160; *Homo Apostolicus*, tract 14, nn. 7-38.)

We shall speak first of Baptism considered in itself, then of its ministration, and finally of the reception of Baptism.

Dissertation I. On Baptism Considered in Itself

50 Baptism is a sacrament by which man is spiritually regenerated through the washing of the body with water, done by another, under the express invocation of the individual Persons of the Most Holy Trinity. With this summary notion premised, we shall treat first of the existence, then of the essence, then of the effects, and finally of the necessity of Baptism.

Part I. On the Existence of the Sacrament of Baptism

51 Baptism is a true sacrament of the New Law. This is of faith from the Council of Trent,¹ and it is clear from Sacred Scripture, which openly teaches that Baptism is a sensible sign instituted by Christ and efficacious of grace.

I said a sensible sign, that is, consisting of matter, which is washing with water, and of form, which is situated in the invocation of the Most Holy Trinity. It suffices to have alleged John 3:5: Unless one is born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; and Matthew 28:19: Going therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

I said a sign efficacious of grace; since regeneration, concerning which Matthew speaks in the cited place, cannot be understood except as spiritual regeneration, which is effected through grace. For the rest, let the dogmatic theologians be consulted.

Note 1. It is disputed concerning the time at which Christ instituted Baptism. The more common and more probable opinion teaches that it was instituted by Christ before the Passion. Otherwise the Apostles would have received the Holy Eucharist and Order before Baptism had been received. There is added that the disciples of Christ baptized before the Passion of the Master.² Now the Baptism conferred by the disciples seems to have been different from the Baptism of John the Baptist. This is deduced from John 3:25 ff. It remains, therefore, that we say that the Baptism conferred by the disciples of Christ was our sacrament. For a third Baptism is invented without sufficient reason (St. Thomas, III, q. 66, a. 2; St. Alphonsus, VI, 96).

It is more disputed at what precise moment Christ instituted Baptism. According to some, in the discourse with Nicodemus;³ according to others, when He sent the disciples to baptize.⁴ According to St. Thomas (III, q. 66, a. 2 and q. 73, a. 5, ad 4), St. Alphonsus (VI, 96), and others, when He Himself was baptized by John.⁵

Note 2. The Baptism of John was not of the same efficacy as the Baptism of Christ. This is of faith from the Council of Trent.⁶ Further, according to St. Thomas, "the Baptism of John was not of itself a sacrament, but as it were a certain sacramental disposing for the Baptism of Christ, and therefore in some way it belongs to the law of Christ, but not to the law of Moses" (III, q. 38, a. 1, ad 1).

¹ Session 7, On Baptism, canon 1.

² John 4:1, 2.

³ John 3.

⁴ John 4:1, 2.

⁵ Matthew 3:11-17.

⁶ Session 7, On Baptism, canon 1.

Part II. On the Essence of the Sacrament of Baptism

Section I. On Remote Matter

52 I. The remote matter of Baptism required for validity is true and natural water. This is of faith from the Council of Trent,¹ and is declared by canon 737, § 1. By true and natural water is understood that which according to common estimation comes under the name of natural water; for attention must be paid to this more than to the assertions of chemists. Water remains valid matter even if a diverse element has been mixed in, provided the quantity mixed in is small and does not change the water substantially. Thus, for example, valid matter is water into which a thousandth part of corrosive bichloride of mercury has been mixed;² with which water many physicians in a case of necessity baptize infants, especially in the womb of the mother, namely lest the mother's uterus be affected by disease.³

Water composed by chemical art from the elements which constitute water, that is, from oxygen and hydrogen, is doubtful matter. In the case there is true water; likewise water natural according to intrinsic causes, but artificial according to the extrinsic cause. Further, it is doubted whether water of this kind is valid matter.

Corollary I. Matter certainly valid is: 1. water drawn from wells, spring water, sea water, rain water; 2. water melted from ice, snow, or hail; likewise water condensed from vapor; likewise water purified from foreign elements by distillation; 3. sulphurous, ferruginous, or mineral water, provided that according to common estimation it is still called water.

Corollary II. Matter certainly invalid is: 1. blood, milk, wine; 2. fluids of the body, such as sweat, urine, saliva; 3. ice, snow, and hail, so long as they have not yet melted; 4. the sap of plants is almost certainly invalid matter. Amniotic fluid, that is, the fluid by which the fetus enclosed in the afterbirth is surrounded, seems to be invalid matter. For it is constituted by secretions from the body of the mother and of the infant, and therefore seems to have to be equated with other secretions, such as sweat, etc. Since, however, the matter is not so certain, in a case of necessity, if Baptism cannot be conferred in a more certain way, it can be ministered with amniotic fluid.⁴

Corollary III. Doubtful matter, besides water composed by chemical art, concerning which above, is: 1. moisture flowing from a vine or other trees; 2. liquid from dissolved salt; 3. water drawn by chemical art from plants, flowers, roots, such as rose water; 4. finally, broth, beer, coffee, tea, ink, mud, lye, and artificial waters are more or less doubtfully valid, according as they are thicker or thinner, or contain a greater or lesser quantity of foreign elements (St. Alphonsus, VI, 103, 104).

¹ Session 7, On Baptism, canon 2.

² In French: *chloride de mercure*.

³ Holy Office, 21 August 1901, in *Nederlandsche Katholieke Stemmen*, 1901, p. 289.

⁴ Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia moralis*, vol. II, n. 47.

53 II. The remote matter required for liceity is water certainly valid, pure, and, if there is question of solemn Baptism, that is, Baptism which is administered with all the rites and ceremonies (can. 732, § 2), baptismal water, that is, water blessed for baptizing (can. 757, § 1). It is said:

1. Certainly valid; nevertheless, in extreme necessity only matter certainly invalid is excluded. If the matter is doubtful, Baptism should be conferred under condition: if the matter is valid; and afterwards it should be repeated under condition (St. Alphonsus, VI, 103).
2. Pure, that is, neither mixed¹ nor filthy. To use very impure water without necessity is a grave sin (St. Alphonsus, VI, 102).
3. Baptismal for solemn Baptism (can. 757, § 1); and this obligation is grave (St. Alphonsus, VI, 102). The consecration, however, must be done twice in the year, namely on Holy Saturday and on the Vigil of Pentecost, the old water having been poured into the sacrarium;² the precept of consecrating the water at the aforesaid times is grave. If lack is feared, common water can be mixed with it, even repeatedly, but in a smaller quantity (can. 757, § 2); if, however, it has become corrupted, or has flowed out, or has failed in any way whatsoever, the pastor is to pour fresh water into the font, well cleaned and neat, and bless it by the proper rite prescribed in his liturgical books (can. 757, § 3). Moreover, if the baptismal water is too cold, it can licitly be warmed or mixed with warmed common water.

With regard to the water to be used in private Baptism, it is better, if it can be done, to use baptismal water, but there is no obligation (cf. can. 757, § 3). Hence a priest called to confer private Baptism will laudably carry with him a sufficient quantity of baptismal water. "If baptismal water is not had and danger threatens, let the priest use simple water,"³ whether holy water or common water, as it is permissible to interpret this word.⁴

¹ The Holy Office, on 21 August 1901, responded that the mixture of corrosive bichloride of mercury, concerning which in the text under I, is licit only where a true danger of disease is present.

² Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 2, n. 5; Sacred Congregation of Rites, nn. 2878, 3331.

³ Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 2, n. 29.

⁴ The Holy Office, 20 June 1883, prefers holy water.

Section II. On Proximate Matter

54 I. The proximate matter required for validity is the washing of the one to be baptized, done by the baptizer himself. This is clear from Sacred Scripture, which declares that man through Baptism is born again of water,¹ and is washed.² Canon 737, § 1, declares the same.

It is said:

1. **Washing;** and this indeed can be done in three ways, namely by immersion, pouring, and sprinkling. As regards validity, however, it makes no difference in what way it is done (can. 758). Nevertheless, true washing wholly requires:

a) That the water physically or immediately touch the one to be baptized. Hence: 1. Baptism is doubtful if the water has touched only the hair, scab, or birth matter still adhering in notable quantity. To birth matter there also seems to be numbered the *vernix caseosa*, which is accustomed to adhere to the fetus before cleansing. Hence surgeons and midwives, having removed scab and filth if need be, should either part the hair with the left hand while baptizing, or rather effect that the water flow over the temples of the head. Likewise, the sacred minister can, while pouring the water, divide

the hair, or rather proceed in such a way that the water flows somewhat over the forehead (St. Alphonsus, VI, 107, q. 3).

2. With regard to Baptism conferred on the afterbirth, some teach absolutely that it is invalid, in whatever afterbirth the conferral may be done; namely, they judge that no afterbirth is a part of the fetus. Others hold Baptism conferred on the external afterbirth, or decidua, as certainly invalid, but Baptism on the inner afterbirths as doubtfully invalid. The reason is that they judge the decidua certainly, but the other afterbirths only probably, not to be parts of the fetus. According to others, Baptism conferred on whatever afterbirth is doubtfully valid. Many allege as the reason that the afterbirths are united with, or constitute as it were one continuum with, the umbilical cord, which probably belongs to the fetus; and thus Baptism conferred on the afterbirths would not be certainly invalid. There is added, they say, with regard to the inner afterbirths, that it is not yet wholly established that they do not belong to the fetus.³ In what way, all things considered, the fetus must be baptized will be explained in n. 93.

3. Baptism on the umbilical cord is more probably valid than on the afterbirths, because the cord is united immediately with the infant, while the afterbirths are united with the infant by means of the cord.⁴

b) That the water touch the one to be baptized with successive motion, unless several parts of water touch several parts of the body at the same instant, as happens, for example, in Baptism by sprinkling. For the rest, successive motion can occur in two ways, namely both by moving the body to the water, as in immersion, and by moving the water to the body, as in pouring and in sprinkling.

Moreover, a small quantity of water suffices, provided nevertheless that it flows over a sufficient part of the body; hence only one or another little drop, even if it flows, will leave Baptism practically doubtful (St. Alphonsus, VI, 107, q. 6). It also suffices that the baptizer, by the motion of a finger or of a moistened cloth, wash a part of the body (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). Note, however, that according to the Holy Office, Baptism conferred "by way of anointing on the forehead, with the thumb moistened in baptismal water," had to be repeated.⁵

2. **Of the one to be baptized;** namely, in such a way that the man can morally be said to have been washed. Further, Baptism is certainly valid if the washing is done on the whole body or on the head, whether on the forehead, cheek, or crown; most probably if on another more principal part, as on the shoulder-blades, shoulders, or chest; it is more doubtful if on a less principal part, as on the hand, finger, or foot. The reason why Baptism conferred otherwise than on the whole body or on the head remains doubtful is "because ... in none of the exterior parts does the integrity of life consist as in the head" (St. Thomas, III, q. 68, a. 11, ad 4; St. Alphonsus, VI, 107, qq. 3 and 4). Hence canon 746, §§ 2 and 3: If the infant has put forth the head and danger of death threatens, let him be baptized on the head; nor afterwards, if he comes forth alive, is he to be baptized again under condition. If he has put forth another member, let him be baptized on it under condition if danger threatens; but then, if he is born alive, he is again to be baptized under condition.

3. **Done by the baptizer himself.** Therefore it does not suffice that the washing be done by the one to be baptized, or by a third party, or by a natural cause alone. Therefore:

a) Baptism would certainly be invalid: 1. if someone, seeing another washing himself or falling into a river, were to pronounce the form; 2. if someone were to utter the form while a third party poured

the water (n. 20).

b) It would be doubtfully invalid if the baptizer himself were to place the one to be baptized under water poured by a third party, provided that the third party is not employed as applying the matter.

c) Baptism would be almost certainly valid if the baptizer himself moved the one to be baptized to water falling from a roof or from the sky, or springing from a fountain (St. Alphonsus, VI, 106).

Corollary I. If Baptism is conferred by immersion, it does not suffice that someone be held motionless in motionless water, because the baptizer cannot be said to wash the one to be baptized. Besides, according to some authors it is also required that the one to be baptized be drawn out of the water, according to that saying of Paul: Do you not know that all we who have been baptized in Christ Jesus have been baptized in His death? For we have been buried together with Him through Baptism into death, so that, as Christ rose from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life; for if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall also be in that of His resurrection.⁶

Corollary II. They also ask about the throwing of the one to be baptized, for example an infant, into a river. Now Baptism of this kind is doubtfully valid, for example because there is not had, as we suppose, emergence. Moreover, a manner of acting of this kind seems absolutely illicit, because the said throwing of itself tends only to killing. "Nevertheless it is licit to baptize a child soon to die with even icy water, if other water cannot be had, even if it were feared that death would be hastened by this ... because then death would not occur of itself, but accidentally; since such an action of itself does not tend to killing, but to washing" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 100). The same, with the same circumstances supposed, holds concerning poisoned or boiling water from which the infant would be killed.

¹ John 3:5.

² Eph. 5:26; Tit. 3:5; Acts 22:16; Heb. 10:22.

³ The fetus is enveloped in three membranes or afterbirths, which are: 1. the exterior afterbirth, which is called the decidua; 2. the inner afterbirths, namely the chorion and amnion. Cf. Cavellmann-Bergmann, *Pastoral-Medizin*, p. 242; *Nouvelle Revue Theologique* 1912, p. 581.

⁴ *Nederlandsche Katholieke Stemmen*, 1927, p. 146.

⁵ 14 December 1898 (*Collectanea*, n. 2028); cf. Holy Office, 8 November 1770; 9 July 1779 (*Collectanea*, nn. 486, 530).

⁶ Rom. 6:3-5.

55 II. The proximate matter required for liceity in solemn Baptism is gathered from canon 758 and the Roman Ritual. The cited canon declares: "Although Baptism can be conferred validly either by pouring, by immersion, or by sprinkling, nevertheless the first or second mode, or one mixed from both, which is more in use, is to be retained, according to the approved ritual books of the diverse Churches." Therefore the third mode, by sprinkling, is no longer to be used. The Roman Ritual defines the mode of baptizing more by these words: "The priest takes baptismal water in a small vessel or pitcher and pours it three times over the head of the infant in the form of a cross ... But where there is a custom of baptizing by immersion, the priest takes the infant and, taking care that he not be harmed, cautiously immerses him and baptizes by a triple immersion."¹ The triple pouring

or immersion in solemn Baptism obliges under grave obligation (St. Thomas, III, q. 66, a. 8; St. Alphonsus, VI, 107, q. 5); in private Baptism it is recommended insofar as it can be done.

¹ Title II, chapter 2, nn. 19, 20. In almost all Churches which use the Latin rite, Baptism is conferred by pouring.

Section III. On the Form

56 The legitimate form of Baptism is:

For the Latin Church: **I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.** This is clear from the Fourth Lateran, Florentine, and Tridentine Councils,¹ and likewise from the Roman Ritual.² That *Amen* is not to be added at the end is clear both from the cited documents and from the response of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on 9 June 1853.

For the Greek Church: **The servant of Christ, N., is baptized** (here the name of the one to be baptized is placed) **in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.** This is established from the Council of Florence and from the decree of Eugene IV for the Armenians.

¹ Session 7, canon 4, On Baptism.

² Title II, chapter 2, n. 8.

57 **I. For validity, so that it be certain, it is required that there be expressed in the form:** 1. the person baptizing (*I*); 2. the person to be baptized (*you*); 3. the act of baptizing (*baptize*); 4. the unity of the divine nature (*in the name*); 5. the express distinction of the three Persons, and indeed by proper names: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. That the act of baptizing and the distinct invocation of the three Persons must be expressed, all concede. Concerning the rest there is dispute. Therefore let there be expressed:

1. **The person baptizing.** Whether the expression of this in the form of the sacrament is required for validity can be disputed. For the rest, it certainly suffices that it be expressed implicitly, as is done in the form of the Greeks, where they say that *is baptized* has the same force as *is baptized by me* (cf. St. Thomas, III, q. 66, a. 5; St. Alphonsus, VI, 108).

Corollary. The word *I* is not essential in the Latin and Greek languages, because the first person, as it is said, is expressed through the word *baptize*; the same cannot be said of several more recent languages.¹

2. **The person to be baptized** indeed seems to have to be expressed, "because, just as the washing, so also the form must be concerned with a certain person" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 108). Yet it seems to suffice that it be expressed implicitly; this can be done even if the word *you* is omitted. Hence the Holy Office on 8 September 1633 declared valid the form of the Armenians: *Now my hand baptizes in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*² But the declaration of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, dated 11 September 1841, that Baptism is rendered invalid through omission of the word *you*, was omitted in the new edition.
3. **The act of baptizing, and indeed the present act or act now being placed, must be expressed**, as is clear: 1. from the Council of Florence;³ 2. from proposition 27 condemned by Alexander VII: "Baptism conferred under this form was at some time valid: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, these words being omitted: I baptize you";⁴ 3. from the Decretal of Alexander III;⁵ 4. from this reason of St. Thomas: "Because the washing of a man

in water can be for many things, it is necessary that it be determined in the words of the form for what it is done; and this indeed is not done by the fact that it is said: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, because we ought to do all things in such a name, as is had in Colossians 3. And therefore, if the act of Baptism is not expressed either according to our mode or according to the mode of the Greeks, the sacrament is not perfected" (III, q. 66, a. 5, ad 2; St. Alphonsus, VI, 108). But the present act of baptizing, or the act now being placed, must be expressed; otherwise, considering the form, nothing would be effected now.

Corollary I. The word *baptize*, or another equivalent, such as *wash* or *lave*, is essential; but not *anoint*, because it does not involve the signification of washing. But in order that a certainly valid word be used, it is better in the vernacular language to use a word derived from the Latin *baptizare*, such as *baptiser*, *to baptize*, unless there is had a word which by usage has been consecrated for signifying sacramental washing, such as *doopen*, *taufen*.

Corollary II. There is doubt concerning the form: *I christianize you*, or concerning the English formula: *I christen thee*, because it expresses rather the effect of the sacramental action than the action itself. Yet if that or a similar formula somewhere by common acceptance signifies the action of baptizing, it is certainly valid. Hence it is valid among the Yugoslavs, as is clear from the Slavic Ritual, which was approved by the Holy See in 1894 and contains for the Greek rite the form: *krescaetsja* (= is christianized), for the Latin rite: *Ia te krstim* (= I christianize you).

¹ The Sacred Congregation of the Council on 11 February 1797 declared valid Baptism conferred thus, provided that a bad or heretical mind is set aside: *Enfante, te baptize en nom de Pere, de Fils et de Saint-Esprit*.

² *Collectanea*, n. 74.

³ Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 696.

⁴ Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 1317.

⁵ Chapter 1, X 3, 42.

58 **4. The unity of the divine nature likewise seems to have to be expressed**, considering the words of Christ: Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Corollary I. *In the name* is essential, at least insofar as it signifies unity; hence it would be invalid: 1. with the words *in the name* omitted, to say *in the Father*, etc.; 2. in place of *in the name*, to use the words *in the names* (St. Alphonsus, VI, 111).

Corollary II. The following forms are valid: 1. *I baptize you in the name of the Father, in the name of the Son, in the name of the Holy Spirit*;¹ 2. *I baptize you in the name of the Father, I baptize you in the name of the Son, I baptize you in the name of the Holy Spirit*;² 3. *I baptize you in the name of the Father and in the name of the Son and in the name of the Holy Spirit*;³ 4. *I baptize you with the name of the Father*, etc.⁴ Further, the four assigned forms, according to the mind of the Sacred Congregations, are valid if, a depraved or heretical mind being set aside, they are used. 5. *I baptize you into the name of the Father*, etc.; for this form plainly agrees with the form handed down in Sacred Scripture.⁵

Corollary III. Since it is somewhat doubtful whether the words *in the name* signify *the name having been invoked* or *by the authority*, the following forms are doubtful: 1. *I baptize you by the authority of the Father*, etc.; 2. *I baptize you name of the Father*, in being omitted (St. Alphonsus, VI, 112, dub. 2). In the case of Faesulae,⁶ Baptism conferred in Italian in this way, *Io ti battezzo 'nnome del Padre*, etc., is indeed judged

valid; but the consultor argued from the usage in the Italian language, or in the Etruscan idiom, of omitting the letter *i* before *m* and *n*. Hence the declaration cannot be referred to another language.

¹ Cf. Holy Office, 11 January 1882, and Sacred Congregation of the Council, 4 May 1641.

² Holy Office, 11 January 1882.

³ Sacred Congregation of the Council, 4 May 1641.

⁴ Sacred Congregation of the Council, 16 August 1828; 24 May 1823; Holy Office, 23 May 1720. See *Thesaurus resolutionum*, vol. 83, fol. 134 and following.

⁵ Cf. the Greek text, Matthew 28:19; Acts 19:5; 1 Cor. 1:13.

⁶ 12 September 1801.

59 5. The express distinction of the three Persons. It is required that the three Persons be expressed explicitly, and, in order that every doubt about validity be excluded, by proper names, and those common or such as are accustomed to be used, and so joined that the distinction is sufficiently signified. This is clear from the words of Christ: Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; likewise from Tradition¹ (St. Thomas, III, q. 66, a. 5 and ad 7; St. Alphonsus, VI, 108, 109). Therefore the three Persons:

a) Must be expressed. It is indeed disputed whether, by special dispensation in the time of the Apostles, Baptism conferred under the form *in the name of Jesus* was valid. But after the times of the Apostles all concede that Baptism conferred in this way is not valid. This is drawn from the words of Christ: Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Likewise from Tradition.² Hence the forms are invalid: *in the name of God*; *in the name of Christ* (St. Alphonsus, VI, 108).

b) Explicitly, as is proven by the arguments brought forward under a). Hence likewise the forms are invalid: "in the name of the Most Holy Trinity"; "in the name of the three Persons" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 111).³

c) By proper names. This is urged by the words of Christ and the ancient practice of the Church. The form is very doubtful: "in the name of the Omnipotent and the Wise and the Good."

d) And by common names. "As," says St. Thomas, "water is taken for Baptism because its use is more common for washing, so for signifying the three Persons in the form of Baptism those names are assumed by which the Persons have been more commonly accustomed to be named in that language; nor is the sacrament perfected in other names" (III, q. 66, a. 5, ad 7). Therefore in the Latin language it should be said: "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." But the following forms are doubtful: "in the name of the Begetter and of the Begotten and of the One Proceeding from Both"; "in the name of the First and Second and Third Person of the Most Holy Trinity"; "in the name of the Father and of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 109). The form "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit and of Mary" is invalid if *of Mary* is said in the same sense as *of the Father*, etc.; but it is valid if the minister wills to invoke her as a helper in obtaining grace (St. Alphonsus, VI, 108).

e) And joined in such a way that the distinction is sufficiently signified. Now: 1. The form is certainly valid if the conjunction *and* is omitted only between *Father* and *Son*, and therefore it is said: "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." The reason is that the very word *Son* designates a

distinct Person. Then, the usage is sufficiently customary of denoting distinct members in this way. There is added the response of the Sacred Congregation of the Council.⁴ 2. The forms are somewhat doubtful: 1. if the conjunction is omitted twice: "in the name of the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit"; 2. if it is expressed only between *Father* and *Son*: "in the name of the Father and of the Son, the Holy Spirit." The reason for both is that then *Holy Spirit* can seem to be an apposition of *Son*; for the name Holy Spirit belongs both to the Father and to the Son (St. Alphonsus, VI, 112). Responses are indeed reported which declared valid Baptism conferred in this way: *Mi te abbattezzo in nome del Padre e del Figliuolo, dello Spirito Sancto*; but the matter is not sufficiently certain and clear to remove every doubt.⁵

¹ Rath, *De Baptismo*, n. 287.

² Cf. Rath, *De Baptismo*, n. 287.

³ Nicholas I in the year 876 to the Bulgarians holds as valid Baptism conferred in the name of the Most Holy Trinity or only in the name of Christ, and argues from Acts; cf. Acts 2:38; 19:5 (Denzinger-Bannwart, n. 335).

⁴ 12 September 1801.

⁵ Cf. Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis*, II, n. 90, note 1.

60 II. For liceity it is required that Latins use the formula of the Roman Ritual, and Greeks the formula shown in their Rituals. Besides, observe that by any change a grave sin is easily committed; for some doubt about the validity of so necessary a sacrament will easily arise.

Corollary. From what has been said both in the present number and in the treatise on the Sacraments in general (n. 23), it is gathered that faulty pronunciation of the form is generally not substantial if it is made from haste, inadvertence, or because of stammering; more easily if it is made with a heretical mind.

Part III. On the Effects of Baptism

61 The effects of Baptism are:

I. Sanctifying grace, of itself first grace, accidentally second grace (n. 6), with the infusion of all the virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit attached.

II. Sacramental grace; this consists in the fact that the sanctifying grace which Baptism confers is both ordered to this, that man be spiritually regenerated and live Christianly, and carries with it a right to actual graces in order to living Christianly. This spiritual regeneration involves the remission of all guilt, both original and personal; the remission of all punishment, both eternal and temporal, with the things to be posited being posited, that is, sorrow for sins.

III. Character. 1. The existence of character is clear from the things said in n. 8.

2. Effects of character. Baptismal character effects that man:

a) Is deputed to the worship of God according to the rite instituted by Christ and exercised in the Church, especially with regard to the sacraments, for the reception of which, therefore, he is rendered capable by character (St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 35, a. 3; III, q. 63, a. 6; St. Alphonsus, VI, 79; cf. can. 737, § 1).

b) Becomes a member of the Church, and is obliged to lead a Catholic life, and is subjected to the authority and laws of the Church, that is, of the spiritual society instituted by Christ (cf. can. 87).

Corollary. In order that the baptized be bound to live Catholicly and obey the Church, it is not required that, after attaining the use of reason, they be asked whether they wish to hold the baptismal promises as ratified and in fact hold them as ratified.¹ Nor should you say: It is repugnant that someone be subjected to authority and laws without the consent of his will. That this is not repugnant is clear even from the fact that without the consent of their will infants are subjected to the authority and precepts of parents, and citizens to the authority and laws of their country.

¹ Council of Trent, Session 7, On Baptism, canon 14.

Part IV. On the Necessity of Baptism

Baptism is necessary by necessity of means and of precept.¹

¹ On the notion of each necessity, see vol. I, n. 484.

Section I. On Necessity of Means

62 After the sufficient promulgation of the Gospel, the sacrament of Baptism is necessary for salvation by necessity of means, yet not absolutely but hypothetically. It is said:

I. After the sufficient promulgation of the Gospel. Thus the Council of Trent.¹ Now sufficient promulgation for some, but not for all, was effected through the sermon of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost. For the rest, authors more commonly teach that the promulgation of the Gospel for different nations took place at different times, and that for the whole world it has already long since occurred, although its diffusion has not yet been extended everywhere.

II. The sacrament of Baptism is necessary for salvation by necessity of means; this proposition is of faith from the Council of Trent: "If anyone says that Baptism is free, that is, not necessary for salvation, let him be anathema."² Cf. canon 737, § 1.

III. Yet not absolutely, but hypothetically; by these words it is signified that there are means which can supply the place of Baptism, namely Baptism of desire and perhaps Baptism of blood, concerning which we shall speak in the scholia.

¹ Session 6, chapter 4.

² Session 7, On Baptism, canon 5.

Scholion I. On Baptism of Desire

63 **I. Notion.** Baptism of desire is so called because it is the effect of the Holy Spirit, who is also called *Flamen* (from breathing or inspiring). Now Baptism of desire is an act of perfect charity or perfect contrition.

64 **II. Suppletive Character.** Baptism of desire is a suppletive means of Baptism, that is, it does not justify except dependently on a desire, whether explicit or implicit, for Baptism. Now an implicit desire for Baptism is always included in an act of charity or perfect contrition elicited by one not baptized; for in such an act there is contained a general purpose of fulfilling all things which have been established by God, among which is the reception of Baptism by one not baptized.

65 **III. Suppletive Force.** An act of charity or perfect contrition supplies the place of Baptism with respect to justification, or the infusion of grace, and consequently with respect to all things which cannot be separated from it, namely the remission of original and actual sins, at least mortal sins, the remission of eternal punishment, the infused virtues, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit; but not with respect to sacramental grace, character, and the remission of all punishment.

66 **IV. The requisites for Baptism of desire to justify** are only those which constitute Baptism of desire.

67 **V. The manner in which Baptism of desire produces its effects.** Baptism of desire produces its effects only *ex opere operantis*; otherwise than the sacrament, which operates *ex opere operato*,¹ and

Baptism of blood, which operates at least partly, as it were, *ex opere operato*.²

Corollary. For one who has been justified through Baptism of desire, there remains the obligation of receiving the sacrament of Baptism, if this can be done; nor can he receive other sacraments before that.

¹ Others say: *ex opere operato* actively.

² Others say: *ex opere operato* passively.

Scholion II. On Baptism of Blood

68 **I. Notion.** Baptism of blood is martyrdom endured by one not baptized.

69 **II. Suppletive Character.** 1. Martyrdom in little children not baptized is not a suppletive means of Baptism, that is, it does not justify them dependently on a desire for Baptism. With respect to the fruitful martyrdom of adults, even if you posit that a desire for Baptism is contained in such martyrdom, nevertheless it seems doubtful whether justification takes place dependently on the aforesaid desire; in a word: it is doubtful whether or not Baptism of blood was instituted by God as a suppletive means of the sacrament; perhaps the desire for Baptism is required only as removing an obstacle, with respect to the infusion of grace.

70 **III. Suppletive Force.** Martyrdom in the non-baptized, both adults and infants, supplies the place of Baptism with respect to the remission of all guilt and punishment (vol. I, n. 418).

71 **IV. The requisites for Baptism of blood to justify.** 1. In little children no disposition is required.

2. In adults there are required the same things which are required for martyrdom strictly so called (vol. I, n. 418). Besides, if the adult has committed grave personal sin, according to some there are required acts of charity or perfect contrition; according to others attrition suffices; according to others, per se an act of charity or perfect contrition is required, while per accidens attrition suffices (cf. St. Alphonsus, VI, 98).

72 **V. The manner in which Baptism of blood produces its effects.** According to some, justification in itself is effected *ex opere operantis*, while from a quasi *ex opere operato* there is given a higher degree of justification; similarly, some remission of punishment is given *ex opere operantis*, while total remission of punishment is granted by a quasi *ex opere operato*. According to others, both justification and the remission of all punishment are effected by a quasi *ex opere operato*. According to others, the effects are produced in the manner of the former opinion if the martyr elicits an act of charity or perfect contrition; in the manner of the latter opinion if he is only attrite; wherefore the dogmatic theologians should be consulted.

Corollary. An adult who knows that martyrdom is imminent is certainly bound, if he can, to receive Baptism; likewise, if he is a sinner and baptized, to confess, or, if he cannot confess, to elicit perfect contrition, and this already because according to what has been said mere attrition with martyrdom probably does not suffice for justification; and so the hope of martyrdom does not free them from these things.

Section II. On Necessity of Precept

73 The necessity of precept already follows from the necessity of means. Moreover:

I. Adults not yet baptized, or doubtfully baptized, are bound to receive Baptism as soon as they can receive it worthily and, considering the circumstances and the dignity of the sacrament, suitably.

"For adults," says St. Thomas, "the sacrament of Baptism is not to be conferred immediately when they are converted, but it must be deferred until some certain time, first indeed because of the caution of the Church, lest she be deceived in conferring the sacrament on those who approach falsely, according to that passage of 1 John 4: Believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits whether they are of God; and this proving is taken concerning those approaching Baptism when for some space of time their faith and morals are examined. Secondly, this is necessary for the benefit of those who are baptized, because they need some space of time for this, that they may be fully instructed concerning the faith and exercised in those things which pertain to the Christian life. Thirdly, this is necessary for a certain reverence of the sacrament, while in the principal solemnities, namely of Easter and Pentecost, men are admitted to Baptism, and thus they receive the sacrament more devoutly" (III, q. 68, a. 3).

II. An adult who without reason defers Baptism for a long time sins gravely, because he is bound to be enrolled in the Church and to live as a Christian.

For the rest, compare what is to be said concerning the time of conferring Baptism (n. 87).

Dissertation II. On the Ministration of Baptism

We must speak first about the person ministering, then about the manner of ministering.

Part I. On the Person Ministering

74 I. Every priest is the ordinary minister of solemn Baptism in this sense, that by the force of his ordination he is deputed principally, not secondarily as a deacon is, for baptizing, and can always be delegated by the proper pastor of the person to be baptized to baptize, and that solemnly (cf. canon 738, § 1).

75 II. A deacon is the extraordinary minister of Baptism in this sense, that by the force of his ordination he is deputed secondarily for baptizing, and can be delegated by the Ordinary or by the proper pastor of the person to be baptized, for a just cause, to baptize, and that solemnly. Hence he is not to use his power without the delegation or permission of the local Ordinary or of the pastor, to be granted for a just cause, which, where necessity urges, is legitimately presumed (cf. canon 741; St. Alphonsus, VI, 116, doubt 1). It was said:

1. A deacon is deputed secondarily, because he is ordained rather to assist a minister of a higher order, and secondarily to supply his place.
2. For a just cause to be granted: for example, if the pastor is absent or ill or subject to excommunication or occupied in hearing confessions; perhaps also if the parents desire it, for example because of consanguinity, etc.
3. Where necessity urges, granted permission is not required, but presumed permission suffices. Now necessity urges if the person to be baptized is in the article or danger of death; likewise if it is foreseen that the priest will be absent for a long time, and no other can be approached.¹

¹ Cf. Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 21 January 1788; 16 January 1804; 11 September 1841 (*Collectanea*, nn. 593, 674, 939).

76 III. With respect to the right of baptizing solemnly, hold the following:

1. The Ordinary of the place and the pastor enjoy the right of baptizing solemnly their own subjects, or rather the inhabitants of their territory; this does not belong to another priest except by permission of the same pastor or of the local Ordinary, which in a case of necessity is legitimately presumed (canon 730, § 1). He who performs this without due permission sins gravely (St. Alphonsus, VI, 115); likewise parents violate the right of the pastor when, without necessity or permission, they bring their child to another priest to be baptized.
2. Even a traveler is to be baptized solemnly by his own pastor in his own parish, if this can be done easily and without delay; otherwise any pastor can solemnly baptize a traveler in his own territory (canon 730, § 2).
3. Where parishes or quasi-parishes have not yet been established, account must be taken of special statutes and received customs, so that it may be established to which priest, besides the Ordinary, the right of baptizing belongs in the whole territory or in part of it (canon 740).

Note. The Baptism of adults, where it can conveniently be done, is to be referred to the local Ordinary, so that, if he wishes, it may be conferred more solemnly by him or by his delegate (canon 744).

77 **IV. With respect to the territory in which solemn Baptism may be conferred**, canon 739 establishes: In another's territory no one may, without due permission, confer solemn Baptism, not even on inhabitants of his own place.

Corollary I. If a woman gives birth outside her own parish, she ought to see that the child is baptized in her own parish, if this can be done easily and without delay; otherwise she can choose either her own parish or that in which she gave birth to the child, or even another (canon 738, § 2; St. Alphonsus, VI, 115).

Corollary II. Those without fixed domicile can choose whichever church they prefer (cf. canon 94, § 2).

78 **V. Every human being is the minister of Baptism** in this sense, that he can baptize validly; in a case of necessity also licitly, though not solemnly (canon 742, § 1). If, when a case occurs, several are present, the prescribed order, to be assigned under 2 below, is to be observed. I said:

1. **In a case of necessity**; wherefore note:

a) Extreme necessity is not required, but a well-founded danger suffices, lest an infant soon to die should die. The Holy Office, to the question "whether a midwife, when she foresees that Baptism will have to be deferred for a long time, can immediately wash a newborn, although he is found in good health, even without the knowledge of one or both spouses, the pastor nevertheless having been warned of this," responded on 11 January 1899: "It must be urged that Baptism be administered as soon as possible; but then it will be permissible for the midwife to confer it when danger is positively feared that the child will die during the time of the delay."

b) To danger of death is equivalent a necessity which can arise especially in mission places from the lack of any priest whatever or from difficulty in approaching him; namely, the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide several times approved the practice prevailing in several places by which catechists or other approved laypersons baptize the infants of Christians quickly, for example not beyond eight days from birth, even when they are in good health.¹

2. **The order to be observed among several ministers of necessity** is set forth in these words by canon 742, §§ 2 and 3: If nevertheless a priest is present, he is to be preferred to a deacon, a deacon to a subdeacon, a cleric to a layperson, and a man to a woman, unless for the sake of modesty it is fitting that a woman rather than a man baptize, or unless the woman knows better the form and manner of baptizing. A father or mother is not permitted to baptize his or her own child, except in danger of death, when no other is present who can baptize. Thus also the Roman Ritual.² Now the prescribed order must be understood so that: 1. any of the faithful, even a woman, existing in union with the Church, must be preferred to any unbeliever, heretic, schismatic, or excommunicate to be avoided, even if he is a priest; 2. a woman is to be preferred to the father, but not to the mother.

3. **An inversion of the order** is per se illicit because of the precept of the Code and the Roman Ritual; but it is a grave sin only then: 1. when a non-priest is preferred to a priest existing in union with the Church; 2. when a non-Catholic or a person to be avoided is preferred to a Catholic. There is indeed doubt when a layperson is preferred to a deacon, since from the text of the law he is a minister by office (canon 741); but because he is only a secondary minister, it does

not seem sufficiently established that there is grave sin. Besides, a just cause always seems to excuse from every sin; hence canon 742, § 2: "unless for the sake of modesty it is fitting that a woman rather than a man baptize, or unless the woman knows better the form and manner of baptizing" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 117).

Corollary. Let the pastor see to it that the faithful, especially midwives, physicians, and surgeons, thoroughly learn the correct manner of baptizing for a case of necessity (canon 743).³ If Baptism was administered neither by the proper pastor nor in his presence, the minister should as soon as possible inform the proper pastor of the baptized person by reason of domicile concerning the Baptism conferred (canon 778). In private Baptism, so far as it can be done, two witnesses, or at least one, are to be used, by whom the conferral of Baptism can be proved (canon 742, § 1).

¹ 21 January 1788 (*Collectanea*, n. 533); 16 January 1804 (*Collectanea*, n. 674); 11 September 1841 (*Collectanea*, n. 939).

² Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 1, n. 16.

³ Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 1, n. 13.

Part II. On the Manner of Administering Baptism

It has been explained above what things are generally required for administering the sacraments validly and licitly. It is sufficient to develop more fully one of the requisites for licit ministration, and to apply it to Baptism, namely the obligation of ministering the sacrament duly, that is, according to the prescriptions of the Church. For the sake of completeness we shall explain both the things which must be observed in the conferral of Baptism and the things which must be observed after it. The prescriptions of the Church regard first the rites and ceremonies, then the sponsors to be used, then the time and place, and finally the notation and proof of Baptism conferred.

Section I. On the Rites and Ceremonies of Baptism

79 I. The rites and ceremonies to be used. 1. Per se Baptism is to be conferred solemnly (canon 755, § 1), that is, with all the rites and ceremonies which are prescribed in the ritual books being observed (canon 737, § 2). Now:

a) The prescribed rites and ceremonies differ according as Baptism is to be conferred on adults or on little children. Nevertheless the local Ordinary can, for a grave and reasonable cause, allow the ceremonies prescribed for the Baptism of infants to be used in the Baptism of adults (canon 755, § 2); wherefore note that the Baptism of adults is indeed more beautiful, but longer, so that it can more easily produce weariness both for the neophytes and for those standing by.

b) The offspring must be baptized in the rite of the parents. If one parent belongs to the Latin rite and the other to an Eastern rite, the offspring is to be baptized in the rite of the father, unless another provision is made by special law. If only one is Catholic, the offspring must be baptized in the rite of this one (canon 756). From these things it follows that, so far as it can be done, care must be taken that the offspring be baptized by a minister belonging to the rite in which the offspring must be baptized;¹ since each person is bound to follow his own rite in confecting and ministering the sacraments (canon 733, § 2; n. 27).

c) The interrogations are to be made in the Latin language; but from the response of the Holy Office² it is permitted that the minister, after he has said the interrogation and responses in the Latin language for himself, repeat the interrogation in the vernacular language, so that he may receive the response of the sponsors.³

2. In danger of death, Baptism may be conferred privately; and, if it is conferred by a minister who is neither a priest nor a deacon, only those things are to be done which are necessary for the validity of Baptism; if by a priest or deacon, the ceremonies which follow Baptism are also to be observed, if there is time (canon 759, § 1).

It is disputed whether, if the danger of death is fairly remote, the ceremonies preceding Baptism also must be performed. Now this is denied quite probably, because the canon speaks only of the subsequent ceremonies, and perhaps does so in order that every danger that someone might die before Baptism may be radically forestalled.

3. Outside danger of death, the local Ordinary cannot permit private Baptism, unless the case concerns heretics who in adult age are baptized conditionally (canon 759, §§ 1 and 2). In such a case even the ceremonies which follow Baptism can be omitted.

¹ Here note canon 98, § 1: "Among the various Catholic rites one belongs to that rite with whose ceremonies he was baptized, unless perhaps Baptism was conferred by a minister of another rite by fraud, or because of grave necessity, when a priest of the proper rite could not be present, or by apostolic dispensation, when the faculty was given that someone be baptized in a certain rite, yet without remaining ascribed to it." Moreover, one who, at the prayers of the parents, contrary to the prescription of canon 756, was baptized by a minister of another rite, belongs to the rite in which he ought to have been baptized according to the prescription of canon 756. Thus the Pontifical Commission, 16 October 1919 (A.A.S. 1919, p. 476).

² 25 August 1880 (*Collectanea*, n. 1538).

³ In some places it has been conceded that the interrogations be made in the vernacular language alone.

80 II. The obligation of the rites and ceremonies is grave from its genus. Hence it would be mortal to omit a ceremony of greater moment, on account of a special end or signification. Such are the use of consecrated water, the anointing both that which must be performed before and that which must be performed after Baptism, the use of oil and chrism consecrated in the present year, insufflation, the imposition of saliva and salt, the profession of faith, and the threefold ablution. Besides, several ceremonies of lesser moment omitted together can coalesce into grave matter (St. Alphonsus, VI, 107, question 5a, 141, 142).

81 III. Ceremonies to be supplied. 1. Ceremonies which in the conferral of Baptism were omitted for any reason whatever are to be supplied as soon as possible in church, unless the case concerns heretics who in adult age have been baptized conditionally and privately by permission of the Ordinary (canon 759, § 3). Now the ceremonies from the Baptism of infants are used if Baptism was conferred in infancy, even if the supplying is done in adult age;¹ otherwise those from the Baptism of adults are used.

2. When Baptism is repeated conditionally, the ceremonies, if indeed they were omitted in the former Baptism, are to be supplied, except in the case in which an adult heretic is baptized conditionally and privately by permission of the Ordinary; but if they were used in the former Baptism, they can be repeated in the second or omitted (canon 760). The same things seem to have to be said of the case in which a heretic, as one certainly baptized invalidly in heresy, is baptized absolutely.

3. If a heretic validly baptized is converted to the faith, the ceremonies likewise are to be supplied, unless for a reasonable cause it seems otherwise to the local Ordinary.²

Note. From baptismal vows no new obligation arises.

¹ Cf. Sacred Congregation of Rites, 27 August 1836, n. 2743, III.

² Roman Ritual, title II, chapter 3, n. 12.

Section II. On Sponsors

82 I. Notion. Sponsors, or receivers, are those who lift the baptized person from the sacred font or receive him from the minister of Baptism. St. Thomas sets forth the reason for this institution in these words: "Spiritual regeneration, which is effected through Baptism, is in a certain way likened to carnal generation; hence it is said in 1 Peter 2: 'As newborn infants, desire the rational milk without guile.' Now in carnal generation the recently born little child needs a nurse and teacher; hence also in the spiritual generation of Baptism someone is required who performs the office of nurse and teacher,

by informing and instructing him, as one newly received into the faith, concerning those things which pertain to the faith and Christian life" (III, q. 67, a. 7).

83 II. The obligation of taking a sponsor. 1. From the most ancient custom of the Church, no one is to be baptized solemnly unless, so far as it can be done, he has his sponsor (canon 762, § 1; Council of Trent, session 24, chapter 2, on reform of marriage). Also in private Baptism a sponsor is to be used if one can easily be had; if he was not present, he is to be used when the baptismal ceremonies are supplied (canon 762, § 2). When Baptism is repeated conditionally, the same sponsor is to be used, so far as it can be done, who perhaps was present at the former Baptism; outside this case, in conditional Baptism a sponsor is not necessary (canon 763, § 1).

It is said, so far as it can be done; hence Baptism is rather to be conferred without a sponsor than to be deferred for a long time because of the lack of a sponsor.

2. Only one sponsor, even of a different sex from the one to be baptized, or at most one male and one female, are to be used (canon 764). It makes no difference of what sex the sponsor is; but if several are used, they must be one male and one female; more than two cannot be admitted.
3. The obligation of taking a godfather or godmother is grave if solemn Baptism is in question; if private Baptism or the supplying of ceremonies is the matter under discussion, the obligation seems only light, just as also the obligation of using the same sponsor if Baptism is repeated conditionally. He who takes two male sponsors or two female sponsors sins lightly if both are of the same sex as the one to be baptized; gravely, if they are of different sex, because kinships are multiplied contrary to the mind of the Church (St. Alphonsus, VI, 155, 159).

84 III. The requisites for someone to be taken as sponsor. 1. In order that someone be validly constituted sponsor, it is required: 1. that he be baptized, have attained the use of reason, and have the intention of carrying out that office; 2. that he belong to no heretical or schismatical sect, nor be excommunicated or infamous with infamy of law by condemnatory or declaratory sentence, or excluded from legitimate acts, nor be a cleric deposed or degraded; 3. that he be neither father nor mother nor spouse of the person to be baptized; 4. that he be designated by the person to be baptized himself, or by his parents or tutors, or, these failing, by the minister; 5. that in the act of Baptism he physically hold or touch the one to be baptized, either by himself or by a procurator, or immediately lift or receive him from the sacred font or from the hands of the one baptizing (canon 765).

Note. If more are designated than the law permits, some judge that all those designated become sponsors whether they touch simultaneously or successively, unless it is known who were designated first, in which case only these are constituted sponsors. Others with St. Alphonsus (VI, 154, doubt 2) distinguish and teach: if they touch successively, the first man and the first woman who touch become sponsors, not others; if all touch simultaneously, according to some no one, according to St. Alphonsus all are constituted sponsors.

2. In order that someone be licitly admitted as a sponsor, it is required: 1. that he have reached the fourteenth year of his age, unless for a just cause something else seems good to the minister; 2. that he not be excommunicated or excluded from legitimate acts or infamous with infamy of law because of a notorious delict, even though no sentence has intervened, nor be interdicted or otherwise publicly criminal or infamous with infamy of fact;¹ 3. that he know the rudiments of the faith; 4. that in no religious institute he be a novice or professed, unless necessity urges and

the permission of at least the local superior is expressly had;² 5. that he not be constituted in sacred orders, unless the express permission of his own Ordinary is added (canon 766). It was said licitly, which does not prevent all those excluded from being able to be validly taken, with the things saved which were set forth under 1. Besides, whenever someone must be rejected, he can nevertheless, if otherwise grave inconvenience would follow, be permitted to assist at the Baptism as a witness, omitting the things which belong to sponsors³ (St. Alphonsus, VI, 156). For the rest, one who is ignorant that touching must be done is very easily kept from touching; commonly it suffices not to warn him. Finally, the minister of Baptism, if he wishes to act as sponsor, which is licit for him,⁴ should choose a procurator who fulfills the parts of the sponsor, namely so that the observance of the ceremonies may be better provided for.

3. In doubt whether someone can validly or licitly be admitted to the office of sponsor or not, the pastor, if time permits, should consult the Ordinary (canon 767).

¹ By common law there are not excluded, for example, those who do not assist at Mass on Sunday or have neglected, even several times, the precept of annual confession or of Easter Communion. For the rest, the same persons are not included in different regions under the name of publicly criminal persons or persons infamous with infamy of fact.

² Nor can a religious who has been made bishop undertake the office of sponsor (cf. canon 627, 2).

³ Holy Office, 9 December 1745; 5 July 1878 (*Collectanea de Propaganda Fide*, nn. 345, 447, 1495).

⁴ Sacred Congregation of Rites, 14 January 1873.

85 IV. The choice of sponsors per se belongs to the person to be baptized, if he is his own master; otherwise to the parents or tutors; but if these are lacking, to the pastor (canon 765, 4).¹ Therefore it is prohibited to the pastor, and indeed under grave obligation, to reject suitable persons chosen by the person to be baptized or by his parents or tutors, and to substitute others; indeed this kind of illegitimate substitution seems to be invalid, since someone, in order validly to be a sponsor, must be designated by the minister only when the person to be baptized and his parents or tutors are lacking (cf. canon 765, 4).

Note. The Provincial Council of Utrecht wisely admonishes:² "If the pastor understands before Baptism that an unworthy person has been chosen by the parents for the office of sponsor, let him teach them the law of the Church in time, and prudently induce them to choose another. If an unworthy person presents himself unexpectedly, let the priest signify to him in an honorable manner that the law of the Church does not permit him to be admitted, but let him by no means rebuke him before others; indeed, let him easily permit him to assist as a witness; and lest, Baptism having been delayed to another time, the infant be exposed to danger of dying without it, let him baptize even without any sponsor."

¹ Council of Trent, session 24, chapter 2, on reform of marriage; Roman Ritual, 2, chapter 1, n. 24.

² Page 76.

86 V. The effects of sponsorship. 1. From Baptism only the one baptizing and the sponsor contract spiritual kinship with the baptized person (canon 768). This kinship, concerning which more fully in the treatise on Matrimony, is not contracted: 1. if a sponsor is used in supplying the ceremonies (canon 762, § 2); 2. when Baptism is repeated conditionally, neither by the sponsor who was present at the former Baptism nor by him who was present at the later one, unless the same sponsor was used in both Baptisms (canon 763, § 3).

2. The kinship which has been contracted constitutes an impediment diriment of marriage between the baptized person and the one baptizing and the sponsor (canon 1079), and causes a sin of lust committed by the aforesaid persons with the baptized person to be spiritual incest (St. Alphonsus, VI, 146, 147). Now "the receivers are to be admonished concerning the spiritual kinship which they contracted with the baptized person";¹ likewise concerning the impediment that has arisen.
3. It belongs to sponsors, from the office undertaken, to have the spiritual child perpetually commended to themselves, and, in those things which concern instruction in the Christian life, diligently to see to it that he show himself throughout his whole life such as, in the solemn ceremony, they promised he would be (canon 769). The obligation of sponsors is grave, but it binds only when parents or tutors are lacking. Practically, sponsors, where the baptized are "nourished among Catholic Christians, can sufficiently be excused from this care, presuming that they are diligently instructed by their parents; yet if in any way they should perceive the contrary, they would be bound, according to their manner, to spend care on the salvation of their spiritual children" (St. Thomas, q. 67, a. 8).

¹ Roman Ritual, title II, chapter 2, n. 31.

Section III. On the Time and Place of Conferring Baptism

87 I. Time. 1. Private Baptism, when necessity urges, is to be administered at any time and place (canon 771).

2. Even solemn Baptism can be administered on any day; nevertheless it is fitting that the Baptism of adults, according to the most ancient rite, be conferred, if it can conveniently be done, on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost, especially in metropolitan or cathedral churches (canon 772).

88 II. Place. 1. Private Baptism, when necessity urges, is to be administered at any time and place (canon 771). The same holds for private Baptism which is conferred outside urgent necessity, that is, for Baptism which, by permission of the Ordinary, is administered privately and conditionally to an adult heretic (cf. canon 759, § 2); and for every conditional Baptism which is conferred without ceremonies (cf. canon 760); if the ceremonies are supplied, this is to be done in a church or public oratory (cf. canon 759, § 3).

2. With respect to solemn Baptism, the following hold:

a) The proper place for administering solemn Baptism is the baptistery in a church or public oratory (canon 773). Hence every parochial church, any contrary statute or privilege or custom being revoked and reprobated, is to have a baptismal font, saving the legitimate cumulative right already acquired by other churches (canon 774, § 1).¹ Besides, for the convenience of the faithful the local Ordinary can permit or order that a baptismal font be placed also in another church or public oratory within the boundaries of the parish (canon 774, § 2).

b) If the person to be baptized, because of the distance of places or other circumstances, cannot approach or be transferred to the parish church, or to another church which enjoys the right of a font, without grave inconvenience or danger, solemn Baptism can and must be conferred by the pastor in the nearest church or public oratory within the boundaries of the parish, even though these lack a baptismal font (canon 775).

c) But in private houses solemn Baptism must not be administered, except in these circumstances: 1. if those to be baptized are the children or grandchildren of those who actually hold supreme rule over peoples or have the right of succession to the throne, whenever they have duly requested this; 2. if the local Ordinary, according to his prudent judgment and conscience, has judged that it should be conceded in some extraordinary case for a just and reasonable cause (canon 776, § 1).² In the cases mentioned, Baptism is to be conferred in the chapel of the house or at least in another decent place, and with baptismal water blessed in the usual way (canon 776, § 2).

In places of the missions, where Catholics live far from a church and infants cannot be brought to the church without great dangers and inconveniences, in those places, I say, the permission to baptize solemnly at home seems to persist.³

Note. Let pastors see to it that a Christian name be imposed on the one who is baptized; but if they cannot obtain this, let them add to the name imposed by the parents the name of some Saint, and write both names in the book of the baptized (canon 761). This addition can be made in a low voice.⁴ Note, however, that there are many names of saints which occur rarely, or have been taken from other languages and altered.

¹ The Pontifical Commission, 12 November 1922, reply to IV, declared that canon 774, § 1 is to be understood so that a church which has the right of a font cumulatively with other parochial churches of the whole city obtains it also before parochial churches newly erected in the city with a baptismal font. But the cumulative right of a font cannot in future be obtained by custom, which must be called corruption. A church which before the promulgation of the Code had an exclusive right of font before other parochial churches, after the promulgation of the Code and the erection of a font in the same churches according to the prescription of the cited canon, obtains only a cumulative right, saving the prescription of canon 778 (A.A.S. 1922, p. 662). Canon 778 prescribes that the pastor of the baptized person be informed.

² The Sacred Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments, 22 July 1925 (A.A.S. 1925, p. 452), to the question "whether the practice is conformable to law according to which infants who are not in danger of death, but cannot be transferred to the church without danger, are solemnly baptized at home by the pastor or by another priest with the pastor's permission," responded that it is conformable to law that, if the infant is not in danger of death but cannot without danger be transferred to the church according to canon 775, the Ordinary, by force of canon 776, § 1, n. 2, can permit, according to his prudent judgment and conscience, for a just and reasonable cause, in some extraordinary case, that Baptism be solemnly administered at home; but judging the gravity of the extraordinary case is left to the prudence and conscience of the Ordinary himself in individual cases.

³ Sacred Congregation of Rites, 4 February 1871 (n. 3234, reply to III).

⁴ Holy Office, June 1883.

Section IV. On the Notation and Proof of Baptism Conferred

89 I. Notation. 1. Pastors must carefully and without any delay enter in the baptismal book the names of the baptized, with mention made of the minister, the parents and sponsors, and the place and day of the Baptism conferred (canon 777, § 1).

But where illegitimate children are concerned, the mother's name is to be inserted if her maternity is publicly established, or if she herself spontaneously asks this in writing or before two witnesses; likewise the name of the father, provided he himself spontaneously asks this of the pastor either in writing or before two witnesses, or is known from a public authentic document; in other cases the newborn is to be inscribed as the child of an unknown father or of unknown parents (canon 777, §

2). Moreover the Pontifical Commission responded¹ that the names of parents are to be inserted in such a way that every occasion of infamy is avoided; but in particular cases recourse must be had to the Sacred Congregation of the Council.

2. If Baptism was administered neither by the proper pastor nor in his presence, the minister should as soon as possible inform the pastor of the baptized person by reason of domicile concerning the Baptism conferred (canon 778). "If the baptized person lacks a domicile, the pastor of the quasi-domicile, or, if he was without fixed domicile, the pastor of the place of Baptism, seems to be the one to be informed."²

3. The use of the baptismal book is prescribed under grave obligation, regard being had, namely, to the grave end of the law, that is, the proof of Baptism received, which, if the baptismal register is lacking, would sometimes be impossible.

¹ 14 July 1922, reply to VIII (A.A.S. 1922, p. 528).

² Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, n. 55.

90 **II. Proof.** To prove Baptism conferred, if prejudice is done to no one, one witness beyond all exception suffices, or the oath of the baptized person himself, if he received Baptism in adult age (canon 779).

Dissertation III. On the Reception of Baptism

Part I. On the Person Receiving

The subject capable of Baptism is every and only wayfaring human being not yet baptized (canon 745, § 1; On the Sacraments in general, n. 38). Having noted these things about the subject generally, we shall speak specifically about the different subjects.

Section I. On Infants

91 Preliminary Note. When Baptism is in question, under the name of little children or infants, according to the norm of canon 88, § 3, come those who have not yet attained the use of reason, and to these are reckoned the insane from infancy, in whatever age they may be constituted¹ (canon 745, § 2, 1).

I. Infants before the use of reason can be baptized validly. This is of faith from the Council of Trent.²

II. Infants must already be baptized before the use of reason. Now:

1. It is clear that this is prescribed under grave obligation and by divine law itself if danger of death is imminent.
2. Outside danger of death, there is the obligation of baptizing them as soon as possible, as is clear from canon 770 in these words: Infants are to be baptized as soon as possible; and pastors and preachers are frequently to remind the faithful of this grave obligation of theirs.

It is disputed how much delay, if the infant is healthy, is to be considered grave. Some say fifteen or more days, others one or another day, others with St. Alphonsus (VI, 118) require a delay which exceeds ten or eleven days; this estimation of the holy Doctor is to some extent confirmed by the Instruction of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation concerning the visitations of bishops.³

¹ Those of seven years are presumed to have the use of reason; those not yet seven are presumed not to have the use of reason (canon 88, § 3).

² Session 5, canon 4.

³ N. 148 (A.A.S., vol. II, p. 39).

Section II. On Abortive Fetuses

An abortive fetus is a fetus prematurely projected from the womb (vol. I, n. 733).

92 I. Every abortive fetus brought forth at any time must be baptized, unless it is wholly certain that he is dead (cf. canon 747). The reason is that in the case it is at least somewhat probable that a wayfaring human being is present (vol. I, n. 732).

The same must be said of everything which is cast out from the womb of a pregnant woman and concerning which it is doubted whether it is a fetus or a mole, as it is called. For the rest, even if it seems to be a mole, this should be carefully dissected, so that it may be inspected whether perhaps a fetus lies hidden in it; likewise, if a pregnant woman suffers a flow of blood, it is expedient that the flow be moved and palpated, because sometimes something is found in it concerning which it is rightly doubted whether it is a fetus (St. Alphonsus, VI, 124).

II. Abortive fetuses, brought forth at any time, if they certainly live, are to be baptized absolutely; if doubtfully, conditionally¹ (canon 747). If the fetus brought forth is still enclosed in membranes or in a vesicle, proceed in this way: Place the vesicle on a table or in a basin or dish, and place a bowl of water nearby. Then first either pour some water over the vesicle or immerse the vesicle itself in the water of the bowl,² meanwhile saying: **If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit**. Then, holding the vesicle somewhat obliquely in the bowl of water, open it with the thumb and index finger of each hand, so that the liquid flows out from it. Then again say, moving the fetus somewhat here and there in the water: **If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit**. Afterward you must again draw the fetus out of the water (n. 54).

Note 1. They say that even very small abortive fetuses sometimes preserve life for a longer time, indeed for several days. Nevertheless there is danger that they may soon die; hence inquiry into whether the fetus is alive should not be prolonged too much.

Note 2. The things explained above must be especially inculcated to midwives and mothers. And although pastors are bound more than others to this instruction, nevertheless confessors too, from a confession heard, can and not rarely must prudently take occasion to ask whether they have been sufficiently instructed.

¹ Before the sixth month there can scarcely be certainty about the life of the fetus, whether it exists in the womb or is brought forth before the sixth month; in the latter case it is either dead or appears dead. Today, however, by means of the stethoscope the pulsations of the heart can ordinarily be perceived from the fifth month.

² Therefore the vesicle is not immediately ruptured, but is first immersed in water and cut there, namely because rupture outside water, on account of the contact of air, according to some, though others deny this, can be so dangerous that the fetus dies before Baptism has been conferred.

Section III. On Fetuses Not Yet Brought Forth

93 No one enclosed in the womb of the mother is to be baptized until there is probable hope that, duly brought forth, he can be baptized (canon 746, § 1). Therefore a fetus not yet duly brought forth cannot be baptized unless, Baptism being delayed, he will probably die without Baptism.

When the case occurs, proceed in this way:

I. If the infant has put forth the head and danger of death is imminent, let him be baptized on the head; nor afterward, if he comes forth alive, is he to be baptized again conditionally (canon 746, § 2).

II. If he has put forth another member and danger is imminent, let him be baptized on that member, however small it may be, for example on a finger or toe (cf. canon 746, § 3). But if you receive the occasion of baptizing again on a more principal member, for example on the hand or foot, then on that member you must baptize again, and indeed as often as you can on a member more worthy than before, for example on the breast or back or shoulders, until you have baptized on the head; for only then, when you have duly baptized on the cleansed head, is one of the Baptisms certainly valid. But if after you have baptized on a finger or toe you can immediately baptize on the head, then omit the other members which I have named between these two extremes and baptize immediately on the head.

Note. In cases in which you cannot immediately baptize on the head, each time in washing the member you must use these words: **If you can be baptized, I baptize you**, etc.¹

III. If the infant is entirely hidden in the womb, he is to be baptized conditionally. If afterward he is brought forth, he must again be baptized conditionally (canon 746, § 5).² A fetus enclosed in the womb is to be baptized conditionally, both because in practice it will be doubtful whether the infant was truly washed or was washed on the head, and because it is somewhat doubted whether a human being not yet born according to common estimation can be reborn.³ But, "just as original sin is contracted by generation alone, so likewise, in order that a man be regenerated by grace, it suffices that he has already been generated. And therefore Baptism is called regeneration by the Council, which does not require birth from the womb, since this is not called generation, but only that nativity which takes place in the womb and by which man becomes a son of Adam" (St. Alphonsus, VI, 107). For the rest, note:

1. The obligation of baptizing an infant in the womb of the mother before the completed fifth month of pregnancy will rarely be present. The reason is that on the one hand there is often great doubt about the life of the infant and about the required washing having been performed; on the other hand intrauterine Baptism, because of the destruction of the afterbirth membranes, will both increase the danger to the mother and bring on the danger of accelerating the death of the offspring.⁴ After the completed fifth month of pregnancy the obligation can more easily be present.
2. Concerning the manner of baptizing a fetus in the womb of the mother, I note: the infant, the afterbirth membranes having been perforated,⁵ can be reached and baptized by means either of a small syringe filled with water, or of a sponge filled with water, or of a moistened finger.⁶ Water mixed with corrosive mercuric chloride is usually used, and this licitly where otherwise there is true danger of disease for the mother (n. 53).

Note. It is clear that intrauterine Baptism must commonly be conferred by a physician or by a midwife, both because of decency and because of the difficulty and dangers attached to the matter. But if on the one hand it is foreseen that the infant will probably die in the womb, and on the other hand intrauterine Baptism cannot be conferred, it sometimes remains that the infant be extracted from the womb and, once extracted, baptized, absolutely indeed if he certainly lives, if doubtfully, conditionally (canon 746, § 4).⁷ Now the infant is extracted by means of some incision of the mother, especially by Caesarean section, as it is called. Concerning these we shall speak in a scholion.

¹ Theoretically, more perfectly thus: In cases in which you cannot immediately baptize on the head, the first time in washing the member you must use these words: **If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit**; at other times: **If you are not baptized and can be baptized, I...** etc. (cf. Roman Ritual, title II, chapter 1, n. 16; canon 746, §§ 2 and 3).

² Sacred Congregation of the Council, 12 July 1794 and 16 March 1877.

³ For the opinion which holds that an infant in the womb of the mother cannot validly be baptized, St. Thomas cannot be cited; for he supposes that Baptism cannot be conferred except by washing the body of the mother, so that he does not deny that the infant is validly baptized if the water touches him immediately (cf. St. Thomas, III, q. 68, a. 11).

⁴ Cf. Capelmann-Bergmann, *Medicina pastoralis*, II, p. 109; *Pastoral-Medizin*, p. 243; Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis*, II, n. 16.

⁵ Baptism first on the afterbirth membranes is omitted, because contact of air is not feared, contrary to the case in which a fetus already brought forth is to be baptized. The perforation of the afterbirth membranes, so that the fetus

may be baptized rather certainly than very doubtfully over the membranes, is quite probably licit, because it yields equally immediately to a good effect, namely the possibility of baptizing the fetus, and to an evil, that is, the death of the infant to follow from the outpouring of the amniotic fluid.

⁶ Cf. Capelmann-Bergmann, *Pastoral-Medizin*, p. 242.

⁷ Roman Ritual, II, chapter 1, n. 20.

Scholion. On Caesarean Section and Other Incisions

Besides Caesarean section, symphysiotomy, pubiotomy, and combined operations are distinguished.¹

¹ Cf. Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis*, I, n. 308 and following; Capelmann-Bergmann, *Pastoral-Medizin*, p. 57 and following.

94 **I. Notions.** 1. Caesarean section is an operation by which, the maternal womb having been cut, the fetus is extracted from the womb. It is called Caesarean section from Julius, who was brought into the light by cutting and thence was called Caesar. Now Caesarean section can be done either on a living mother or on the body of a mother recently dead.

2. Symphysiotomy is an operation by which the cartilage, the symphysis, which joins the two pubic bones, is cut, whereby it happens that the width of the pelvis is increased and the fetus can more easily come forth into the light.

3. Pubiotomy is an operation by which one or both pubic bones are cut, and in that way the exit of the fetus is rendered easier.

4. Combined operations are constituted by symphysiotomy together with artificial premature delivery.¹

¹ Cf. Antonelli, loc. cit.

95 **II. Morality.** 1. Caesarean section or another incision of the living mother, according to the circumstances:

a) Is licit if there is a well-founded hope of saving both the mother and the offspring, and by the section the hope of baptizing the offspring is increased.¹ It is said:

1. If there is a well-founded hope of saving both the mother and the offspring; for otherwise the section would involve homicide. "Evils are not to be done," says St. Thomas, "that goods may come, as is said in Romans 3:8; and therefore a man ought not to kill the mother in order to baptize the child" (III, q. 68, a. 11, ad 3; St. Alphonsus, VI, 106). Now hope of saving the offspring is not present except after 28 weeks from conception; before that he is not viable. For the rest, observe that hope of performing the operation with a happy outcome is present today much more easily than formerly because of the progress of surgical art.²

2. And by the section the hope of baptizing the offspring is increased. For it is licit for the mother to expose herself to danger of death so that the spiritual salvation of the offspring may be better provided for.

b) It is obligatory, that is, it must be sustained by the mother, if: 1. there is a well-founded hope of saving the mother and the offspring; and 2. by the section the hope of baptizing the offspring is notably increased. The reason is that the mother is bound to prefer the eternal life of the offspring to her own temporal life. Now since the infant can commonly be baptized either in the womb of the

living mother, or after, the mother being dead, he has been cut out, therefore section of the living mother will very rarely be obligatory. If the case obtains, prudence will commonly require that the section be urged upon the mother rather than imposed.

2. Section on the body of a dead mother:³

a) Is laudably done whenever there is even the least hope of extracting a living fetus. Now some hope is already had about the fortieth day from conception, indeed even before, since they narrate that it has happened that fetuses have been extracted alive at the assigned time.⁴

b) Is obligatory, and indeed under grave obligation, whenever there is probable hope of extracting a living fetus. Now probable hope seems to be present after about the completed fourth month from conception.⁵ But the obligation once begun "perseveres until the morally certain death of the offspring... How long life can be preserved for infants in the womb of a deceased mother cannot be determined: this depends much on the character of the illness from which the pregnant mother died; but there is no doubt that a fetus can survive the mother for an hour, indeed for several."⁶

¹ It suffices practically to note this; for there are also other cases in which the section is licit, for example if not only is there a well-founded hope of saving the mother and the offspring, but by the section the hope of saving the mother is increased, while the hope of baptizing the offspring is not diminished, etc.; but these cases cause no difficulty.

² *Nederlandsche Katholieke Stemmen*, 1907, p. 15.

³ Note that the death of the mother is not certainly established unless the first signs of putrefaction are present.

⁴ Cangiamilla, *Embryologia sacra*, book II, chapter 5.

⁵ Cf. Capelmann-Bergmann, op. cit., p. 62.

⁶ De Smet, *De Sacramentis*, n. 313. Cf. Ferreres, *Mort réelle et mort apparente*.

96 III. By whom is it to be performed? 1. Section of a living mother, as is clear, belongs only to an expert; one who is not an expert would become guilty of homicide.

2. Section of a mother not certainly dead, but perhaps only apparently dead:

a) If revival, as it is called, is held as possible, the section should be done by an expert if one is present, because otherwise the operation would expose the life of the mother to graver danger without sufficient reason. If an expert is lacking, generally whoever is sufficiently skilled is bound, or at least one who has hope of extracting the fetus; because then there is sufficient reason for admitting the graver danger. Now revival is held as possible if the mother succumbs after a crisis of the nerves, whether induced by vehement pain or by another cause.

b) If revival is held as impossible, namely if the mother is seen to succumb after longer pains, the section again belongs primarily to an expert, who can admit the danger of accelerating death if it is present. If an expert is lacking, generally another is bound, as was said above.

3. If the mother is certainly dead, the things just said under b) hold.

I said above, generally he is bound, etc., because authors do not agree to what extent even a priest must, or licitly can, perform the section, or command that it be performed, that is, by ordering see to it that it is done. Now he certainly cannot proceed to the said operation if the common good stands in the way, namely if, considering the circumstances, it must be feared that by this kind of manner of acting the priest would become less capable of promoting the salvation of people, or that other

inconveniences would arise from it for the faithful.¹ If danger to the common good certainly is not imminent, some judge that the priest is bound, because natural law, to which the decrees are not thought to be contrary, imposes the obligation. Others teach that he is prohibited from performing the section. They rely on decrees of the Holy Office.² The first decree indeed regards in itself circumstances in which the common good stood in the way; but the second, they say, which refers the petitioner to the first, seems to signify that a general prohibition is intended. Finally, others hold each opinion as truly doubtful, and consequently think that a priest can perform the section or command that it be performed, but is not bound. The matter seems truly doubtful to me also; but for that reason I think that natural law, as possessing priority, should prevail, or that the section is to be performed, except, of course, in the case in which danger to the common good stands in the way.

Corollary. All to whom the matter becomes known are per se bound prudently to see to it that the section is done, but especially relatives and the pastor. Therefore a surgeon should be called as quickly as possible, and meanwhile the uterus of the deceased mother should be kept warm.³ Nor should the section be omitted, even if a fairly notable time has elapsed from the death of the mother; for they narrate that it has happened that fetuses have survived the mother for 24, indeed for 48 hours and beyond.⁴ Hence a physician asserting that the fetus has certainly died should not easily be believed. Indeed Dr. Brillaud even contends: "Since medical science knows no sign by which it may be judged with certainty that the fetus is dead, the Caesarean operation after death must always be undertaken."⁵

¹ Civil laws commonly stand in the way.

² 15 February 1780 (*Collectanea*, n. 541) and 13 December 1899.

³ Older authors add that the mouth of the mother is to be opened; but according to physicians the infant does not breathe in the womb of the mother.

⁴ Eschbach, *Disputationes physico-theologicae*, p. 356.

⁵ In Eschbach, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

97 IV. The manner of performing the section. 1. The section is made from the navel to the genitals or pubic bone; but lest the intestines be injured, this precaution is to be used: once a small opening has been made, the operator immediately puts into it the index finger placed beneath the back of the scalpel or knife, and in the aforesaid manner cuts first the skin, then the other coverings which cover the intestines. When this has been done, the uterus, if the pregnancy is more advanced, will appear of itself; otherwise it will be found back behind the bladder. If this is filled with urine and impedes the finding of the uterus, let it be compressed by the hand and emptied.

2. The uterus, once found, is immediately cut, proceeding from the upper and anterior part to the lower; then the afterbirth membranes also are cut or ruptured, by which the fetus is enveloped.
3. The infant or fetus is extracted, and if certain or doubtful signs of life appear, he is to be baptized at once. If nevertheless danger of death is thought or feared to be present, the fetus is to be baptized before he is extracted.
4. After Baptism has been conferred, if the infant survives with hope of preservation, the umbilical cord is cut at a distance of two or three inches from the abdomen and is strongly tied with thread at a distance of one inch from the abdomen; when these things have been done, he is handed over to be nourished.¹

Question. What should be done by a confessor who, from the confession of a sick girl, discovers that she is pregnant?

Response 1. If the girl is already pregnant from about the fourth month, she is bound under grave obligation to see to it that after her death she be cut; nor is she excused on account of the loss of reputation. Therefore let the girl reveal her condition to a prudent person either by word of mouth, or let her hand over to him a writing to be read after death, in which she declares her pregnancy and her will that after death the infant be extracted and baptized.

Response 2. If the girl is ignorant of the grave obligation, and it is feared that, once taught, she will not obey it, let the confessor proceed only by persuading.

¹ Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis*, II, n. 57.

Section IV. On Monsters

98 **I. Monsters and prodigies** are always to be baptized at least conditionally (canon 748). Namely, if the monster has a head and breast, or at least a head, even if beast-like, it is certainly a human being; since it cannot be anything else, because there cannot be generation between a human being and a brute: hence it is to be baptized absolutely. Otherwise Baptism is to be conferred conditionally; this also holds concerning one about whom it is doubted whether or not he ought to be reckoned among monsters and prodigies (St. Alphonsus, VI, 125).

II. If the monster has two heads and two sufficiently distinct breasts, there is a double human being; hence a double Baptism is to be conferred. If nevertheless danger of death is imminent, both are to be baptized at once under the form: **I baptize you**, etc.

III. But in doubt whether there is one human being or several, one is to be baptized absolutely, the others conditionally (canon 748). In practice, proceed in this way:

1. If the doubt arises from the fact that the monster does not have two sufficiently distinct heads and two sufficiently distinct breasts, then first one must be baptized absolutely, and afterward the other conditionally in this way: **If you are not baptized, I...**, etc.
2. If the doubt arises from the fact that the monster has two heads and one breast, proceed in the same way as was said under 1.
3. If the doubt arises from the fact that the monster has two breasts and, apparently, only one head, then let the head be baptized absolutely, then each breast conditionally: **If you are not baptized, I...**, etc.¹

¹ Namely, if, as commonly happens, it is doubtful which breast belongs to the baptized head.

Section V. On Infants of Non-Catholics

99 An infant of non-Catholics, that is, of unbelievers, heretics, schismatics, and Catholics who have fallen into apostasy or heresy or schism, is licitly baptized:

I. When he is in such danger of life that it is prudently foreseen that he will die before he reaches the use of reason (canon 750, § 1), or when "it is very prudently doubted that, from the infirmity by which they are actually affected, they will not live, but will die before the age of discretion."¹

Therefore a probability founded on this, that in some place, for example, half of infants die before the use of reason, does not suffice; nor a probability arising from this, that in some region a contagious disease is raging and there is grave danger that the disease may be transferred to infants.² If it is doubted whether an infant who is in danger of death has reached the use of reason, "let the missionaries try to instruct them in the better way in which it can be done; otherwise let them be baptized conditionally."³

II. When the infant appears perpetually insane;⁴ in this case there can be no discussion of education properly so called (St. Alphonsus, VI, 130).

III. Outside the case of danger of death or insanity, the infant is licitly baptized, provided that his Catholic education is safeguarded: 1. if the parents or tutors, or at least one of them, consents; 2. if the parents, that is, father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, or tutors, are lacking, or have lost their right over him, or can in no way exercise it (canon 750, § 2). It is said:

1. **Provided that his Catholic education is safeguarded.** Now, considering the responses of the competent Authority,⁵ it suffices that, all things considered, the Catholic education be in some way safeguarded, or that, all things having been seen, a noteworthy hope of Catholic education shines forth. Here, however, note that this kind of hope is more easily present in the case in which either parent is Catholic and the Catholic party consents, than in the case in which each parent is non-Catholic.
2. **If the parents... consent;** and so even the consent of the mother alone or of a female tutor suffices. And this holds even if it is foreseen that the other parent will afterward see to it that the infant is baptized by a heretical minister.⁶ Now the said consent is required per se if it is a question of an infant of unbelievers. This is clear from the Instruction of Benedict XIV *Postremo mense*;⁷ the same is taught by the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide.⁸ But the reason seems to be that the Church, by conferring Baptism on the offspring of parents over whom she has no right, places that offspring in such a condition that it can and per se must be separated from the parents. But this seems to involve a violation of right (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 10, a. 12; St. Alphonsus, VI, 132). If the discussion concerns an infant of baptized non-Catholics, consent is not required per se, because the Church has a right over them as her subjects. It is, however, commonly required per accidens, because if it is lacking, hope of Catholic education will commonly be absent. Hence canon 751 declares that, with respect to infants of two heretics or schismatics, or of two Catholics who have fallen into apostasy or heresy or schism, generally the norms established by canon 750 are to be observed.
3. **If the parents... have lost their right over him, or can in no way exercise it.** The case would occur if the infant had been entrusted to a Catholic, or had been abandoned and received in a Catholic hospital or by a Catholic.⁹ But if the parents have entrusted the infant to a Catholic to be educated, per se he ought not afterward be returned to them, even if they ask for him back and the infant has not yet been baptized; since the prior offering and acceptance ought not afterward be rescinded to the prejudice of the eternal salvation of the one offered (St. Alphonsus, VII, 130).
4. Finally, it is permitted to baptize infants offered by unbelievers if the missionary has a well-founded motive for believing that their parents too will in the future seek Baptism.¹⁰

¹ Holy Office, 18 July 1894 (*Collectanea*, n. 1877); Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 15 February 1781.

² Instruction of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 17 April 1777, reply to VIII (*Collectanea*, n. 522).

³ Instruction of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 17 April 1777, reply to VIII (*Collectanea*, n. 522).

⁴ Holy Office, 18 July 1892.

⁵ Instruction of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 17 April 1777 (*Collectanea*, n. 522).

⁶ Cf. Holy Office, 12 October 1600; 29 November 1672, reply to I (*Collectanea*, n. 205); Instruction of the Holy Office, 1827; Holy Office, 6 July 1898, reply to IV (*Collectanea*, n. 2007).

⁷ 28 February 1747.

⁸ Holy Office, 29 November 1672, reply to I (*Collectanea*, n. 205).

⁹ The cited Instruction of Benedict XIV.

¹⁰ Holy Office, 11 December 1850, reply to IV (*Collectanea*, n. 1054).

100 Corollary I. An infant of non-Catholic parents, whether legitimately or illegitimately baptized, per se must be withdrawn from the care of the parents so that he may be educated Catholicly. But in practice the Church will not be able to use her right (St. Alphonsus, VI, 127, 128).

Corollary II. The fact that parents baptized Catholic live so non-Catholicly that there is little hope of Christian education is not a reason for refusing Baptism.¹ The same must be said of infants of Catholics who have given their name to socialism.

Corollary III. If a Catholic mother desires that the infant be baptized Catholicly, but the non-Catholic father wishes him to be baptized after some time by a heretical minister, proceed in this way: If the offspring will soon be baptized by a heretical minister, it is better to wait and afterward baptize the offspring conditionally. If one must wait longer, it is better to baptize the infant Catholicly at once. In the case, per se indeed, the heretical spouse is to be warned about the Baptism conferred; but if grave inconvenience stands in the way of warning, a second Baptism can be permitted. Besides, prudence will sometimes suggest that the Baptism be conferred by someone other than the pastor himself; let a Catholic and trustworthy person be chosen.

¹ Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 31 January 1796 (*Collectanea*, n. 625).

Section VI. On Adults

When Baptism is in question, those are considered adults who enjoy the use of reason (canon 745, § 2). Moreover:

101 I. Adults are bound, as soon as it can morally be done, to acquire sufficient instruction for themselves and to receive Baptism. If they are sufficiently instructed and rightly disposed and ask for it, per se they must be baptized, even if they are minors and their parents contradict it (canon 745, § 2). The reason is that with respect to eternal salvation they are in their own right (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 10, a. 12; St. Alphonsus, VI, 128). I said per se, since circumstances or even the common good sometimes require that Baptism be delayed.

The Holy Office,¹ to the question "whether a girl of ten years living in a monastery can safely be admitted to the profession of the Catholic faith, her heretical father being unwilling," responded: "Let the Vicar Apostolic first take care with all his strength to obtain the consent of the girl's father. If consent is not obtained, let him seriously weigh the inconveniences which are foreseen to arise from the admission of such a girl into the Church, both with respect to grave damage to the Catholic

school and mission; and insofar as no inconveniences, or only contemptible ones, are foreseen, let him admit her without delay; but insofar as grave inconveniences are foreseen as future, let him defer her admission to the formal and public profession of the Catholic faith, unless danger of death is imminent; and meanwhile let him take care to exhort her to persevere in her good purpose, and to pray God that He deign to remove all obstacles; and at the same time let him see to it that she continue in the monastery, so that in this way she may complete and perfect her Catholic education." Therefore great prudence is necessary, and in cases of this sort a new reason is found for observing canon 744, by force of which the Baptism of adults, where it can conveniently be done, is to be referred to the local Ordinary.

Corollary. Children baptized against the will or without the knowledge of their parents per se can, if they are exposed to dangers of faith, withdraw themselves from their parents and be helped in this by others; but prudence commonly prohibits these things from being put into practice, all the more because civil law commonly stands in the way.

¹ 16 July 1881.

102 II. With respect to the Baptism of dying adults, these things specifically must be noted:

1. A dying adult who can no longer ask for Baptism, but who either previously or in the present state with some probability manifested an at least more or less explicit intention of receiving Baptism, is to be baptized conditionally; if afterward he recovers and a doubt remains concerning the value of the Baptism conferred, Baptism is again to be conferred conditionally (cf. canons 752, § 3 and 754, § 3).
2. A dying adult who can no longer ask for Baptism, but who with some probability is judged contrite or attrite, or to have the will of employing the means of salvation, in our opinion can, but need not, be baptized conditionally if he more or less explicitly rejects Baptism, as if the case concerns a Jew (n. 41). If that does not obtain, per se he seems to be baptized conditionally (n. 41). I said per se, because prudence can prohibit this doctrine from being brought into practice.

Section VII. On the Insane and the Furious

103 I. The insane and the furious who are such from birth, or at least before attaining the use of reason, are to be baptized, even against the will of their parents insofar as prudence permits it (cf. canon 754, § 1; n. 99). Those who became insane or furious after the use of reason are to be treated as adults, and therefore cannot be baptized unless, before they became insane, they had the desire of receiving Baptism; but if it is certain or probable, even slightly, that this took place, they are to be baptized when danger of death is imminent (canon 754, § 3), or even during the course of life if it is rightly feared that, when danger of death is imminent, Baptism will be omitted.

II. Those who have lucid intervals, while they are in possession of their mind, are to be baptized if they wish (canon 754, § 2). They are also to be baptized, as was said concerning other insane persons, when danger of death is imminent, if before they became insane they showed a desire of receiving Baptism (canon 754, § 3).

III. One who labors under lethargy or frenzy is to be baptized only when awake and willing; but if danger of death threatens, let the things said concerning the insane and concerning those who have lucid intervals be observed (canon 754, § 4).

Scholion. On the Doubtfully Baptized

104 **I. Those doubtfully baptized or doubtfully validly baptized** must be rebaptized under condition whenever, after diligent examination has been instituted, a prudent doubt remains about the conferral and its validity (cf. canon 732, § 2). It is said:

1. **After diligent examination has been instituted.** The reason is that the examination instituted perhaps will procure sufficient certainty about the value of Baptism, so that, the examination being neglected, it would be rash and injurious to the sacrament to repeat Baptism immediately (St. Alphonsus, VI, 136 and following). Some authors indeed judged that those baptized by a layperson can be rebaptized even when no inquiry has been carried out; indeed there were synods which in such a case simply prescribed repetition. But that this opinion must be rejected is clear from the fact that it can happen that the value of Baptism conferred by a layperson is morally certain. Hence the said synods were afterward corrected, and Benedict XIV teaches that they are to be disapproved.¹
2. **Whenever a prudent doubt remains about the conferral and its validity.** With respect to proof of Baptism, canon 779 establishes: "To prove Baptism conferred, if prejudice is done to no one, one witness beyond all exception suffices, or the oath of the baptized person himself, if he received Baptism in adult age." But authors dispute what things for the most part are required so that one may be permitted to trust, with moral certainty, the testimony of a layperson concerning Baptism duly conferred. Some judge that it suffices that a physician or midwife, taught the method of baptizing, testifies in the particular case that he or she baptized duly, provided nothing occurs which weakens the testimony.² Others besides require that the physician or midwife of unimpaired reputation has often been found to baptize duly. Others require that the testimony of the layperson be confirmed by at least one witness. But the circumstances must be inspected, which certainly can be such that certainty about the value of Baptism is had, although the layperson has not often been found to have baptized duly, or his testimony is not confirmed by another witness. Nor do I think that this is simply denied by any author.³ Nevertheless midwives should be admonished that they baptize in the presence of one or another witness, who attends to the manner of baptizing, warns the midwife if she errs, and afterward can testify concerning Baptism duly conferred. The same must be applied in many regions to catechists, since very great is the levity of many peoples in asserting even grave matters.

Corollary I. Those who, a long time after Baptism received, begin to doubt whether they were duly baptized by a pastor or by a midwife should put away scruples. It must be judged that he was duly examined at the proper time, if it was necessary. Besides, according to many, one born of Catholic parents and educated among Catholics, although no testimony concerning Baptism exists, is not to be rebaptized. Nevertheless the presumption deduced from these things is today rather often destroyed by a contrary presumption in regions where negligence of parents is not rare, for example by easily deferring Baptism. Therefore if, after inquiry, a prudent doubt remains, Baptism is to be repeated under condition. Moreover, the sole reason that no positive testimony exists is not sufficient for repeating Baptism before ordination.⁴ Nor in the case of a mixed marriage, before the marriage, must the non-Catholic party be baptized under condition because of doubt about Baptism, if that party wishes to remain in heresy.⁵

Corollary II. Exposed and found infants, unless, the matter having been diligently investigated, their Baptism is established, are to be baptized under condition (canon 749). In practice they commonly must be baptized under condition, and this even if a slip is attached by which the conferral of Baptism is signified, unless the person who wrote the slip is both certainly known and held for certainly worthy of trust, or it is proved from another source that Baptism was duly conferred (St. Alphonsus, VI, 135).⁶ Considering the documents cited in the note, per se inquiry must first be made, unless there is danger in delay; in practice, however, in some regions it is not customary to do this. The things which have been said about exposed infants are also to be applied to infants abandoned by vagrant parents, and this even if they have already been born, for example, three or five or more years, unless there is indubitable certainty about Baptism received.

Corollary III. Those baptized by a layperson, for example by a physician or by a midwife, must not rarely be baptized under condition, because, when inquiry has been made, a doubt often remains. Except if a duly instructed, Catholic, sincere person of proven solidity affirms that he or she baptized duly. If the case concerns a non-Catholic person, some doubt will more easily remain; indeed if a hater of religion, for example a Jew, baptized, there can be reason for doubting due intention.

If an infant was baptized by a layperson, let the priest inquire: 1. what form he used; 2. whether the water was natural; onto what part it was poured; whether it touched the skin, or only the hair or the uncleanness of birth; whether it was poured in sufficient quantity, so that it flowed; whether he washed the infant and pronounced the form with sufficient simultaneity.

Corollary IV. Converted heretics commonly must be baptized under condition, because, when examination has been instituted, doubt about the value commonly remains. The Holy Office declared that examination must be instituted.⁷ Inquiry should be made whether the sect to which the newly converted person belonged holds Baptism in great esteem and is accustomed to take great care about the form and matter; whether the little minister is religious, and in what manner he was accustomed to baptize. When the matter has been examined, outside the case of imminent danger of death, the judgment of the Bishop must always be sought; he will judge in particular cases whether some probable doubt concerning validity underlies.

¹ *De Synodo dioeclesana*, book 7, chapter 6, n. 7.

² Benedict XIV, *De Synodo dioeclesana*, book 7, chapter 7, n. 11.

³ The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide on 8 September 1869 for the East Indies established: "In order that the missionary not be bound to baptize under condition those baptized by a trustworthy catechist, it is required that there be two witnesses who can testify that Baptism was legitimately conferred; excepting, however, certain cases in which, with the individual circumstances weighed, and with attention paid to the skill and probity of the catechist, to whom nevertheless trust is not to be granted too easily, it can happen that no probable doubt at all about the validity of Baptism arises, even if two witnesses were not present."

⁴ Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 30 September 1848 (*Collectanea*, n. 1034).

⁵ Holy Office, 13 April 1878.

⁶ Holy Office, 5 January 1724 (*Collectanea*, n. 299).

⁷ 20 November 1878 (*Collectanea*, n. 1504); 21 February 1883 (*Collectanea*, n. 1590).

105 II. The order to be observed in reconciling a heretic from the responses of the Holy Office is this:¹

1. If Baptism is conferred absolutely, no abjuration nor absolution is required, because the sacrament of regeneration washes away all things.
2. When Baptism has been judged valid, only the abjuration or profession of faith is received, which is followed by absolution from censures.
3. If Baptism is to be repeated under condition, it is permitted to proceed in a twofold order, namely:
 - a) Either thus: 1. Abjuration or profession of faith; 2. conditional Baptism; 3. sacramental confession with conditional absolution.
 - b) Or thus: 1. Abjuration or profession of faith; 2. sacramental confession without absolution; 3. conditional Baptism; 4. a summary repetition of the confession and conditional absolution.

With respect to abjuration, the Profession of Faith which is found at the beginning of the Code suffices; and it "is held juridically performed when it is made before the local Ordinary himself or his delegate and at least two witnesses" (canon 2314, § 2).

¹ 20 July 1859 (*Collectanea*, n. 1178); 2 December 1874 (*Collectanea*, n. 1426).

Part II. On the Manner of Receiving Baptism

With respect to the reception of Baptism, both valid and licit, we refer to those things which we noted in the treatise On the Sacraments in general (n. 39 and following). Nevertheless, it is pleasing to enlarge what was said about licit reception with these things concerning the Baptism of an adult. Therefore in an adult to be baptized there are required:

106 **I. Faith.** This is clear from these words of Christ in Mark 16:16: "He who believes and has been baptized will be saved." Now explicit faith is required in those things which certainly or probably must be believed by necessity of means: in those certainly to be believed, because otherwise the sacrament would certainly be received fruitlessly; in those probably to be believed, because it would probably be received fruitlessly (vol. I, n. 488).

107 **II. Instruction,** according to these things in canon 752:

1. An adult is not to be baptized unless knowing and willing and well instructed (§ 1).
2. But in danger of death, if he cannot be instructed more diligently in the principal mysteries of faith, it is sufficient, for Baptism to be conferred, that he in some way show that he assents to them and seriously promise that he will observe the commandments of the Christian religion (§ 2).
3. Indeed, if because of impending death or other circumstances instruction cannot be premised, nevertheless Baptism is to be conferred, even if explicit faith is lacking in those things which are only probably to be believed by necessity of means.
4. Finally, if it is doubted whether a dying person has reached the state of discretion, let him be instructed in the better way in which it can be done.¹

¹ Holy Office, 18 July 1892, reply to IV (*Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, 1897, p. 95).

108 **III. Attrition, and indeed supernatural attrition,** concerning mortal sins, if any have been committed by the one to be baptized (canon 752, § 1). Habitual attrition suffices, that is, attrition elicited and not retracted. Attrition cannot be had concerning original sin; nevertheless a certain displeasure about it is required. Contrition and attrition are "sorrow regarding and in some way breaking down the hardness of the will; and therefore they can exist only concerning those sins which come upon us from the hardness of our will; and because original sin has not been introduced by our will, but contracted from the origin of a vitiated nature, therefore concerning it there cannot be contrition, properly speaking, but only displeasure or sorrow" (St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 2, a. 2). The required displeasure is always had in him who supplies the other requisites.

Hope and initial love are also required; but these too are always found in him who enjoys the dispositions explained.

109 **IV.** It is fitting that both the priest who is about to baptize adults and the adults themselves, if they are healthy, be fasting. Unless grave and urgent causes stand in the way, a baptized adult should immediately assist at the sacrifice of the Mass and receive Holy Communion (canon 753).¹

Corollary. Confession of sins is not to be imposed on an adult to be baptized absolutely. Nevertheless it is usefully instituted, so that the one to be baptized may be admonished about vices

and better disposed for Baptism (St. Thomas, III, q. 68, a. 6). Nor are satisfactory works to be imposed, because Baptism is ordered to removing every debt both of guilt and of punishment.

¹ Roman Ritual, title 2, chapter 3, n. 7.