

MANUAL OF MORAL THEOLOGY

by Ludovicus Wouters, C.SS.R.

Emeritus Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology

VOLUME III

On the Virtue of Chastity and on the Opposite Vices (1928)

Bruges: Carolus Beyaert, Pontifical Publisher, 1928 • The Latin is in the public domain.
The English translation is our own, made from the 1928 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.

CONTENTS

Analytical Index (as printed)	4
Proemium	5
On the Virtue of Chastity and on the Opposite Vices	6
Admonition	6
Preliminary Notions nn. 1–13	6
Book I. On Chastity Generally nn. 14–80	11
Part I. On Chastity Insofar as It Regards Venereal Things nn. 14–68	12
Section I. On the Virtue Itself of Chastity nn. 14–24	12
Section II. On the Opposite Vice, or Lust nn. 25–68	20
Chapter I. On Lust Generally nn. 25–30	20
Chapter II. On Natural Consummated Lust nn. 31–47	25
§ 1. On Fornication nn. 32–34	26
§ 2. On Adultery nn. 35–37	30
§ 3. On Incest nn. 38–39	31
§ 4. On Carnal Sacrilege nn. 40–42	33
§ 5. On *Stuprum*, or Seduction nn. 43–44	34
§ 6. On Rape nn. 45–47	36
Chapter III. On Unnatural Consummated Lust nn. 48–61	37
Article I. On Pollution nn. 49–51	37
Article II. On Sodomy nn. 52–54	40
Article III. On Bestiality nn. 55–56	42
Article IV. On Unnatural Intercourse with a Person of Diverse Sex nn. 57–61	43
Scholion I. On Some Other Modes of Lying Together nn. 59–61	44
Scholion II. On Canonical Penalties Against the Lustful	44
Chapter IV. On Non-Consummated Lust nn. 62–68	45
Scholion. On Indirectly Voluntary Lust nn. 65–68	47
Part II. On Chastity Insofar as It Regards Acts which Are Ordered to Venereal Things, or on Pudicity nn. 69–80	52
Section I. On the Virtue Itself of Pudicity n. 69	52
Section II. On the Opposite Vice, or Immodesty nn. 70–80	52
Chapter I. Principles nn. 70–71	52
Chapter II. Applications nn. 72–80	53
Article I. On Looks n. 73	53
Article II. On Touches n. 74	55
Article III. On Kisses n. 75	56
Article IV. On Speeches and Songs nn. 76–80	56
Scholion I. On Hypersexuality, Contrary Sexuality, and Sexual Perversion nn. 77–79	57

Scholion II. On Remedies Against Lust	n. 80	58
Book II. On Conjugal Chastity in Particular	nn. 81–139	60
Part I. On the Lawful Acts of Spouses	nn. 81–103	61
Section I. On Conjugal Intercourse	nn. 81–100	61
Chapter I. On the Lawfulness of Conjugal Intercourse	nn. 81–95	61
Article I. On the End	n. 82	61
Article II. On Place and Manner, or Position	n. 83	62
Article III. On the Absence of an Impediment	nn. 84–88	63
§ 1. On a Promise Made to the Partner	nn. 84–85	63
§ 2. On a Vow of Chastity		63
§ 3. On Impotence for Intercourse	nn. 86–87	64
§ 4. On a Doubtfully Valid Marriage	n. 88	66
Article IV. On the Absence of Harm to Be Averted	nn. 89–95	66
Chapter II. On the Obligation of Conjugal Intercourse	nn. 96–100	69
Section II. On Accessories to Intercourse	nn. 101–103	73
Part II. On the Illicit Acts of Spouses	nn. 104–118	75
Appendix I. On Internal Sins Against Chastity	nn. 119–126	85
I. On Morose Pleasure	nn. 119–121	85
II. On Desire and Joy	nn. 122–126	88
Appendix II. On Instruction in Relation to Chastity	nn. 127–139	90
I. Sexual Instruction	nn. 127–130	91
II. Matrimonial Instruction	nn. 131–139	93
In Latin	n. 132	94
In Dutch	n. 133	96
In Italian	n. 134	98
In French	n. 135	100
In German	n. 136	102
In English	n. 137	104
In Spanish	n. 138	105
In Portuguese	n. 139	107
Colophon (Volume III)		109
Alphabetical Index to Volume III		110

Analytical Index (as printed)

- Proemium — p. VII
- Preliminary admonition — p. VIII
- Preliminary notions — p. 1
- Book I. On chastity generally — p. 7
- Part I. On chastity insofar as it regards venereal things — p. 7
- Section I. On the virtue itself of chastity — p. 7
- Section II. On the opposite vice, or on lust — p. 18
- Chapter I. On lust generally — p. 18
- Chapter II. On natural consummated lust — p. 24
- Section 1. On fornication — p. 25
- Section 2. On adultery — p. 30
- Section 3. On incest — p. 32
- Section 4. On carnal sacrilege — p. 35
- Section 5. On stuprum — p. 37
- Section 6. On rape — p. 38
- Chapter III. On unnatural consummated lust — p. 40
- Article I. On pollution — p. 41
- Article II. On sodomy — p. 44
- Article III. On bestiality — p. 47
- Article IV. On unnatural intercourse with a person of a different sex — p. 48
- Scholion I. On certain other modes of intercourse — p. 50
- Scholion II. On canonical penalties against the lustful — p. 50
- Chapter IV. On non-consummated lust — p. 52
- Scholion. On indirectly voluntary lust — p. 54
- Part II. On chastity insofar as it regards acts which are ordered to venereal things, or on modesty — p. 60
- Section I. On the virtue itself of modesty — p. 60
- Section II. On the opposite vice, or on immodesty — p. 60
- Chapter I. Principles — p. 60
- Chapter II. Applications — p. 62
- Article I. On looks — p. 62
- Article II. On touches — p. 64
- Article III. On kisses — p. 65
- Article IV. On conversations and songs — p. 66

- Scholion I. On hypersexuality, contrary sexuality, and sexual perversion — p. 67
- Scholion II. On remedies against lust — p. 69
- Book II. On conjugal chastity specifically — p. 71
- Part I. On the lawful acts of spouses — p. 71
- Section I. On conjugal intercourse — p. 71
- Chapter I. On the lawfulness of conjugal intercourse — p. 71
- Article I. On the end — p. 72
- Article II. On place and mode, or position — p. 74
- Article III. On the absence of an impediment — p. 74
- Section 1. On a promise made to the other spouse — p. 75
- Section 2. On a vow of chastity — p. 75
- Section 3. On impotence for coition — p. 76
- Section 4. On a doubtfully valid marriage — p. 78
- Article IV. On the absence of harm to be averted — p. 79
- Chapter II. On the obligation of conjugal intercourse — p. 82
- Section II. On accessories to intercourse — p. 88
- Part II. On the illicit acts of spouses — p. 90
- Appendix I. On internal sins against chastity — p. 104
- I. On morose delight — p. 104
- II. On desire and joy — p. 108
- Appendix II. On instruction in regard to chastity — p. 112
- I. Sexual instruction — p. 112
- II. Matrimonial instruction — p. 116
- Alphabetical Index — p. 141

Proemium

No one will deny that the matter which we shall treat in these pages is very practical; practical, I say, for confessors, to whose judgment sins opposed to chastity are especially wont to be submitted; for preachers, upon whom lies the duty of stirring up both love of chastity and hatred of lust; and finally for spiritual directors of souls, to whom, as to the Apostle, the privilege has been granted of presenting chaste virgins to Christ.

Moreover, in handing down and explaining the doctrine, we shall chiefly tread in the footsteps both of St. Thomas, whose authority no one today has called into doubt as being preferable to all others, and of St. Alphonsus, who "among the tangled opinions of theologians, whether laxer or stricter, laid down a safe way by which the directors of the souls of Christ's faithful might walk with unoffending foot"; and whose authority was held in such esteem by the Sacred Penitentiary that it did not hesitate to answer that a confessor is not to be disturbed who, in the practice of the Sacred Penance, follows all the opinions of Blessed Alphonsus, although he does not read the works of the Blessed Doctor

except in order to know his doctrine accurately, and does not weigh the arguments or reasons upon which the various opinions rest.

May God grant, through the intercession of the Immaculate Mother of God and standard-bearer of virgins, that this little work, however slight, may bring some fruit, and may prepare the way for a complete Moral Theology to be published at some time.

Wittem, 2 August 1928.

¹ Decree *Urbis et Orbis*, 23 March 1871, concerning the grant of the title Doctor.

² 5 July 1831.

On the Virtue of Chastity and on the Opposite Vices

(St. Thomas, *Summa Theologiae* II-II, qq. 151-154; Supplement, q. 42, a. 4; q. 49, aa. 4-6; q. 64; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis* III, 412-485; VI, 900-954; *Homo Apostolicus*, treatise IX; treatise XVIII, 35-50.)

Admonition

As I am about to write on this slippery matter, I am pleased to quote this grave admonition of St. Alphonsus: "Now with difficulty we undertake to treat that matter, the very name of which infects the minds of men. Let the chaste reader pardon me, I ask, if he finds here several questions and circumstances omitted by Father Busembaum, but discussed and explained. Would that I had been able to explain more briefly or more obscurely! But since this is the more frequent and more abundant matter of confessions, and that on account of which the greater number of souls slide down into hell; indeed, I do not hesitate to assert that because of this one vice of impurity, or at least not without it, all who are damned are damned; therefore it was necessary for me, for the instruction of those who desire to learn moral science, to explain myself clearly - though as chastely as could be done - and to discuss very many particulars.

"Yet I beg students who are preparing themselves for the office of hearing confessions that they not read this treatise on the sixth precept, nor likewise the other on the conjugal debt, except... for this one end alone, casting away every curiosity whatsoever. And at that time let them often lift their mind to God and commend themselves to the Immaculate Virgin, lest, while they are striving to gain the souls of others for God, they themselves suffer harm to their own souls" (III, 413).

¹ Cf. Cajetan, *Commentarium* on the cited place of St. Thomas; Billuart, *De temperantia*, dissertations 4-6; *De matrimonio*, dissertation; Waffelaert, *De virtutibus cardinalibus*; Noldin, *De VI praecepto et de usu matrimonii*; Eschbach, *Disputationes physiologico-theologicae*; Alberti, *De Sexto et Nono praecepto et Usu matrimonii*; Vermeersch, *De castitate et de vitiis contrariis*; Duynstee, *De leer der kuischheid*; Merkelbach, *Quaestiones de castitate et luxuria*; Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis*; Capellmann-Bergmann, *Pastoralmedizin*; Von Olfers, *Pastoralmedizin*; Surbled, *La Morale dans ses rapports avec la medecine et l'hygiene*.

Preliminary Notions

The things which we are about to say concerning the virtue of chastity and the vices opposed to it cannot be rightly understood unless certain points concerning the diversity of the sexes and the propagation of the human race are first set down.

1 I. Diversity of Sex. The human race, like the more perfect species of animals, is propagated through the cooperation of two, namely male and female. Since these have different functions in

relation to propagation or generation, there exists a great difference between the body of the male and that of the female with respect to the organs of generation. From this diversity especially arises the diversity of sex.

2 II. The Male Organs which concur in generation are chiefly these: the two testicles, the epididymides, the two deferent canals, and the male member.

1. The two testicles, or testes, are two oval bodies which are contained in the scrotum. In these the male seed or sperm is produced; in order that it be prolific, it must be full of spermatozoa. Now semen is a liquid substance, white in color and somewhat thick. Moreover, from the time of puberty the testicles begin to produce semen, though for the most part not immediately prolific; this production continues throughout the whole of life, although from the fifty-eighth to the sixty-second year onward the semen is commonly no longer prolific; there are, however, exceptions.
2. The epididymis is a canal, folded back upon itself many times and existing beneath the outer skin of the testis, through which semen is led to the deferent canals.
3. The two deferent canals go out from the testicles and terminate in the male member; through these canals, therefore, the semen is conveyed to the male member.
4. The male member, which is also called the penis, rod, mentula, or veretrum, consists of two cavernous bodies, and emits both urine and semen. When blood has been drawn in, it is erected and made rigid. In the extreme part of the male member is found the glans, which is covered by the foreskin, and is said to be the chief seat of venereal pleasure.

3 III. The Female Organs which concur in generation are chiefly enumerated as follows: the two ovaries, the uterus, the vagina, and the vulva.

1. The two ovaries are spongy bodies, which are attached to the uterus on the right and on the left, and they produce ova, from which, beginning at puberty, one matures each month, falls from the ovary, and slowly proceeds through the oviduct into the uterus.
2. The uterus, or womb, has the form of an inverted pear and serves for the development of the fertilized ovum.
3. The vagina extends like a flaccid canal from the neck of the uterus and terminates in the vulva.
4. The vulva, in which the vagina terminates, is situated in the lowest and middle part of the body, that is, between the thighs, and consists of the larger or external labia of the pudendum, the smaller or internal labia, and the clitoris. The clitoris is situated between the smaller labia, and is a rudimentary mentula, or as it were a very small penis. It is said to be, together with the bulbs of the vestibule of the vagina, the chief organ of venereal pleasure.

Before the mouth or entrance of the vagina, yet in the vulva, there is the orifice of the urethra, which terminates in the bladder. Thus, beginning from the anterior part of the body, there are: 1. the orifice of the urethra; 2. the mouth of the vagina; 3. the anus. The mouth of the vagina is in large part closed by the hymen, that is, a thin membrane which, once torn, for example by intercourse, is not restored again. It is commonly called the sign of virginity. But since it is sometimes absent, and is not always broken in first acts of intercourse, others place the sign of virginity in a certain contraction and

compression by which the parts of the orifice of the vagina are constricted so long as they have not been dilated by carnal intercourse.¹

One should also note the breasts or mammae, which serve for producing milk and giving it to the offspring.

Finally, in women one should note the phenomenon which is called the menses. The menses are a flow of blood which women undergo each month from the vagina. They are interrupted during the time of pregnancy and, at least commonly, of lactation. The menstrual flow is prolonged for two or three days, sometimes for several days. In warmer regions they appear earlier than in colder regions; among us, from the twelfth to the fourteenth year of age. The menses continue until the forty-fifth or fiftieth year of age, at which time a woman's fertility is wont to cease, and this time is called menopause, the critical age, or the age of return.

Moreover, observe:

1. The menstrual flow is very beneficial to health; its suspension, except during pregnancy, or its irregularity is harmful and has an influence especially upon the brain in nervous girls. During the time of the menses, especially the first menses, women undergo an irritation of the nerves, and not rarely are agitated by feelings of anger and sadness. Hence at that time they should be treated more indulgently by the husband.
2. At the time when menopause begins, melancholy and great irritability and sensitivity are accustomed to occupy women; these indeed ordinarily last for a few months. When these have passed, a notable change in physical and moral being often takes place. Those who until then had been subject to infirmities not rarely recover health. Moreover, reason and will seem to acquire something of virile strength.

¹ Vermeersch, *De Castitate*, n. 139.

4 **IV. Puberty.** According to canon law, a male is considered pubescent after the completion of the fourteenth year, a female after the completion of the twelfth year (can. 88, § 2). According to the development of the genital organs, a male is pubescent when he has begun to produce fertile semen, among us from the fifteenth to the eighteenth year of age; a female is pubescent from the time of the production of an ovum or ova. That this time has arrived is manifested by the menstrual flow, which follows the discharge of a mature ovum, and among us begins from the twelfth to the fourteenth year of age.

5 **V. The Act Ordered to Generation**, that is, intercourse, consists in this: the male member, made erect and rigid, penetrates the female vagina and pours seed or sperm into it. It is called active generation. Intercourse can take place lying down, standing, or even sitting; likewise, since the vagina is in the lowest part of the body, it can take place both from the posterior and from the anterior part of the woman. But the natural and ordinary position is that it take place lying down and from the anterior part; hence the woman lies beneath and on her back, with knees raised and spread, and the man lies upon her.

6 **VI. Fertilization**, or passive generation, takes place in this way. Male semen admitted into the vagina ascends to the inner parts of the uterus and to the ovaries, as though carefully seeking or awaiting the mature ovum. When the ovum is found by the semen, the spermatozoa surround it,

attempt to penetrate its substance, and fertilize it once penetrated. The mature and fertilized ovum proceeds into the uterus and develops in it.¹

¹ A mature ovum which falls from the ovary, if it has not been fertilized, is expelled through the vagina on the occasion of the menses.

7 **VII. Pregnancy** is said to be the condition of a woman who bears a fetus in the uterus. Ordinarily it is prolonged for nine months or about 280 days. In the first three months pregnancy is recognized as probable from the suspension of the menses, from the swelling of the breasts, and from the greater development of the uterus. Afterwards it becomes certain from the movements of the fetus and the pulsations of its heart. Finally it becomes evident from the enlarged abdomen and the gait of the woman. During the time of pregnancy the opening of the uterus is closed, and a new conception does not take place.

8 **VIII. Birth** consists in the expulsion of the fetus, which expulsion indeed takes place through the vagina. Birth is accompanied by rather strong pains, and for several days, ten to fifteen, a flow of blood follows it. The time which follows birth is called the puerperal period or the time of purgation.

9 **IX. Lactation.** Around the fifth month of pregnancy the breasts of the woman increase in size and prepare for the production of milk. A few days after birth milk is secreted; this secretion can continue for eighteen to twenty-four months.

10 **X. The Venereal Act** is distinguished into complete and incomplete; to the latter belongs libidinous distillation.

1. The complete act consists: 1. among men, in the emission of semen, whether in intercourse or outside it; 2. among women, in extreme venereal commotion, that is, carried all the way to its end, so that full satisfaction is had. It is commonly accompanied by the pouring forth of fluids, both vulvo-vaginal fluids and those which flow from the glands situated in the neck of the uterus. These fluids commonly flow into the cavity of the uterus, and sometimes are even poured outside the body, namely from the vagina. Venereal commotion and the secretion of fluids are indeed useful, but are not necessary for generation.
2. The incomplete act consists: 1. among men, in motions and agitations of the genital organs preceding emission; 2. among women, in non-extreme venereal commotion.
3. Distillation in a man is the secretion of a certain fluid distinct from semen and produced by the glands of the urethra. It occurs drop by drop, and can be joined with venereal pleasure or lack it. In a wife, whether and what distillation properly is, insofar as it is distinguished from venereal commotion, I have not been able to discover.

11 **XI. Venereal Pleasure.** Pleasure is distinguished in two ways: venereal and sensible.

1. Venereal pleasure is said to be that which is annexed to the venereal act. It is twofold, complete and incomplete; the former is joined with the complete venereal act, the latter with the incomplete act.
2. Sensible pleasure is that which arises from the conformity of a sensible object with the respective sense; for example, from the touch of a soft thing, from the sight of a beautiful thing, from the taste of a sweet thing, and so forth. This pleasure has annexed to it some alteration of the body

through the movement of blood or vital spirits around the breast or heart, but without commotion of the spirits serving generation (St. Alphonsus III, 415).

Sensible pleasure is distinguished into carnal sensible pleasure and purely sensible pleasure, according as it arises from an object of itself apt to excite venereal pleasure, for example from the kiss of a woman, or from another object (St. Alphonsus III, 415-416).

12 Note 1. The pubescent, and likewise those non-pubescent persons, in the canonical sense, who have semen, even infertile semen, are capable of acts both complete and incomplete.

Non-pubescent persons, say at least thirteen years old, are capable of incomplete acts.

It can be doubted whether the sensation in the genitals of boys, say from eight to twelve years old, is venereal or merely sensible-carnal. If it is to be called venereal, it is certainly explained somewhat better why the said sensation is often sought with such ardor, and why such a frequency of immodest touches occurs, for example in colleges or boarding schools where religion and the vigilance of teachers are lacking; and this among boys from eight to twelve years old. Moreover, it is certain that the capacity for having venereal sensation can be hastened by certain circumstances or by intense or frequent immodest acts (cf. also Duynstee, cited work, p. 146 sq.).

13 Note 2. Eunuchs by birth, or spadones, that is, those who are such by nature, and likewise eunuchs made such, or castrati, who were deprived of the testes in tender years, are not capable even of incomplete venereal acts. Those who have been deprived of the testes in mature age can for some space of time emit semen preserved in the epididymis,¹ and therefore are capable of complete venereal acts; when that semen has been emitted, they now lack semen, but they remain capable of venereal acts.²

And with these matters having been noted beforehand, we shall speak first of chastity generally, and then, on account of the importance of the matter, of conjugal chastity specifically.

¹ Formerly the two seminal vesicles, that is, canals located between the rectum and the urinary bladder, were thought to be receptacles of spermatozoa, so that emitted semen was said to flow proximately from them. But today they are considered rather as an organ of a certain secretion. This secretion accompanies the flow from the testicles. This, however, does not prevent spermatozoa from often being found in the said vesicles. Whether they are dead or living is disputed. But many living ones are found in the epididymis, so that they can be extracted from the epididymis for artificial fertilization (Vermeersch, cited work, p. 7).

² Cf. Eschbach, cited work, p. 150.

Book I. On Chastity Generally

Chastity, as will become clearer from what is to be said, can be considered in two ways, namely insofar as it regards venereal acts and insofar as it is concerned with acts which are ordered to venereal things. Considered in the former way it is especially called chastity; regarded in the latter way it is called modesty. We shall treat the matter in both respects. Therefore let there be:

Part I. On Chastity Insofar as It Regards Venereal Things

(St. Thomas, II-II, qq. 151-152; St. Alphonsus, *Opera Dogmatica* I, treatise V, dissertation XI, appendix, § 1, nn. 40-41.)

We shall speak first of the virtue itself of chastity, insofar as it regards venereal things; then of the sin opposed to it, or lust.

Section I. On the Virtue Itself of Chastity

14 I. Notion. Chastity is so called from chastising, because it regards motions and operations which especially ought to be chastised or restrained (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 151, a. 1). Now chastity is: a supernatural virtue inclining man to moderate the appetite and use of venereal things. Its remote material object is the appetite and use of venereal things; its proximate material object is the acts excluding or moderating the aforesaid. The formal object is the honesty which shines forth in their exclusion or moderation (cf. St. Thomas, II-II, q. 151, a. 2). Having given this notion, it is useful, for the sake of explanation and proof, to add these points from St. Thomas:

1. Chastity is a virtue. For "in this... consists the nature of human virtue, that it be something modified according to reason" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 151, a. 1). But chastity moderates the appetite and use of venereal things according to reason.
2. Chastity is a subjective part or species of temperance. For temperance "restrains the appetite from those things which most allure man" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 141, a. 2); hence its subjective parts are those which moderate some one of the pleasures which most allure man. But chastity does this; indeed, it moderates the pleasure which allures man above all others, namely the pleasure of venereal things (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 146, introduction, compared with q. 141).
3. Chastity is a virtue distinct from the other subjective parts of temperance, that is, from abstinence and sobriety. For virtues which regard motions and operations formally diverse differ one from another. But chastity regards operations formally diverse from those which abstinence and sobriety regard. For the former is concerned with the appetite and use of venereal things, by which the nature of the species is preserved; the latter are concerned with the appetite and use of foods or drinks, by which the nature of the individual is preserved; and these operations are formally diverse (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 151, a. 3).

15 II. Division. Chastity is divided:

1. By reason of the subject, into youthful, conjugal, widowed, and virginal chastity. Youthful chastity is that by which the young abstain from all venereal things before marriage. Conjugal chastity is that by which spouses exclude all venereal things unlawful for them, while prudently moderating those which are lawful. Widowed chastity is that by which someone abstains from all venereal things during widowhood. Virginal chastity is that by which a person, immune from a voluntary complete venereal act, excludes all venereal things.
2. By reason of the object, into common chastity and virginity, according as it moderates or excludes venereal things. More must be said concerning virginity.

16 **III. Notion of Virginity.** "The name of virginity," says the Angelic Doctor, "seems to be taken from freshness; and just as that is called fresh and persisting in its freshness which has not experienced burning from an excess of heat, so also virginity implies this, that the person in whom it exists is immune from the burning of concupiscence, which seems to exist in the consummation of the greatest bodily pleasure, such as the pleasure of venereal things" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 152, a. 1).

Virginity itself is the virtue by which a subject, immune from a complete and voluntary venereal act, from an honorable and supernatural end, takes up the resolution of perpetually abstaining from all venereal things. Therefore two things are required, namely the immunity and the resolution just assigned. "In venereal pleasure," says St. Thomas, "three things are to be considered. One, indeed, is on the part of the body, namely the violation of the sign of virginity; another is that in which what belongs to the soul is joined with what belongs to the body, namely the very resolution of semen causing sensible pleasure; the third is solely on the part of the soul, namely the resolution of arriving at such pleasure. Among these, what was placed first is related accidentally to the moral act, which is considered in itself only according to those things which belong to the soul; the second is materially related to the moral act, for sensible passions are the matter of moral acts; but the third is related formally and completely, because the nature of moral things is completed in that which belongs to reason. Therefore, since virginity is spoken of through the removal of the aforesaid corruption, it follows that the integrity of the bodily member is accidentally related to virginity; but immunity from the pleasure which consists in the resolution of semen is materially related; and the resolution itself of perpetually abstaining from such pleasure is related formally and completely in virginity" (II-II, q. 152, a. 1). Moreover, observe:

1. The resolution of abstaining from venereal things must be taken up from an honorable end; for "complete abstinence from venereal things, considered according to itself and stopping in it, implies no honesty, because of itself, according to reason, so to speak, by reason of the mere sterility of nature, it does not profit or confer advantage; but it is made honorable by the end which it serves, which is to be free for God and divine things, for which it is necessary to be at leisure from earthly and temporal things."¹ Finally, a supernatural end is required, because we are speaking only of supernatural virtue.
2. It is disputed whether for the virtue of virginity a resolution is sufficient, or whether a vow of abstaining from venereal things is required. Some, against others, require a vow, at least so that virginity may be a virtue distinct from common chastity. The opinion of St. Thomas is disputed. The holy Doctor in IV Sentences, dist. 33, q. 3, a. 2, ad 4, says thus: "The complete nature of virginity insofar as it is a virtue exists only in those who have the choice of preserving integrity, kept until now, even to the end, whether without a vow or with a vow." And in the same place, dist. 49, q. 5, a. 3: "The aureole of virginity is properly due only to those who had the resolution of preserving virginity perpetually, whether they confirmed this resolution by vow or not." But in II-II, q. 152, a. 3, ad 4, he teaches: "To the fourth it must be said that virginity, according as it is a virtue, implies a resolution confirmed by vow of preserving integrity perpetually; for Augustine says in the book *On Virginity* (ch. 8) that 'through virginity the integrity of the flesh is vowed, consecrated, and preserved for the Creator Himself of soul and flesh'; hence virginity, according as it is a virtue, is never lost except through sin." From this Cajetan infers that here, according to St. Thomas, virginity is not a special virtue distinct from chastity unless it has been confirmed by

vow; and that St. Thomas here retracted what he had said when younger. Others answer, however, that St. Thomas is speaking thus of virginity according to its perfect degree and as it is commonly cultivated.²

¹ Salmanticenses, *De virtutibus*, arbor praedicamentalis, n. 119; St. Thomas, II-II, q. 152, a. 3.

² Salmanticenses, cited place, n. 121; Cajetan, on II-II, q. 152, a. 3; Waffelaert, *De virtutibus cardinalibus*, n. 127; Dominicus Soto, on IV Sentences, dist. 49, q. 5, a. 2; Sylvius, on II-II, q. 152, a. 3; Billuart, *De temperantia*, dissertation 4, article 3.

17 IV. Morality of Virginity. 1. Virginity is a virtue. For, as we noted from St. Thomas in n. 14, "in this... consists the nature of human virtue, that it be something modified according to reason" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 151, a. 1). But virginity excludes the appetite and use of venereal things according to right reason.

18 Proof of the minor: According to right reason, one may abstain from bodily pleasures in order to be free for the goods of the contemplative life; for the order of reason requires that, in order to be free for greater goods, someone can abstain from lesser goods. But virginity abstains from bodily pleasures so that it may be more freely free for contemplation of divine things, according to these words of the Apostle: "The unmarried woman and the virgin thinks on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy in body and in spirit; but she who is married thinks on the things of the world, and how she may please her husband."¹ Hence it follows that virginity is not something vicious, but rather laudable, or a virtue (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 152, a. 2).² Add all and each of the things which we are going to say below concerning the excellence of virginity.

Objection. Virginity is opposed to the precept of conserving and propagating the human species; therefore it cannot be a virtue.

Response. I distinguish the major: Virginity universally observed is opposed to the law of conserving and propagating the human species: granted; observed by some: denied. Namely, "something is due in two ways: in one way, so that it be fulfilled by one person, and this due thing cannot be omitted without sin; but another thing is due to be fulfilled by the multitude, and every single person of the multitude is not bound to fulfill such a due thing" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 152, a. 2). But the precept given concerning generation regards the whole multitude of men; hence it is not required that it be observed by individuals, but it suffices that it be fulfilled by many. If this were denied, all men absolutely, who are capable of marriage, would be bound to enter it; which no one would say (St. Thomas, cited place; St. Alphonsus, *Opera Dogmatica* I, treatise III, *De fidei veritate*, ch. 13, n. 11). It is added that the abstinence of some greatly profits the multitude itself; for it is "necessary for the multitude not only that it be multiplied bodily, but also that it advance spiritually; and therefore sufficient provision is made for the human multitude if some give their work to carnal generation, while others, abstaining from this, are free for contemplation of divine things, for the beauty and salvation of the whole human race; just as also in an army some guard the camp, some carry the standards, and some fight with swords" (St. Thomas, cited place).

¹ 1 Cor. 7:34.

² Hieronymus de Medicis, on this place of St. Thomas.

19 Finally, note that abstinence from venereal things is not for that reason vicious because it harms health on account of an abundance of semen, since experts testify to the contrary. Namely, first,

"among the inferior sex a redundant seed never exists; for we know that mature ova are regularly deposited from the ovaries and cast out of the body, and likewise the same thing obtains concerning the menses or superfluous blood which unmarried women emit month by month. But as regards celibate men, these things must be noted: 1. The activity of their organs in elaborating semen continually becomes less;¹ 2. Semen contains nothing deadly in itself or harmful to the body; indeed, when it is found especially in greater quantity, it greatly helps through absorption;² 3. Finally, among those in whom, because the organs operate more diligently, a true abundance of semen exists, nature itself spontaneously, or apart from every free will, unloads itself through nocturnal pollutions in sleep.³ There is therefore no reason why absolute continence of celibates should be judged to be adverse to the human body, while on the contrary it can favor the prosperity of that body and of the whole man,"⁴ as Bossu again testifies.⁵

¹ "Like all the others," says D. Bossu, "the organs of generation lose their faculties and tend to atrophy when they are plunged in repose and complete inaction" (apud Eschbach, cited work, p. 481).

² Hence D. Bossu: "Pollutions which occur during sleep, in vigorous subjects observing continence, are salutary; far from fatiguing or being harmful, they render body and spirit more disposed." "It is necessary, however," the same author continues, "that they be moderate, for by being repeated too often they can become the cause of atonic losses" (apud Eschbach, cited place).

³ Eschbach, cited work, p. 481.

⁴ "When the passions are calm... continence, having become easy, no longer has inconvenience; or rather, it has advantages in that it renders the body more disposed, more alert, the spirit more penetrating, and other pleasures more lively and sweeter" (Eschbach, cited work, p. 481).

⁵ Lessius, *De justitia*, l. 4, c. 2, n. 99 sq.; Vermeersch, *De castitate*, n. 1519.

20

2. Virginity, according to St. Thomas, is a virtue distinct from common chastity. Thus, with the holy Doctor, many authors hold, while others deny.¹ For "where there is a special matter of good having a special excellence, there is found a special nature of virtue; as is clear in magnificence, which is concerned with great expenditures, and from this is a special virtue distinct from liberality, which is concerned generally with every use of money. But this, namely to preserve oneself immune from the experience of venereal pleasure, has a certain excellence of praise beyond this, namely to preserve oneself immune from the disorder of venereal pleasure; and therefore virginity is a certain special virtue related to chastity as magnificence is related to liberality" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 152, a. 3). Note that St. Thomas, as it seems, argues from a special matter of good having special excellence, rather than from the special difficulty of complete abstinence.
3. Virginity, although complete abstinence from venereal things becomes honorable from an extrinsic end, practically that of religion, nevertheless belongs, equally with common chastity, to the genus of chastity. For a virtue is reduced to the genus of that virtue whose object it touches, and that in the mode proper to that virtue; this is clear from the doctrine on the division of virtues in general. But virginity, equally with common chastity, is concerned with the object of chastity, namely venereal things, and it touches them in the mode proper to chastity, namely under the aspect of temperance.

So too St. Thomas; this is deduced from the fact that he "does not take the aforesaid distinction from something pertaining to religion or to another virtue outside the genus of chastity, but from the proper matter of virginity within the aforesaid genus, which is complete continence from venereal things."² It is added that he confirms his argument by the example of magnificence in relation to liberality; "which example he also uses in the reply to the fifth, where, after making a comparison with conjugal and widowed chastity, he concludes: virginity alone is posited as a special virtue above chastity, as magnificence is above liberality. But that magnificence and liberality are distinguished essentially, in the way of St. Thomas, according to their proper matter, no one doubts."³ Finally, q. 152, a. 2 has these words: "Something can be called most excellent in two ways; in one way, in some genus; and thus virginity is most excellent, namely in the genus of chastity."

¹ The denial is attributed in the footnote to other authors, including Lessius and Vermeersch; see previous note.

² Salmanticenses, cited place.

³ Salmanticenses, cited place.

21 V. Excellence of Virginity. Virginity is preferred to the matrimonial state. This is of faith from the Council of Trent, session 24, canon 10. It is proved first from Sacred Scripture. "His disciples say to Him: If the case of a man with his wife is so, it is not expedient to marry. He said to them: Not all receive this word, but those to whom it has been given. For there are eunuchs,... who have castrated themselves for the kingdom of heaven. He who can receive it, let him receive it."¹ "Therefore he also who joins his virgin in marriage does well; and he who does not join her does better."²

It is proved secondly from the Holy Fathers, who perpetually, and even in whole works, extol the state of virginity above the state of marriage with splendid praises. "By divine right," says St. Augustine, "continence is set before wedlock, and pious virginity before nuptials."³ And elsewhere: "But virginal integrity, and immunity from all intercourse through pious continence, is an angelic portion, and in corruptible flesh a meditation upon perpetual incorruption. Let all fruitfulness of the flesh, all conjugal modesty, yield to this."⁴ So too (Pseudo?) St. Clement of Rome,⁵ Athenagoras,⁶ St. Athanasius,⁷ St. Cyril of Jerusalem,⁸ St. Gregory Nazianzen,⁹ St. Epiphanius,¹⁰ St. Gregory of Nyssa,¹¹ St. John Chrysostom,¹² St. Aphraates,¹³ Theodoret,¹⁴ St. John Damascene,¹⁵ Tertullian,¹⁶ St. Cyprian,¹⁷ St. Ambrose,¹⁸ St. Jerome,¹⁹ and St. Fulgentius.²⁰

It is proved thirdly by reason: "both because a divine good is preferable to a human good; and because the good of the soul is preferred to the good of the body; and also because the good of the contemplative life is preferred to the good of the active life. But virginity is ordered to the good of the soul according to the contemplative life, which is to think on the things that are of God; while marriage is ordered to the good of the body, which is the bodily multiplication of the human race; and it pertains to the active life, because man and woman living in marriage necessarily have to think on the things of the world, as is clear through the Apostle in 1 Cor. 7. Hence, without doubt, virginity is to be preferred to conjugal continence" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 152, a. 4; cf. St. Alphonsus, *Opera Dogmatica* I, p. 644 sq.).

¹ Matt. 19:10-12.

² 1 Cor. 7; cf. *ibid.* 25-40 and Apoc. 14:1-4.

³ *De sancta virginitate*, c. 1, n. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, c. 13, n. 12.

⁵ Epistle 1 to virgins, c. 4.

⁶ *Legatio pro Christianis*, n. 33.

⁷ *Apologia ad Constantium*, n. 33.

⁸ Catechesis 4, c. 24-25.

⁹ Oration 37, c. 10-11 and c. 13.

¹⁰ *Adversus haereses*, exposition of faith, c. 21.

¹¹ *De virginitate*, passim.

¹² *De virginitate*, c. 9-10.

¹³ Demonstration 18, *De virginitate et sanctitate*, n. 8.

¹⁴ On 1 Cor. 7:26 and 38.

¹⁵ *De fide orthodoxa*, l. 4, c. 24.

¹⁶ Book 1, *Ad uxorem*, c. 2-4 inclusive.

¹⁷ *De habitu virginum*, c. 3-4 and c. 23.

¹⁸ Book 2, *De virginibus*, c. 3, nn. 11 and 13; *De viduis*, c. 12, n. 72.

¹⁹ Epistle 22, nn. 19-20; *Against Jovinian*, passim.

²⁰ Epistle 3, c. 9-10, nn. 14-17 inclusive.

22 VI. The Special Reward of Virginity. To virginity there belongs a special reward, which is called an aureole. Now then:

1. Aureole, by the force of the word, sounds the same as a lesser golden crown. For since, according to Sacred Scripture, the life of man on earth is warfare¹ or contest² for obtaining the kingdom of heaven,³ or even a racecourse in which one must run in order to seize the prize,⁴ and therefore heavenly beatitude is proposed in the manner of a crown of justice⁵ and of unfading glory,⁶ theologians have been accustomed to call essential beatitude a golden crown, or even simply gold. But since in Sacred Scripture to some, on account of a certain signal victory not common to all, a certain special reward is promised, such a reward, as being less than essential beatitude, is called an aureole by theologians. This, according to the mind of St. Thomas (cf. Supplement, q. 96, a. 1), is defined by St. Alphonsus as: "An accidental joy or reward, added on account of an excellent victory" (*Opera Dogmatica* II, *Dissertationes de novissimis*, § VIII). This joy will also redound into the body of the blessed, producing a certain special beauty (St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 96, a. 10; St. Alphonsus, cited place).
2. Three aureoles are distinguished, namely those of virgins, martyrs, and doctors. Thus many Holy Fathers; likewise theologians commonly, relying on certain texts of Sacred Scripture.⁷ "It must be said," says the Angelic Doctor, "that an aureole is a certain privileged reward corresponding to a privileged victory; and therefore, according to privileged victories in the three battles which threaten every man, three aureoles are taken. For in the battle which is against the flesh, he obtains the chief victory who completely abstains from venereal delights, which are chief in this genus; such a one is a virgin, and therefore an aureole is due to virginity. But in the battle which is fought against the world, that is the chief victory when we sustain persecution from the world even unto death; hence to martyrs, who obtain victory in that battle, a second aureole is due. But

in the battle which is fought against the devil, that is the chief victory when someone removes the enemy not only from himself, but also from the hearts of others; this is done through doctrine and preaching; and therefore to doctors and preachers a third aureole is due" (Supplement, q. 96, a. 11).

"Some, however, distinguish the three aureoles according to the three powers of the soul, so that the three aureoles are said to correspond to the chief acts of the three powers of the soul. For the chief act of the rational power is to diffuse the truth of faith also in others, and to this act the aureole of doctors is due. But the chief act of the irascible power is to overcome even death on account of Christ, and to this the aureole of martyrs is due. But the chief act of the concupiscible power is to abstain wholly from the greatest delights of the flesh, and to this the aureole of virgins is due" (cited place).

"Others distinguish the three aureoles according to those things by which we are most nobly conformed to Christ; for He was mediator between the Father and the world; therefore He was a doctor, according as He manifested to the world the truth which He had received from the Father; He was a martyr, according as He suffered persecution from the world; and He was a virgin, insofar as He preserved purity in Himself; and therefore doctors, martyrs, and virgins are most perfectly conformed to Him; hence to such persons an aureole is due" (cited place).

3. In order that a right to the aureole be acquired, besides the state of grace and immunity from a complete and voluntary venereal act, there is required a resolution of perpetually abstaining from venereal things. It is disputed whether a vow is also required (n. 16). Moreover, a resolution, or vow, suffices even if someone, whether by privilege, as the Blessed Virgin Mary, or from another cause, does not experience the stimulus of the flesh, and therefore lives and dies without battle; likewise if someone elicits the resolution, or vow, of abstaining from venereal things after he has awaited marriage in vain, provided, however, that the resolution, or vow, has been elicited truly and from a supernatural motive.

¹ Cf. Job 7:1.

² Cf. 2 Tim. 4:7.

³ Cf. Apoc. 5:10; Matt. 5:10 and 19:12.

⁴ Cf. 1 Cor. 9:24-25; Phil. 3:14.

⁵ Cf. 2 Tim. 4:8.

⁶ Cf. 1 Pet. 5:4.

⁷ Cf. Dan. 12:3; Apoc. 7:4; 14:3-4.

23 VII. Loss of Virginité. Virginité perishes:

1. Irreparably, by the very fact that the material element of the virtue is voluntarily lost, that is, through a voluntary complete venereal act, whether voluntary in itself or in its cause. For virginité requires immunity from the voluntary experience of venereal pleasure (n. 16). But it cannot happen that "one who has experienced venereal pleasure becomes one who has not experienced it" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 152, a. 3, ad 3). Through a complete venereal act virginité perishes, even if the sign of virginité were to remain intact. It is disputed whether virginité is lost irreparably through consent in a complete act while it is taking place, the act itself having arisen apart from

the will. Some affirm it; namely, in their opinion, consent to the present fact of the resolution of semen suffices.¹ To others, the contrary must be admitted, or rather the voluntary effecting of the said fact seems necessary, in order that virginity be lost irreparably.²

Virginity irreparably lost can nevertheless be repaired in a certain respect, as is said, namely according to the formal element of the virtue. "It must be said," says St. Thomas, "that virtue can be repaired through penance as to that which is formal in virtue, but not as to that which is material in it; for if a magnificent man has consumed his riches, his riches are not restored to him through repentance for the sin; and similarly, one who has lost virginity by sinning does not recover the matter of virginity through penance, but he recovers the resolution of virginity" (II-II, q. 152, a. 3, ad 3).

2. Virginity perishes reparably through the resolution of entering marriage and consummating it; likewise through any mortal sin of lust which does not destroy the material element of virginity, for example through an internal act, or through venereal commotion which does not reach a complete act (cf. St. Thomas, in IV Sentences, dist. 33, q. 3, a. 1, ad 4). There is dispute concerning the one who induces another to a sin of lust. Some affirm, and judge that the resolution of abstaining from venereal things, required for virginity, extends itself to any sin against chastity.³ Others think that the said resolution extends itself only to directly proper acts.⁴

Question: whether virginity perishes irreparably or reparably through libidinous acts which of themselves lead to a complete act, if in fact the complete act does not follow.

Some seem to assert irreparable loss.⁵ Others distinguish and judge that virginity is lost irreparably in this case by those who are capable of the complete act; likewise by those who have been made incapable only accidentally, as some sick persons, or by design, as eunuchs; but reparably by boys, who are by nature unfit for the complete act. The reason alleged is that in the former persons the material element of virginity remains only accidentally. But it seems that one should say that in the proposed case virginity is never lost irreparably, since in fact, while the material element of the virtue remains, it seems always to be restored when the formal element is added.

St. Thomas has these words: "If lust against nature anticipates the time of perfect age, since there is not present the discharge of semen, and consequently neither the complete pleasure suffocating the mind, virginity is not lost as to that which is material in it" (in IV Sentences, dist. 33, q. 3, a. 1, ad 4).

3. Virginity in no way perishes through injury to the sign of virginity which does not occur through intercourse but in another way, for example through dancing or medical treatment. Nor is it lost through involuntary pollution or intercourse extorted by force, to which the virgin does not consent. Through subsequent complacency concerning intercourse involuntarily had, virginity indeed perishes, but reparably, as we said above.

¹ Eschbach, cited work, p. 501 sq.

² Vermeersch, *De Castitate*, n. 142.

³ Waffelaert, cited work, n. 123.

⁴ Vermeersch, cited work, n. 142.

⁵ Vermeersch, cited work, n. 142.

24 **VIII. Recovery of Virginity** (reparably lost). If virginity has been lost through the resolution of entering and consummating marriage, it is recovered through the renewal of the resolution of abstaining from all venereal things. If it has been lost through sin, it is recovered through penance together with the aforesaid resolution.

¹ Cajetan, on II-II, q. 152, a. 1; Billuart, *De Castitate*, art. 5; Eschbach, cited work, p. 502.

Section II. On the Opposite Vice, or Lust

(St. Thomas, II-II, qq. 153-154; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis* III, nn. 412-485; *Homo Apostolicus*, treatise 9.)

We shall speak first of lust generally; then of natural consummated lust; next of unnatural consummated lust; finally of non-consummated lust.

Chapter I. On Lust Generally

25 **I. Notion.** Lust is: the disordered appetite and use of venereal things as such (St. Alphonsus III, 412). It is called:

1. Appetite; by this word internal acts concerning venereal things are comprehended.
2. Use; this word regards external acts.
3. Of venereal things; under this name come semen and a certain spermatic fluid distinct from semen. They are called venereal things because they serve generation, over which, according to the gentiles, the goddess Venus presided.
4. As such. Venereal things as such are understood as venereal things considered according to themselves, or insofar as they are of such a nature, and not insofar as they are a part of the body. Moreover, the use of venereal things as such is constituted by venereal acts, both complete and incomplete (n. 10). But the use - if it is permitted to use this word in the present case - of venereal things as they are a part of the body is constituted, for example, by the artificial removal of infected semen. Moreover, if in the course of the treatise there is speech of the use of venereal things, venereal things as such are always understood; let this be said once for all.
5. Disordered, that is, which either is in no way ordered to the good of the species, as for example pollution, or is indeed ordered to the propagation of the species, that is, to generation, but not to the preservation and education of the one generated, as for example fornication.

26 **II. Division.** Lust is distinguished:

1. Into consummated and non-consummated, according as the act of lust is complete or not complete (n. 10).
2. Into natural and unnatural, according as the act of itself is apt for generation, as fornication, or is not apt for it, as pollution.
3. Into directly voluntary and indirectly voluntary, according as it is intended or is not intended, but is foreseen as going to follow from an action and ought to be guarded against.

27 **III. Morality.** 1. All lust is sin. This is proved first from Sacred Scripture. "No fornicator, or unclean person, or covetous person, which is the service of idols, has an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God."¹ "Do not err: neither fornicators, nor those serving idols, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor men who lie with males, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor the rapacious shall possess the kingdom of God."² "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, impurity, lust... of which I forewarn you, as I have foretold, that those who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God."³

Secondly, by reason. The use of a thing which lacks ordination to the natural end of that thing is sin, unless that very thing is ordered to an intermediate end higher than its natural end. But all lust involves the use of a thing, namely of venereal things, which lacks ordination to the natural end of venereal things; and those venereal things themselves are not ordered to an intermediate end higher than their natural end. Therefore all lust is sin.

The major is clear from this, that one who uses some thing contrary to its natural end acts against the ordering of the Author of nature, unless He Himself has furthermore ordered that thing to a higher intermediate end. "It must be said," says St. Thomas, "that sin in human acts is that which is contrary to the order of reason; but this belongs to the order of reason, that it order each thing suitably to its end; and therefore it is not sin if, through reason, man uses certain things for the end for which they are" (II-II, q. 153, a. 2); and these words certainly must also be applied to venereal things. Hence the holy Doctor soon declares that the emission of semen "ought to be done in such a way that it agrees with the end for which it is needed" (II-II, q. 153, a. 3, ad 1; cf. *De malo*, q. 15, a. 1, ad 4).

The minor contains two things which need exposition or proof. The first is this: Lust involves the use of venereal things which lacks ordination to the natural end of venereal things. For the natural end of venereal things is the perfect good of the human species, that is, generation and the perfection of the one generated through education (n. 33; St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 41, a. 1). But all lust involves the use of venereal things which lacks ordination to the perfect good of the human species. Namely, unnatural lust is ordered neither to generation nor to education; natural lust is not ordered to education; finally, non-consummated lust lacks ordination to a legitimate complete act, and thus is deprived of remote ordination to the good of the species. Each of these points will become clearer from what is to be said.

The other is this: Venereal things themselves cannot be ordered to an intermediate end higher than their natural end; for the good of the human species is ordered immediately to God, that is, to the ultimate end.⁴

Objection 1. Anyone can lawfully use, as he pleases, that which is his own; but in a venereal act man uses nothing except that which is his own, unless perhaps in adultery or rape. Therefore there cannot be sin in venereal use.

¹ Eph. 5:5.

² 1 Cor. 6:9-10.

³ Gal. 5:19, 21.

⁴ Cf. the clear argumentation of Duynstee (cited work, p. 16 sq.), who takes the argument from the fact that an act of lust is opposed to the natural end of the venereal act; this seems to be the proximate reason for its malice.

28 Response. Man enjoys only useful dominion over his body and its semen; their owner is God Almighty. Hence he is bound to use them according to the norm established by the Author of nature. But the Author of nature, as has been proved, forbids the use which lust involves (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 153, a. 3, ad 2).

Objection 2. "Through the venereal act semen is emitted, which is a superfluity of food; but in the emission of other superfluities no sin is considered; therefore neither can there be any sin concerning venereal acts."

29 Response. "Semen is a superfluity which is needed; for it is called superfluous from the fact that it is a residue of the operation of the nutritive power; yet it is needed for the work of the generative power. But the other superfluities of the human body are those which are not needed, and therefore it does not matter howsoever they are emitted, provided the decency of human society is preserved. But it is not the same in the emission of semen, which ought to be done in such a way that it agrees with the end for which it is needed" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 153, a. 3, ad 1).

Instance. At least in those whose semen is not generative, its emission will lack sin.

Response. "Moral precepts attend to that which is according to nature, and not to that which is found accidentally in this constitution or age. But of itself semen is ordered by nature to the generation of offspring; otherwise it would not be semen. And therefore, concerning any emission of semen, the common precepts, which are taken chiefly from the end, which is generation, must be observed, however much by accident generation cannot then follow."¹ (Cf. St. Thomas, *De malo*, q. 15, a. 2, ad 14.)

2. All lust is grave sin. This is clear first from the texts of Sacred Scripture adduced in n. 27. Then, all lust, as we have just said, is sin because it involves the use of venereal things deprived of ordination to the good of the species. But the said privation in the individual species of lust is grave, or contains a grave disordering. Therefore all lust is grave sin.

The minor is proved in parts. a) The privation of consummated unnatural lust consists, if the discussion is of a man, in this: that the act is neither of itself apt for generating a man nor ordered to the education of the one generated; these privations are grave. It consists, if the discussion is of a wife, likewise in this: that the act is not ordered to education; this privation is likewise grave. It also consists, as regards the wife, in this: that the act is not ordered to generation. But since the seminal emission of the wife is neither necessary nor proved to be very useful for each individual generation, the gravity of this privation is not established.

b) The privation of natural consummated lust consists in this: that the act is not ordered to the education of the one to be generated (n. 33); this privation is grave.

c) The privation of non-consummated lust consists in this: that the act is not a proximate and natural preparation for a legitimate consummated act; this privation is likewise grave.

Others argue from the fact that all lust involves an act deprived of an essential relation to the species.² I confess that I do not see the force of this argument without the addition of the proposed point, perhaps because the very sense of the argument has remained inaccessible to me. For it remains, as it seems, to prove that the privation of that relation is grave. But if this is supplied, the argument seems to fall into our proof.

St. Thomas reasons thus: "It must be said that the more necessary something is, the more necessary it is that the order of reason be preserved concerning it; hence consequently it is more vicious if the order of reason is set aside. But the use of venereal things, as was said in the preceding article, is very necessary for the common good, which is the preservation of the human race; and therefore in this matter the order of reason must especially be attended to; and consequently, if anything is done concerning this besides what the order of reason has, it will be vicious. But this belongs to the nature of lust, that it exceed the order and mode of reason concerning venereal things; and therefore without doubt lust is sin" (II-II, q. 153, a. 3). By these words, as is clear from what is set down at the beginning of the question, the holy Doctor intends to establish the grave malice of lust. Moreover, compare what is to be said concerning the individual species of lust (nn. 32-61), and likewise concerning non-consummated lust (nn. 62-64).

3. Lust cannot be rendered honorable by any end. For in order that it could be rendered honorable, there would be required an intermediate end to which the good of the human species is subordinated, so that it would be lawful to pursue that intermediate end while neglecting the good of the species. But the good of the human species is subordinated to no intermediate end, but is immediately ordered to the ultimate end, which is God (St. Alphonsus III, 478).

Objection 1. Just as it is lawful, for preserving life, to amputate genital members and even directly to remove semen, so likewise pollution seems lawful if it is supposed necessary for protecting life.

Response. The difference is in this: that the said operations do not involve, as pollution does, the use of venereal things as such, but a disposition concerning them insofar as they are part of the body and, as such, ordered to the whole.

Objection 2. Theologians formerly conceded the expulsion of corrupt semen, even if, beyond the intention, some emission of non-corrupt semen were to follow.

Response. Theologians conceded the expulsion of corrupt semen when produced by means of medicine and without libido (St. Alphonsus III, 478); such an expulsion does not involve, as pollution does, the use of venereal things as such. Moreover, corrupt semen is no longer true semen.³

Question: whether he sins gravely who consents to the venereal pleasure of pollution or of venereal commotion, to which libidinous distillation is equivalent, when it follows beyond the intention.

Response. Affirmatively, and this holds even if it is a question of a merely natural venereal motion, for example pollution. The reason is that all venereal things, even venereal pleasures, in order to be rightly admitted by the will, must be ordered to the good of the species; for this is the supreme intermediate end of all venereal things. But the venereal pleasure of which we are speaking is not ordered, indeed cannot be ordered, to the good of the species; and this privation is grave. Therefore the will must not admit that pleasure, or consent to it. It is added that consent to the pleasure of a venereal motion fosters and increases the venereal motion itself.

4. Consummated and non-consummated lust differ in species. This is commonly admitted by authors and seems to be deduced from the fact that the non-consummated act of itself prepares for, or leads to, the consummated act. But that which prepares for an act is morally diverse from the act itself. These things hold only if one stops at the non-consummated act; but if the non-consummated act is ordered to the consummated act, and the consummated act follows, with this

it constitutes one sin in number and species.⁴ If the consummated act, although intended, does not follow, there is a consummated act in affection, but a non-consummated act in effect.

¹ Cajetan on II-II, q. 153, a. 3.

² Cf. Vermeersch, *De castitate et de vitiis contrariis*, nn. 352-354; Merkelbach, *Quaestiones de castitate et luxuria*, pp. 22-23.

³ This question concerning the expulsion of corrupt semen today seems no longer practical. For according to modern physicians, semen is not corrupted, because the part of the semen that has gone outside its internal place either flows out spontaneously or is expelled with urine. Moreover, physicians have found no medicine by which, apart from libidinous pollution, even the smallest part of the semen may be expelled (Gaude, edition of St. Alphonsus's *Theologia Moralis* III, 448, note).

⁴ To this case can be applied what St. Thomas declares concerning a similar case: "A sin of the heart and of the mouth are not distinguished from a sin of deed when they are joined with it, but as any of these is found in itself; just as also a part of a motion is not distinguished from the whole motion when the motion is continuous, but only when the motion stops in the middle" (*Ethics*, I. 10, c. 4).

30 IV. Effects. 1. Lust is a capital vice. For a vice which has an end that is very appetible, so that from its appetite a man proceeds to commit many sins, is capital. But lust has an end that is very appetible, from the appetite of which a man proceeds to commit many sins. Therefore lust is a capital vice.

The minor is proved from the fact that the end of lust is the pleasure of venereal things, which is the greatest; and for that reason pleasure of this kind is especially appetible according to the sensitive appetite, both because of the vehemence of the pleasure and also because of the connaturality of this kind of concupiscence.¹

2. Lust causes not only many sins but also other moral evils which lead to sins, namely blindness of mind, thoughtlessness, rashness, inconstancy, love of self, hatred of God, affection for the present age, and horror of the future; these are called the daughters of lust. That they are produced by lust St. Thomas proves in this way: when the lower powers are vehemently affected toward their objects, it follows that the higher powers are impeded and disordered in their acts. But through the vice of lust the lower appetite tends vehemently toward its object because of the vehemence of passion and pleasure. Therefore through lust the higher powers, namely reason and will, are especially disordered in their acts. Now four acts of reason are distinguished, and two acts of the will concerning things to be done; each of these is corrupted by lust.

The first act of reason is simple understanding, which apprehends some end as good; and this act is impeded by lust, and in this respect there is posited blindness of mind, by which it happens that the lustful man does not apprehend as his due ultimate or intermediate end the one which truly is such, but goes astray and sets up for himself another, undue end.

The second act is deliberation concerning means; and this too is impeded by lust, and in this respect there is posited rashness, by which it happens that a man does not use sufficient deliberation concerning the means and the end.

The third act is judgment concerning things to be done, which is also impeded by lust, and in this respect there is posited thoughtlessness, by which it happens that someone fails in selecting, among several means, those more apt for the end.

The fourth act is the command of reason concerning things to be done, which is also impeded by lust, and in this respect there is posited inconstancy, by which it happens that the lustful man does not carry out what he determines must be done; hence Terence in the *Eunuch* says of someone who was saying that he would withdraw from friendship: "One little false tear will restrain these words."

The first act of the will is the appetite of the end, which is impeded by lust, and in this respect there is posited love of self, by which the lustful man not only loves himself inordinately - for that is common to every sin - but by which he loves his flesh and its pleasures, so that he constitutes his ultimate end in them. And by opposition there is posited hatred of God, who forbids and punishes the pleasure desired.

The other act of the will concerns the means to the end, and in this respect there is posited affection for the present age, to which the lustful man adheres because of his pleasures in such a way that he would always wish to remain in it; and by opposition, horror and despair of the future age: horror, because the lustful man knows that through death he must be deprived of his pleasures and undergo most grave torments for them; likewise despair, because the lustful man, while he is too much detained by carnal pleasures, does not care to arrive at spiritual ones, but is disgusted by them (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 153, a. 5).

¹ Hieronymus de Medicis, on II-II, q. 153, a. 4.

Chapter II. On Natural Consummated Lust

31 Natural consummated lust is an act of lust which of itself is apt for generation. Six species are distinguished, namely: fornication, adultery, seduction, rape, incest, and sacrilege.

The said sins differ specifically, since their objects are specifically diverse, or have a specifically diverse repugnance to right reason; St. Thomas explains this as follows: The matter or object of natural lust can fail to agree with right reason in two ways:

I. "In one way because it has repugnance to the end of the venereal act," namely insofar as "the due education and promotion of the offspring born is impeded; this is simple fornication, which is of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman."

II. "In another way the matter in which the venereal act is exercised can be unsuitable to right reason by comparison with other human beings. And this in two ways:

1. "First, indeed, on the part of the woman herself with whom someone has intercourse," because the honor due to her is not preserved, either because of kinship, and this is incest; or because of a vow, and this is sacrilege.
2. "Secondly, on the part of him in whose power the woman is; and if she is in the power of a husband, it is adultery; but if she is in the power of her father, it is seduction, if violence is not brought to bear; but rape, if violence is brought to bear" (II-II, q. 154, a. 1).¹

Moreover, they are called species of lust, both because the enumerated sins are committed from an affection of libido rather than from an affection of injustice, and the moral species is taken primarily from the end; and also because in them there is a special repugnance to chastity, situated in the fact that one commits lust with some person notwithstanding the circumstance that that person is joined to another, or is consanguineous, or is sacred, and so forth (cf. St. Thomas, *De malo*, q. 15, a. 3, ad 3).

¹ Cf. Billuart, *De temperantia*, diss. 5, art. 3. Note that seduction and rape are not taken by all in the same sense as by St. Thomas (nn. 43, 45).

§ 1. On Fornication

32 **I. Notion.** Fornication is intercourse of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman by mutual consent.

It is called *of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman*. Moreover, persons are here called unmarried who are bound by no special bond of marriage, vow of chastity, consanguinity, or affinity; in a word, by no bond from which, to the malice of lust, another malice would be added (St. Alphonsus III, 432).

It is called *by mutual consent*; by this is signified the distinction between fornication and seduction (n. 43) and rape (n. 45).

33 **II. Morality.** First note proposition 48 condemned by Innocent XI: It seems so clear that fornication in itself involves no malice and is evil only because it has been forbidden, that the contrary seems wholly discordant with reason.

1. *Fornication is intrinsically and gravely evil.* This is clear first from the texts of Sacred Scripture cited above (n. 27). Next, the act of generating must be done in such a way that provision is made for the education of the human being to be procreated, and indeed, since nature abhors the defective, that provision is made perfectly. But provision would not be made perfectly for education if the act of generating were permitted to those who were not joined by an indissoluble bond, that is, marriage; in other words, if fornication were lawful. Therefore fornication is unlawful, and that under grave sin, because the defect of ordering to education of which we have spoken is grave.

The minor is proved. Since education requires the cohabitation and cooperation of father and mother, and that a lasting one, only then is provision perfectly made for education when provision is perfectly made for lasting cohabitation and cooperation. But only an indissoluble bond, that is, marriage, of itself perfectly provides for the lasting or even perpetual cohabitation and cooperation of father and mother; not, however, a purpose, which can be laid aside; nor a common mutual contract, which can be dissolved by the consent of both; nor a vow, which at least can be removed by dispensation.

Concerning the lasting cohabitation required, St. Thomas notes: "It is manifest... that for the education of a human being there is required not only the care of the mother, by whom he is nourished, but much more the care of the father, by whom he is to be instructed, and defended, and promoted in goods both interior and exterior; and therefore it is contrary to the nature of man that he should use wandering intercourse, but it is necessary that he be of one male to a determinate female, with whom he remains not for a short time, but for a long time or even for the whole of life" (II-II, q. 154, a. 2).

The same argument can also be proposed in this way: The use of venereal things must be ordered, and indeed, since nature abhors the defective, must be perfectly ordered, to the perfection of the human being procreated; likewise, since the human being procreated is perfected through education, to education; likewise, since education requires the lasting cohabitation of the parents, to lasting cohabitation. But only intercourse between persons bound by an indissoluble bond, that is, marriage, is perfectly ordered to lasting cohabitation, as is clear from what has been said above. Therefore only

intercourse performed by married persons is lawful, but not intercourse performed by unmarried persons, that is, fornication.

Objection 1. It can sometimes happen that fornicators, that is, those not bound by marriage, will make good provision for the education of the offspring to be procreated.

Response. Let it pass; but nature, or the Author of nature, must be judged on His part to have provided perfectly for the education of offspring. But this requires that generation be permitted only to those who are joined by an indissoluble bond (p. 26).

Objection 2. Fornication at least seems lawful if now offspring certainly cannot be generated, for example if those having intercourse are certainly sterile, or the woman has been deprived of her ovaries.

Response. Moral precepts attend to that which is according to nature, and not to that which is found accidentally in this or that constitution or age; but of itself semen is ordered by nature to the generation and perfection of offspring. And therefore concerning any emission of semen the common precepts, which are taken chiefly from the end - which is generation and the perfection of the one generated - must be observed, however much by accident generation cannot then follow (n. 27).

2. *The fornication of a Christian is graver than fornication committed by another*; the Apostle alleges the reasons for this assertion in these words: "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Taking therefore the members of Christ, shall I make them the members of a harlot? God forbid. Or do you not know that he who adheres to a harlot becomes one body? For they shall be, he says, two in one flesh."¹ - "Flee fornication. Every sin whatsoever that a man commits is outside the body; but he who fornicates sins against his own body. Or do you not know that your members are the temple of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own?"²

3. *Concerning the gravity of the sin of fornication relative to other sins*, take these words of St. Thomas: "Fornication... is against the good of the human being to be born; and therefore according to its species it is a graver sin than sins which are against exterior goods, such as theft and other things of this sort; but it is less than sins which are directly against God and than a sin which is against the life of a human being already born, such as homicide" (II-II, q. 154, a. 3).

¹ 1 Cor. 6:15-16.

² 1 Cor. 6:18-19.

34 III. To fornication are referred concubinage and prostitution; likewise, in a certain way, the intercourse of a castrated man and of one who has undergone vasectomy, and onanistic intercourse.

1. *Concubinage* is carnal and habitual commerce between the same persons, whether they live in the same house or in different houses. The circumstance of concubinage does not change the species of the sin, so that of itself it need not be opened in confession; nevertheless, it must be manifested to the confessor if he asks.

Concerning penalties, they establish:

Canon 2357, § 2: Those who... publicly live in concubinage... are to be excluded from legitimate ecclesiastical acts until they have given signs of true repentance.

Canon 2359, § 1: Clerics in sacred orders, whether secular or religious, who are concubinarians, after a warning has been uselessly given, are to be compelled to withdraw from illicit cohabitation and to repair scandal by suspension from divine offices, deprivation of the fruits of office, benefice, and dignity.

Question: whether the public power can tolerate concubinage prevailing in colonies, in which, namely, officials both civil and military take an indigenous woman as a concubine, whom, when they return to their homeland, they abandon.

Response. In view both of the very great difficulty of removing that nefarious custom and of those things which will soon be alleged by some in favor of tolerating prostitutes, and which seem to have greater force for colonies than for other regions, the said concubinage can quite probably be tolerated.

Nevertheless Vermeersch rightly writes: "These things... the public power or magistracy ought carefully to guard:

- a) That no legitimate wife, nor also any woman converted to the faith, be permitted to be admitted as a concubine, so that in this way due honor may be preserved both for marriage and for religion;
- b) That every concubinage of a woman who has not fully matured, and every abduction and artful seduction of any woman whatsoever, be severely repressed.
- c) That exterior decency be provided for. It cannot be permitted that these concubines as such be brought forward openly, and be led about as if legitimate wives and be treated with favors. On the contrary, it is necessary that the need of in some way veiling or concealing that shameful commerce contain a tacit reproof of the thing.
- d) That those who preserve chaste morals be preferred, as being of themselves better for fulfilling offices, at least other things being equal.

Finally, it is to be wished that in Europe we prepare better cultivators of those regions; and that, by entering into a compact, those who there remain good may be better protected from human respect and from the contagion of vices."¹

2. *Prostitution* consists in this, that a woman is prepared to grant the use of her body to anyone. A woman given over to prostitution is called a prostitute; the house where - commonly with others - she dwells is called a brothel. Concerning the circumstance of prostitution, what has just been said about concubinage holds.

Prostitution is distinguished: 1. into public and clandestine, according as it is admitted by the public power, or is not admitted and is practiced clandestinely; 2. into brothel prostitution and free prostitution, the latter of which is practiced in streets and frequented places.

The public power cannot tolerate free prostitution, since it offers an occasion of sinning to those not seeking one. Nor can it tolerate brothel prostitution in smaller places. Whether it can do so, with the necessary conditions observed,² in great cities is disputed. Some affirm this, namely so that greater evils may be forestalled, such as pollution, sodomy, bestiality, the seduction of honorable girls, and

venereal diseases.³ Others deny it, and judge that, on the one hand, greater evils are not notably diminished by tolerated brothels, while on the other hand sins are notably multiplied thereby. "Through prostitutes," says St. Alphonsus, "... greater evils are not avoided; because in lustful men, from easy and frequent intercourse with prostitutes, libido fixes deeper roots. And therefore, since this vice is increased more by frequency, they do not cease to commit pollutions and abominable sins, at least with the prostitutes themselves; nor for that reason do they abstain from soliciting honorable women. - Conversely, by the permission of prostitutes, innumerable other evils are added besides: namely more girls are prostituted, young men despise their parents, dissipate their goods, neglect scientific studies, stir up quarrels, and reject honorable marriages" (III, 434).

St. Augustine,⁴ whose words St. Thomas adduces (II-II, q. 10, a. 11), is commonly said to favor the milder opinion, to which also the author of the little work *On the Governance of Princes*⁵ adheres. St. Alphonsus, as is clear from the words cited above, already inclined to the more severe opinion, which today, because circumstances have changed, seems wholly to be followed. For - apart from the fact that brothels, as we have noted, always seem to have multiplied sins rather than diminished them - first, the crimes of which the adversaries speak are, because of the stricter public discipline, more forestalled. Next, brothels can now scarcely be relegated to the "meaner and remote" places of great cities. Moreover, in view of the greater ease of travel and the increased commerce with great cities, houses of prostitutes can easily be, and are, approached from everywhere, even from villages. Finally, the permission of brothels favors that detestable traffic in women and girls which internationally provides brothels of great cities continually with new victims of lust, not rarely unwilling or deceived; this reason alone has already impelled several nations, and even the League of Nations, both to oppose the system, hitherto quite commonly prevailing, of permitting brothels, and to promote "abolitionism," which reproves every connivance in this matter on the part of civil authority.⁶

3. The intercourse of a castrated man and of one who has undergone vasectomy⁷ (an unmarried man with an unmarried woman) is to be reduced to fornication. Onanistic intercourse of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman is pollution in effect, with an affection toward fornication added (n. 51).

¹ *De castitate et de vitiis contrariis*, n. 213.

² Namely, brothels must be relegated to the meaner and remote regions of the city.

³ Even prostitutes to whom a certificate of health has been granted infect very many with venereal disease.

⁴ "Remove prostitutes from human affairs: you will disturb all things with lusts" (*De Ordine*, l. 2, c. 4, n. 12; in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, t. 32, col. 1000). It should be noted, however, that the aforesaid words do not so clearly express the opinion of St. Augustine. If we consider what the holy Doctor teaches in his *Retractations* and in his exposition against Faustus, he seems to adhere to the more severe opinion (Marc-Gestermann, *Institutiones morales Alphonsianae* I, n. 775, note).

⁵ L. 4, c. 14, after the middle.

⁶ Dutch law establishes penalties: 1. against pimps, that is, those who preside over a brothel (Penal Code, art. 250bis); 2. against those who take profit from a woman's lust, or *souteneurs*, as they are called (Penal Code, art. 452); 3. against those who for pay hand women over to prostitution (*vrouwenhandelaars*; Penal Code, art. 250ter).

⁷ Those castrated after puberty and those who have undergone vasectomy are capable of seminal emission in the first or second intercourse, namely until the epididymis has been emptied; after that emptying they can indeed preserve erectility and penetrate the vagina, and even ejaculate some liquid, but that liquid is not true semen.

§ 2. On Adultery

35 **I. Notion.** Adultery is intercourse which injures the fidelity of the marriage bed, whether one's own, or another's, or both at the same time.

Adultery is had even if the other spouse consents. This follows from proposition 50 condemned by Innocent XI: "Intercourse with a married woman, with her husband consenting, is not adultery, and therefore it is enough in confession to say that one has fornicated." The reason, however, is that the said consent does not prevent a sin of injustice from being added to the sin against chastity, as will be more fully explained below.

36 **II. Division.** Adultery is distinguished into simple and double, according as one or both are married.

37 **III. Morality.** 1. Adultery contains a twofold sin, namely of lust and of injustice (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 1, ad 2). It contains a sin of lust because, equally with fornication, it involves the use of venereal things which, as performed by persons not bound by an indissoluble bond, is not perfectly ordered to the education of offspring (n. 33). It contains a sin of injustice because it injures the right either of one's own consort, or of another's consort, or of both. I said *or of both*, namely if both are married; in that case there are two sins of injustice, because two distinct rights are injured (St. Alphonsus III, 445).

But if one spouse consents to the intercourse of his or her consort with another, there is indeed, as we said above, adultery, and therefore besides lust there is added a sin of another species, and indeed, according to the almost common opinion, of injustice. But it is disputed with respect to whom injustice is committed in this case. Some¹ judge that injustice is not committed against the husband, because no injury is done to one who knows and wills; but it is committed with respect to the conjugal state. But it seems that one should say that action is unjustly taken against the husband himself. For the matter concerns a right of the husband which he cannot renounce except as to his own exercise of it; and therefore that right, notwithstanding the consent, persists. But if the right of the husband persists, it is not seen why injustice is not had with respect to the husband, just as if the consent had not taken place. Add that the conjugal state is not a moral person which enjoys strict rights, so that strict injustice cannot be committed against it (cf. St. Alphonsus, *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. 9, n. 16).

2. Concerning the relative gravity of adulteries, note: If the adulterating woman is married, the sin is held graver than if the man is, because of graver inconveniences, for example damage to the true heir,² uncertainty of offspring,³ and so forth.⁴ But if both are married, it is still graver, because there are two injustices against each spouse, to be expressed in confession (St. Alphonsus III, 445).

Note 1. The pollution of a married person in some way takes on the nature of adultery, because it injures the right of the consort, who alone has the right to the use of the body of the consort, according to these words of the Apostle: The woman does not have power over her own body, but the man. Likewise also the man does not have power over his own body, but the woman⁵ (n. 104).

Note 2. Intercourse with another's betrothed man or betrothed woman quite probably does not take on the nature of adultery, or quite probably is not opposed to justice, since the arguments of the adversaries prove nothing at all. They argue from the fact that fornication renders the thing

promised, that is, the body, notably worse in order to marriage. But first, that which the adversaries suppose is rightly called into doubt, namely that by betrothal there is introduced an obligation of justice to hand over the body such as it was at the time of the promise. If the question is about another promise, this will sometimes be clear from the circumstances; but in the present case the matter seems doubtful. Next, it is by no means clear that the body is rendered notably worse by intercourse in order to marriage (St. Alphonsus VI, 847).⁶

¹ Billuart, *De temperantia*, dissert. 6, a. 5; Merkelbach, cited work, p. 40.

² Namely, if the woman is married and commits adultery at the time when she conceives, there is danger lest foreign offspring be supposed by the husband and share the inheritance with legitimate children.

³ Namely, it will be doubtful whose offspring it is.

⁴ It is added, namely, that a woman easily becomes sterile from mingling with several men.

⁵ 1 Cor. 7:4.

⁶ Cf. our little work *De forma promissionis et celebrationis matrimonii*, ed. 5, pp. 10-11.

§ 3. On Incest

38 I. Notion. Incest is said from *in* and *castus*, and is intercourse between relatives or affines within the degrees which constitute an impediment of marriage. It is said:

1. *Between relatives*, that is, relatives either naturally, or consanguineously,¹ or spiritually,² or legally;³ likewise between affines.⁴
2. *Within the degrees which constitute an impediment of marriage*, whether by ecclesiastical law alone or also by natural law itself. Namely, as St. Thomas teaches, "in the mingling of joined persons there is something which is in itself unbecoming and repugnant to natural reason, as that mingling should take place between parents and children, whose kinship is of itself and immediate. For children naturally owe honor to parents... But other persons who are not joined according to themselves, but by order to parents, do not have unbecomingness thus from themselves. But concerning this, becomingness or unbecomingness varies according to custom and human or divine law, because the use of venereal things, which is ordered to the common good, is subject to law" (II-II, q. 154, a. 9, ad 3).

One who, after a dispensation has been obtained for entering marriage, sins with a relative or affine, quite probably does not commit incest (St. Alphonsus III, 452).

¹ In the direct line of consanguinity, marriage is invalid between all ascendants and descendants, both legitimate and natural. - In the collateral line it is invalid up to the third degree inclusive, yet in such a way that the impediment of marriage is multiplied only as often as the common stock is multiplied (can. 1076, §§ 1 and 2).

² Only that spiritual relationship of which canon 768 speaks invalidates marriage (can. 1079). Canon 768, however, establishes: From baptism only the one baptizing and the sponsor contract spiritual relationship with the baptized.

³ Those who by civil law are held incapable of entering marriage with one another on account of legal relationship arising from adoption cannot validly contract marriage with one another by force of canon law (can. 1080).

⁴ Affinity in the direct line invalidates marriage in any degree; in the collateral line up to the second degree inclusive (can. 1077, § 1).

39 **II. Morality.** 1. Incest, besides the sin of lust which it involves for the same reason as fornication (n. 33) and adultery (n. 37), also contains a sin against piety. Incest, however, between those spiritually related seems to be opposed to religion rather than, or equally with, piety, because the Church seems to have established the law both from the motive of reverence due to those joined together and from reverence due to the sacrament (cf. St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 10, ad 2; St. Alphonsus III, 450). I said: incest contains a sin against piety; for it is opposed to reverence due from piety, according to these words of St. Thomas: "Naturally man owes a certain honor to parents, and consequently to other blood-relatives, who draw their origin proximately from the same parents... But it is manifest... that in venereal acts there especially consists a certain shamefulness contrary to honor; hence men are ashamed concerning these things; and therefore it is unfitting that such venereal mingling should take place between such persons with one another" (II-II, q. 154, a. 9). These things can also be applied to those legally related, because the adopter and the adopted are in the likeness of parent and child, and therefore the Church, in making the law, is judged to have been moved by the same motive.

2. Incests between those joined in diverse ways differ thus:

a) Incest between those naturally related, or consanguineous, those spiritually related, and those legally related differ in species. The reason is that the said relationships arise from an altogether diverse root, namely natural relationship from intercourse, spiritual relationship from the sacrament, legal relationship from adoption; hence they themselves, and consequently their violations through incest, seem morally diverse. With respect to incest between those spiritually related, it is added that this also seems opposed to religion.

b) Incest between affines, those spiritually related, and those legally related, for the same reason explained under a), differ in species.

c) Incest between consanguineous persons and affines more probably does not differ in species. The reason is "because a person who is affine is joined to someone on account of a person joined by consanguinity; and therefore because one is on account of the other, consanguinity and affinity make an unbecomingness of the same nature" (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 9, ad 2; St. Alphonsus III, 449; VI, 469).

3. Incests between lines and degrees of diverse connections differ thus:

a) With respect to consanguinity, incest in the first degree of the direct line¹ seems to differ in species from others. But incest between other consanguineous persons seems not to differ in species. The reason is that among consanguineous persons in the first degree of the direct line the character of piety is found *per se*, whereas among the rest it is found only by participation, that is, by relation to parents. But what is such *per se* seems to differ in species from what is such by participation. But things which are such by participation seem to differ not in species, but only in degree (St. Alphonsus III, 448; VI, 469, 470; cf. St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 9, ad 3). St. Alphonsus (VI, 470) and others judge that a sin with a person ascending in the direct line also differs in species from a sin with one descending, and therefore they teach that it must be explained whether a father sinned with his daughter, or a son with his mother.

b) With respect to affinity, incest in the first degree of the direct line, that is, between stepson and stepmother and between father-in-law and daughter-in-law, in the same way as incest in the first

degree of the direct line of consanguinity, seems to differ in species from others. "The reason is that the debt of reverence which is the special motive prohibiting intercourse of parents with children is also the motive prohibiting intercourse between stepmother and stepson, or father-in-law and daughter-in-law." Thus St. Alphonsus (VI, 469) and others.²

Whatever is admitted theoretically, in practice the confessor, in order to consult the peace of the penitent, if he has a founded suspicion that incest was committed in the first degree of the direct line, whether of consanguinity or affinity, should ask about it; and he should proceed for the same reason if the discussion is of the first degree of the collateral line.

Corollary. A parish priest who sins with his parishioner, likewise a confessor who sins with a penitent, are not guilty of incest, because spiritual relationship, which is an impediment of marriage, is lacking (cf. can. 1079 compared with can. 768). Nevertheless the parish priest sins against justice, because from his office, to which a salary is annexed, he is bound to provide for the spiritual good of the parishioner (St. Alphonsus III, 451).

¹ Many assert the same concerning the first degree of the collateral line (cf. St. Alphonsus III, 448; VI, 470).

² Salmanticenses, tr. 26, c. 5, n. 31; Lugo, disp. 16, nn. 316 and 319.

§ 4. On Carnal Sacrilege

40 **I. Notion.** Carnal sacrilege is the violation of a sacred person, thing, or place by a venereal act (St. Alphonsus III, 454). What persons, things, and places are sacred will be clear from what is to be said.

41 **II. Division.** Carnal sacrilege, like sacrilege taken generally, is divided into personal, local, and real.

42 **III. Morality.** Carnal sacrilege, besides the sin of lust, also involves a sin of irreligiosity. The reason is that the special shameful of lust is very repugnant to the sanctity of a sacred person, place, and thing (cf. St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 10, ad 3).

Corollary I. He commits personal carnal sacrilege who violates his own or another sacred person through lust.

I said *a sacred person*; now a person certainly becomes sacred through a public vow of chastity, whether solemn or simple. There is dispute about a private vow of chastity. Some¹ affirm, and judge that a peculiar sanctity belongs to the body by the very fact that through a vow of chastity it is dedicated to God. Others² deny this, because in their opinion a person, in order to become sacred, must be deputed to divine worship by public authority. In this opinion, the violation of a public vow and of a private vow differ in species, because in the former there is true sacrilege, while in the latter there is another sin against religion; and therefore it would not be enough to confess that one was bound by a vow. Nevertheless carnal sacrilege does not differ in species according as it was committed by a person bound by a solemn vow or by a person bound by a simple public vow, for example a religious of simple vows.

I said *through lust*; moreover an act of lust, both internal and external, violates one's own person; only an external act violates another person.

Hence he perpetrates personal carnal sacrilege: 1. a sacred person who sins against chastity; 2. every person who commits lust with a sacred person; if both are sacred, each is guilty of a double sacrilege;

3. a sacred person who, from an affection of libido, furnishes another person an occasion of sinning against chastity. Quite probably one must say otherwise if he proceeds from another motive. The reason is that an absolute affection of libido is specially repugnant to the sanctity of the person, but quite probably not an affection in a qualified sense, such as is involved in an act by which a sacred person, from a motive other than libido, furnishes someone an occasion of injuring chastity (St. Alphonsus III, 457).

One who is both a priest and a religious can indeed be called a sacred person by a twofold title; but that does not cause him, when sinning against chastity, to commit a double personal carnal sacrilege (St. Alphonsus III, 455).

Corollary II. He commits local carnal sacrilege who violates a sacred place through lust.

I said *a sacred place*; under this heading, as regards our matter, belong a church and a public oratory, provided they have been consecrated or solemnly blessed (cf. can. 1154 and 1191). There is rightly doubt about semi-public oratories and cemeteries, because the former are not deputed to divine worship in the same way (cf. can. 1191, § 1; 1196, § 2), while the latter are destined only for the burial of the faithful, and not for divine worship (cf. can. 1154).

I said *through lust*; by this word here understand an external sin of lust or immodesty. Hence he is guilty of local carnal sacrilege who in a sacred place perpetrates, for example, fornication, pollution, and so forth, or a gravely sinful act of immodesty, for example very indecent touches, obscene conversations, and so forth. Moreover, the things said more probably hold even if the sins are done secretly, because nonetheless they seem gravely repugnant to the sanctity of the place. Many teach the same concerning illicit conjugal intercourse (St. Alphonsus III, 458-462).

Internal sins do not violate the sanctity of a place, although he is guilty of local carnal sacrilege who desires an external carnal work to be performed in a sacred place, or who takes delight in such a work as performed in a sacred place (cf. St. Alphonsus III, 43).

Corollary III. He perpetrates real carnal sacrilege who abuses a sacred thing for a shameful sin; as if someone in confession solicits a penitent to shameful things. The same must be said of a priest who, vested in sacred vestments for celebrating, or carrying or distributing the Holy Eucharist, or - which you may also apply to a layperson - immediately after receiving the Holy Eucharist, should sin shamefully (St. Alphonsus III, 463; *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. 9, n. 23).

Note. The circumstance of time then constitutes carnal sacrilege when a shameful action has an extraordinary repugnance with the time, as if someone on Good Friday were to present obscene spectacles (cf. St. Alphonsus III, 46).

¹ Cajetan on II-II, q. 99, a. 1; Billuart, *De temperantia*, diss. 6, a. 8; cf. St. Thomas, II-II, q. 99, a. 3, ad 3; q. 154, a. 1, ad 3 and a. 10, ad 1; II Sent., dist. 38, q. 1, a. 3, quaestiuncula 2.

² Vermeersch, *De castitate*, n. 314.

§ 5. On **Stuprum**, or Seduction

43 **I. Notion.** *Stuprum* can be taken in a broad and in a strict sense. Taken in the broad sense, it is defined: intercourse with a woman - whether a virgin or deflowered - who consents in no way or not freely, for example with one resisting, sleeping, insane, or consenting from fraud or fear. Taken in the

strict or canonical sense, it is: intercourse with a virgin who consents in no way or not freely (St. Alphonsus III, 443); moreover, by the name of virgin here is understood one who retains the seal of virginity, even if perhaps she has sinned.

44 **II. Morality.** *Stuprum* is opposed not only to chastity but also to justice, because it involves the use of the body against the free will of the one to whom that use belongs. Indeed, if the woman who is forced to intercourse is a virgin, another injustice is added, and this more probably grave; it consists in the fact that the virginal seal is taken from the virgin, which, as a grave sign of immunity from intercourse, for example in order to the state to be undertaken, seems in itself to be of grave importance.

The former injustice ceases if the woman freely grants the use of her body; for although in that case, since she is not married, she acts illicitly, nevertheless she does not act invalidly, because God has granted to each person a right of using his or her own body.

It is disputed whether the other injustice also ceases if a virgin consents to her own defloration. Now St. Alphonsus (III, 443), with others, rightly affirms against many that it does. For, as we have said, God has granted to each person a right in the use of the body, so that a virgin, by granting the use, acts illicitly indeed, but not invalidly. But to the use of a virginal body belongs the injury of the virginal seal. Therefore she can validly grant it. Hence intercourse with a consenting virgin lacks every injustice and is equivalent to mere fornication; nevertheless "there can be a special sin from another source, namely by reason of infamy, or the grief of parents, or quarrels, hatred, and so forth" (St. Alphonsus III, loc. cit.).

Note 1. *Stuprum*, if it is reserved, likewise *stuprum* liable to ecclesiastical penalty, is understood as *stuprum* taken in the strict sense, unless something else is expressly signified.

Note 2. A girl oppressed by force is bound positively to resist the oppressor, and only on account of danger of death or of another harm equivalent to it is it permitted for her to remain passive, provided, however, that the danger of consent is removed. Since that danger of consent can easily be present in the case, it should be advised that the virgin rather allow herself to be killed than violated (St. Alphonsus III, 368). Likewise, "a woman oppressed by force... can, indeed must, turn herself and interrupt intercourse, even if the man's semen were to be poured out, because this would happen by accident and by reason of the man's malice alone" (St. Alphonsus VI, 954, doubt 1).

Note 3. It is disputed whether it is licit for a woman oppressed by force to expel the male semen received. With St. Alphonsus (loc. cit.) and others we think it must be denied. For since semen as such exists only on account of the good of the species, and the good of the species is subordinated to no created good but to God alone, every disposition concerning semen as such which directly impedes the good of the species is intrinsically evil. But the oppressed woman of whom we are speaking expels the semen as such, and by that expulsion directly impedes the good of the species. Therefore the expulsion is intrinsically evil. It is added that, if this argumentation is rejected, it is not seen by what reasoning that way of acting, of which there is discussion in nn. 108-109, namely the constriction of the mouth of the uterus, can be proved intrinsically evil.

§ 6. On Rape

45 **I. Notion.** Rape, as it is taken here, is the violent abduction of any person whatsoever, for the sake of satisfying libido (St. Alphonsus III, 444).¹ It is called:

1. *Abduction*; to this, under the moral respect, detention in the place where the person is staying is equivalent.
2. *Violent*. Violence, however, can be physical or moral, and can be inflicted either on the one abducted, or on those under whose power the person is, or to whose custody the person has been committed, or on both parties. Hence if some woman of full age goes away spontaneously, for example with a lover, without the knowledge of her parents, it will not properly be rape but flight (St. Alphonsus III, 444); otherwise if she is a minor (cf. can. 2353).
3. *Of any person whatsoever*, whether male or female, whether married or unmarried, whether virgin or corrupted (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).
4. *For the sake of satisfying libido*, whether through intercourse or through another shameful act. Rape is had even if intercourse or another shameful work does not follow; likewise even if the abducted person afterward consents to the sin of lust. But rape, as it is here taken, that is, as a sin of lust, is not had if a person is abducted for the sake of another end, for example, in order to enter a valid marriage.

¹ Although rape - as will be clear from what is to be said - does not in its own concept involve consummated lust, nevertheless it is customarily treated in this place.

46 **II. Morality.** From what has been said, it follows that rape is opposed not only to chastity but also to justice, with respect either to the abducted person, or, if that person is a minor, to those under whose power the person is, or to both (St. Alphonsus III, 444). If a minor consents to his or her own abduction, injury persists with respect to those to whose care the minor is subject.

47 **III. Penalties.** 1. One who, with a view to marriage or for the sake of satisfying libido, has carried off an unwilling woman by force or deceit, or a woman of minor age who indeed consents but without the knowledge or against the will of her parents or guardians, is held *ipso iure* excluded from legitimate ecclesiastical acts and furthermore is punished with other penalties according to the gravity of the fault (can. 2353).¹

2. A layperson who has been legitimately condemned for the crime... of rape of impubescent persons of either sex... is held *ipso iure* excluded from legitimate ecclesiastical acts and furthermore is punished with other penalties according to the gravity of the penalty (can. 2354, § 1). A cleric is to be punished from § 2 of the same canon with various penalties according to the gravity of the fault.

General Note 1. It is clear that several of the species of sins explained can concur in one and the same act, as if someone has intercourse with a married blood-relative.

General Note 2. Insofar as acts of immodesty and of non-consummated lust contract the species of sins contained in consummated lust and explained above, we shall speak below.

¹ When it constitutes a diriment impediment of marriage, it is explained in the treatise on that sacrament.

Chapter III. On Unnatural Consummated Lust

48 **I.** Unnatural consummated lust is: a completed venereal act which is unsuited for generation. Moreover, in order that an act be of itself apt for generation, there are required: 1. the carnal union of two; 2. the union of two of the same species; 3. the union of two of diverse sex; 4. union in the due vessel of the diverse sex. Hence there are four species of lust against nature, namely: pollution, which excludes the union of two; bestiality, which excludes the union of two of the same species; sodomy, which excludes the union of two of diverse sex; finally, intercourse which excludes union in the due vessel of the diverse sex (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 11; St. Alphonsus III, 412).

II. The enumerated sins differ in species, because in morally diverse ways they are repugnant to right seminal emission (St. Alphonsus III, 464). There is added proposition 24 condemned by Alexander VII: Softness, sodomy, and bestiality are sins of the same lowest species, and therefore it is enough to say in confession that one has procured pollution.

III. Concerning the relative gravity of the said sins, take these words of St. Thomas: "Gravity in sin is considered more from the abuse of some thing than from the omission of due use; and therefore among the vices which are against nature, the sin of uncleanness holds the lowest place, which consists in the mere omission of intercourse with another (pollution); but the gravest is the sin of bestiality, because the due species is not preserved; hence on that verse of Genesis 37, 'He accused his brothers of a most wicked crime,' the Gloss says that they were mingled with beasts. After this is the vice of sodomy, since there the due sex is not preserved; after this is the sin from the fact that the due manner of lying together is not preserved; but more if there is not the due vessel, than if there is disorder according to some other things pertaining to the manner of intercourse" (II-II, q. 154, a. 12, ad 4).

With these things having been noted generally, we shall speak specifically about the individual unnatural sins.

Article I. On Pollution

49 **I. Notion.** Pollution, softness, masturbation is a completed venereal act outside intercourse, both natural or copulation, and unnatural or sodomy and bestiality (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 11; St. Alphonsus III, 465). Moreover, it has been explained above (p. 6) in what a completed venereal act consists, both among men and among women.¹

¹ Cf. Van Roey, *Quaestio specialis de Sexto decalogi praecepto*.

50 **II. Morality.** First note proposition 49, which was condemned by Innocent XI at least as scandalous and dangerous in practice: "Softness is not prohibited by the law of nature. Hence, if God had not forbidden it, it would often be good and sometimes obligatory under mortal sin." With these things noted, receive the following:

1. *Pollution both of a man and of a woman is a sin.* This is clear both from Sacred Scripture (n. 27) and from the fact that the said pollutions involve the use of semen or quasi-semen which lacks ordination to the natural end of semen or quasi-semen, that is, to the good of the species. But a use of semen of this sort is a sin (n. 27).

Moreover, authors dispute in what especially the malice of pollution is situated. According to Eschbach,¹ Noldin,² and several more recent authors, it must chiefly be placed in satiating venereal pleasure. But this opinion seems to be rejected. For pleasure according to itself is not evil, but only by reason either of the end (p. 90), of which there is no discussion here, or of the work concerning which or in which one takes pleasure, so that one must necessarily come to the malice of the work itself. Hence the malice of pollution is primarily and chiefly to be placed in the disordering of the work itself,³ that is, in the fact that it involves a venereal act, completed, which is not ordered to the good of the species (cf. St. Thomas, *De malo*, q. 15, a. 1, corpus, and a. 2, corpus).

2. *Pollution both of a man and of a woman is a grave sin.* This is again clear from Sacred Scripture (n. 27).

Next, as regards the pollution of a man, it is drawn from the fact that this involves a use of semen which is neither apt for generating nor ordered to the education of the one to be generated; these privations are grave (n. 28). As regards the pollution of a woman, it is deduced from the fact that there is had a use of quasi-semen which - to say nothing of the defect of ordination to generation (n. 28) - is not ordered to education, which ordination ought to be present in every use even of quasi-semen, and the privation of which is grave (n. 28). Hence St. Thomas: "From one intercourse one human being can be generated; and therefore a disordering of intercourse which impedes the good of the offspring to be born is, from the very kind of the act, mortal sin" (II-II, q. 154, a. 2, ad 6). But the holy Doctor speaks about fornication, and therefore about the disordering arising from the fact that ordination to education is lacking; for ordination to generation indeed subsists in fornication.

Note 1. It is disputed whether pollutions of a man and of a woman differ in species; in other words, whether the disordering which we have said is present in the pollution of a man and of a woman is morally, and not only physically, diverse; this is difficult to determine.⁴

Note 2. According to some,⁵ the completed venereal act of a woman, to which a flow of vaginal fluid is joined, differs specifically from completed venereal commotion which occurs without a pouring forth of this sort. But the said pouring forth of fluid either is necessarily required for completed commotion, or is nothing except the complement of completed commotion, and therefore does not differ from it.

Note 3. It is asked whether the venereal act of old men, eunuchs, and boys, carried all the way to its end, is of the same species as the pollution of an adult. Now with respect to old men this is quite commonly affirmed, and seems altogether to be affirmed, because old men possess true semen, though infertile, and therefore in them there is emission of semen. With respect to eunuchs and boys, who lack true semen, some deny it,⁶ chiefly because emission of semen, and therefore true pollution, is lacking. Others affirm it, relying especially on this reason, that the action and intention of the agent constitute the species more than the material effect does. Now the act and intention of the agent of themselves suffice for producing pollution. St. Alphonsus (III, 476), Van Roey,⁷ and Waffelaert⁸ adhere to this opinion.

3. Another malice can be added to pollution, namely from the object thought of, from the circumstances of the subject, but not from the manner in which the pollution is excited. I said:

a) From the object thought of, as if someone, while polluting himself, desires intercourse with an unmarried woman, a blood-relative, and so forth (St. Alphonsus III, 476).

b) From the circumstances of the subject or of the sinner. Thus if a married person pollutes himself, the species of adultery is added; if a sacred person, the species of carnal sacrilege, and so forth (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

c) From the circumstances of the object, that is, of the person by touching whom, with hand or body, by kissing, or by embracing, someone pollutes himself; as if he touches a married woman, a blood-relative, and so forth; in this case again there is had the species of adultery, incest, and so forth (St. Alphonsus III, 467, 476). These things, however, do not hold concerning the act of looking, unless the affection of libido is determined toward the person, for example, a married woman as such. The reason for the distinction is that touches, kisses, and embraces, since in the concrete and materially they reach such a person, cannot abstract from a circumstance inhering in the person; but looks, which are less material, commonly abstract from the person as such (St. Alphonsus III, 421).

¹ *Disputatio physiologico-theologica*, p. 548.

² *De sexto praecepto*, n. 29.

³ And these things hold concerning every sin of lust.

⁴ Cf. Waffelaert, *De virtutibus cardinalibus*, n. 167.

⁵ Cf. Bucceroni, *Institutiones Theologiae Moralis* I, n. 813.

⁶ Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis*, I, n. 475; Vermeersch, *De castitate et de vitiis contrariis*, n. 328, and others.

⁷ *Quaestio specialis de Sexto decalogi praecepto*, p. 20.

⁸ *De virtutibus cardinalibus*, n. 162.

51 Question: whether another malice is added to pollution from the sex or species which someone pollutes himself by touching with hand or body; in other words, whether pollution provoked by touching with the hand a person of diverse or of the same sex, or a beast, has annexed to it the malice of fornication, sodomy, or bestiality.

Response. Quite probably, with St. Alphonsus, this is denied if only pollution is intended. It is true indeed that incomplete acts of themselves take on the species of the completed act in the same species, because by their nature they are ordered to it. Thus, for example, the touch of a woman of itself takes on the species of fornication (St. Alphonsus III, 416, 2; *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. 9, n. 3). But it is not clear that the same happens if the incomplete act is referred by the agent himself to an act completed in another species; for example, if the touch of a woman is referred by the one touching to pollution (St. Alphonsus III, 467; *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. 9, n. 25).

The same, strictly speaking, seems able to obtain if a joining of bodies outside the vessel intervenes; but then, regularly speaking, there will be had an affection toward true mingling, that is, toward an act completed in the same species. Hence if, for example, a male lies upon the body of a woman, the malice of fornication will scarcely be absent (St. Alphonsus, cited places, compared with III, 466, inferred 2).

d) But not from the manner in which the object is reached. Hence it is the same whether someone reaches the object with his own hand, with an instrument, or by sight and provokes pollution. Likewise, if there is question of bodily joining with a woman, it does not matter whether someone pollutes himself within the hands, between the breasts, or between her thighs. The reason is that these materially relate to the pollution in question, and they are not evil except by order to it, and

therefore they do not change the species. Many except pollution in another's mouth, which is customarily called *irrumatio*; concerning this, see n. 57.

Note 1. If a penitent accuses himself of immodest touches, it seems that one can proceed thus:

I. If he is of more advanced age, or an adolescent of eighteen to nineteen years, or a girl of nineteen to twenty years, pollution can be presumed, and is sufficiently manifested by the very accusation of immodest touches; hence there is no obligation to ask about pollution having followed.

II. If pollution cannot be presumed, or rather if there is doubt whether it followed, let this be done:

1. If from the circumstances it is clear to the confessor that pollution is known to the penitent, he should ask about it.
2. If that is doubtful to the confessor, he should not ask, because it is better that the material integrity of confession be lacking than that the penitent learn things which up to that point he had been ignorant of, or that a desire of learning them be conceived by him, or that the confessor be exposed to suspicion and the Sacrament to hatred (cf. can. 868, § 2; St. Alphonsus, *Praxis*, n. 90). Hence impubescent boys and girls are not to be asked about pollution; the same should be applied to the pubescent in the first years after puberty, unless they appear corrupted.

III. In the case in which questioning seems to be required, women and girls should not be asked whether there was an effusion of semen or fluid, but whether they fully satisfied libido or nature, or whether they had vehement satisfaction, or whether they were greatly excited; but males who appear instructed in this matter can be asked whether they emitted nature.

Note 2. One who performs intercourse onanistically (n. 108) is guilty of pollution. Therefore its malice is added to the sin which fornicatorial, adulterous, incestuous, or sacrilegious intercourse already contains of itself.

But if it is asked whether, with foresight of the effusion of semen outside the vessel, it is licit to break off illicit intercourse, for example fornicatorial intercourse, the response is affirmative; indeed there is an obligation of doing so, that is, of desisting from the sin. Yet it would not be licit to break it off for this end, that offspring be avoided, by stopping at that; but it would be licit for this end, that offspring be avoided whose education is not provided for of itself.

Article II. On Sodomy

52 **I. Notion.** Sodomy is intercourse with a person of the same sex (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 12, ad 4; St. Alphonsus III, 466).¹ It is also called sodomy properly so called, to distinguish it from unnatural intercourse with a person of diverse sex, which is customarily called sodomy improperly so called (n. 57). If sodomy is committed with boys, it is called pederasty.

Moreover, the essence and malice of this species of lust seems to consist in congress or in venereal mingling with an individual indeed of the same species, but of a sex with which the act of generating cannot be instituted. Hence for sodomy, besides persons of the same sex, there are required: 1. an act placed after the manner of intercourse; 2. an act placed, by means of the genital member, on the part of the agent; 3. the insertion of the genital member into the vessel of the other. It is said:

1. *An act placed after the manner of intercourse*; hence sodomy is not had in effect if someone touches with the hand, even with effusion of semen, the private parts of another.
2. *An act placed by means of the genital member*, because otherwise venereal mingling is not had.
3. *The insertion of the genital member into the vessel of the other*, because otherwise true mingling is lacking. It is required, therefore, either that a male insert the virile member into the posterior vessel or - as others add - into the mouth of another male; or that a woman insert the vulva into the vulva or into the posterior vessel or - as others add - into the mouth of another woman.

I said: *or - as others add - into the mouth of another male*, and: *into the mouth of another woman*. Namely, the said acts seem to be called sodomy properly so called, because here too there is had venereal mingling with a person of the same sex (St. Alphonsus III, 466; *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. 9, n. 25). Nevertheless, congress with a person of the same sex in the posterior vessel and in the mouth do not differ in species, because the malice of each consists in venereal mingling with a person of the same sex in an undue vessel.

Corollary I. Sodomy between women can indeed be attempted, but, if the structure of the genitals is normal, it cannot be actually exercised. When women, as seems sometimes to happen, apply vulva to vulva or to the posterior vessel of another woman, there is certainly an affection toward sodomy, but true sodomy seems not to be present; since it is not seen why, once the necessity of congress *in a vessel* is admitted among males, intercourse *toward a vessel* among women would suffice. The fact that congress *in a vessel* cannot take place between them proves rather that sodomy is impossible for them, unless the clitoris is abnormally developed, than that congress *in a vessel* is not required.

Corollary II. Intercourse of a man with a man which has taken place neither in the posterior vessel nor in the mouth, but in another part of the body, is not sodomy, but pollution in effect; nevertheless, regularly speaking, it will have annexed an affection toward sodomy (St. Alphonsus III, 466).

Corollary III. They commonly say that true sodomy is had whether seminal emission occurs inside or outside the vessel, so that there is no need to indicate that point (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

¹ Those who are especially borne by affection toward persons of the same sex are called homosexuals.

53 II. Morality. 1. Sodomy is intrinsically and gravely evil, indeed after bestiality the gravest sin of lust. It is intrinsically evil because it involves the use of semen or quasi-semen which is not ordered to the good of the species (n. 28). It is gravely evil because, equally with pollution, it contains, if the discussion is of a man, a use of semen which is neither apt for generating nor ordered to the education of the one to be generated; if the discussion is of a woman, it involves the use of quasi-semen which is not ordered to education (n. 28). Finally, it is a most grave sin, as is clear from the testimonies of Sacred Scripture: "But the men of Sodom were very wicked, and sinners before the Lord exceedingly."¹ - "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman, because it is an abomination."² - "God delivered them up to shameful passions. For their women changed the natural use into that use which is against nature. And likewise also the males, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their desires toward one another, males with males working shame."³ It is clear besides from the very notion of sodomy handed down, which in the use of venereal things excludes not only the due organ but also the due sex.

2. The sins of the agent and of the patient do not differ in species. But since the circumstance of seminal emission must be made known, and it can be presumed on the part of the agent but not so certainly on the part of the patient, the penitent should be asked whether he was agent or patient, unless you prefer to inquire directly, or it is sufficiently clear from elsewhere, whether or not seminal emission took place (St. Alphonsus III, 468).
3. Sodomy perpetrated with a blood-relative or affine, equally as direct intercourse had with them, also takes on the malice of incest; perpetrated with a married woman, it also contains the guilt of adultery.

¹ Gen. 13:13.

² Lev. 18:22.

³ Rom. 1:26-27.

54 **III. Penalties.** 1. Laypersons and clerics constituted in minor orders, legitimately condemned for... sodomy... are by that very fact infamous, besides other penalties which the Ordinary shall judge should be inflicted (can. 2357, § 1; can. 2358).

2. Clerics in sacred orders, whether secular or religious, if they have admitted sodomy, are to be declared infamous, deprived of any office, benefice, dignity, or function which they may have, and in graver cases deposed (can. 2359, § 2).

Observe, however, that where in the Code there is speech of penalties against sodomy, sodomy perpetrated between males is understood, in the posterior vessel, with seminal emission made there. Sodomy is to be taken in the same sense if anywhere it is reserved.

Note. Sodomy is more often committed in cities than in villages, especially by reason of sleeping in the same bed. If someone seems to have to be questioned - for example, if a man confesses that he has sinned with a man, or a woman that she has sinned with a woman, and introduces a prudent suspicion of sodomy - it must be inquired whether intercourse or a joining of bodies took place. The inquiry can be instituted in this way: Did they exercise mutual touches? If this is affirmed, was it by hand or by body? If by body, did they join bodies?¹

¹ Aertnys, *Theologia pastoralis*, n. 38.

Article III. On Bestiality

55 **I. Notion.** Bestiality is intercourse with a beast (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 12, ad 4; St. Alphonsus III, 474). Now the essence and malice of this sin seems to consist in venereal mingling with an individual of a species with which the act of generating cannot be instituted. Hence for bestiality, equally and for the same reasons as for sodomy (n. 52), there are required: 1. an act placed after the manner of intercourse; 2. an act placed, by means of the genital member, on the part of the agent; 3. insertion of the genital member into some vessel of the beast, that is, into the natural vessel or into another. Moreover, it does not matter of what species or of what sex the beast was, "because the whole essential deformity of this crime consists in access to a diverse species" (St. Alphonsus III, 474).

Corollary I. Bestiality is not had if someone indecently touches a beast with the hand, or, for example, admits the tongue of a beast to his own private parts. Besides, intercourse with a beast which has not

taken place in some vessel is not bestiality in act, although it will easily have annexed an affection toward bestiality.

Corollary II. If bestiality is reserved anywhere, it is understood as congress in the natural vessel of the beast, with effusion of semen made there.

56 II. Morality. Bestiality - equally and for the same reasons as pollution and sodomy (n. 5) - is intrinsically and gravely evil; indeed it is the gravest sin of lust, because through it a man is venereally mingled with a diverse species. Add these words of Sacred Scripture: "He who has intercourse with a beast or cattle, let him die the death; also kill the beast. - The woman who lies beneath any beast shall be killed together with it; their blood be upon them."¹

Note. Bestiality is committed more rarely in cities than in villages, by peasants, stablemen, and others who spend much time with beasts; more rarely by women than by men. If someone seems to have to be questioned, he can be asked whether the presence of animals was for him an occasion of sinning. If the confessor from the response notices that the penitent is free from this sin and perhaps ignorant of it, let him take care to shut out the idea of that sin, asking, for example, whether he acted cruelly toward animals.²

¹ Lev. 20:15-16; cf. Exod. 22:19.

² Aertnys, *Theologia pastoralis*, n. 38.

Article IV. On Unnatural Intercourse with a Person of Diverse Sex

57 I. Notion. Unnatural intercourse is here understood as intercourse of a man with a woman in the posterior vessel or - as others add - in the mouth. Namely, the malice of this sin consists in mingling with a person with whom someone can procreate offspring, but with whom he is here and now mingled in such a way that offspring cannot be procreated. It is said *in mingling*; hence congress *in a vessel* is required. It is said *with whom he is so mingled that offspring cannot be procreated*; hence congress in an undue vessel is required, that is, in the anus. There is dispute about congress in the mouth, which according to some is pollution, to which an affection toward fornication is added; but according to others it is equated with coitus with a woman in the posterior vessel, because here likewise there seems to be mingling with a person of diverse sex (St. Alphonsus VI, 935).¹ Intercourse with a woman in the posterior vessel is more often called sodomy improperly so called or imperfect; intercourse in the mouth is called *irrumatio*. Moreover, imperfect sodomy and *irrumatio* do not differ in species, because the malice of each consists in mingling with a person of diverse sex in an undue vessel.

Note. Intercourse in another part of the body - besides the posterior vessel and the mouth - is pollution with an affection toward fornication; it does not matter in what part it takes place.

¹ Cf. however St. Alphonsus III, 466 and *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. 9, n. 25.

58 II. Morality. 1. The unnatural intercourse of which we are speaking - equally and for the same reasons as pollution, sodomy, and bestiality - is intrinsically and gravely evil.

The Sacred Penitentiary responded on April 3, 1916: "If the husband wishes to commit with her the crime of the Sodomites, since this Sodomitic coitus is an act against nature on the part of both spouses thus coming together, and by the judgment of all doctors is gravely evil: hence for absolutely

no cause, not even for avoiding death, can the wife licitly comply in this matter with her immodest husband. And the Sacred Penitentiary vehemently marvels that the opposite opinion, with disgrace to human nature, could have persisted in the minds of certain priests, as is reported."

2. The sins of the agent and of the patient do not differ in species. The circumstance of seminal emission, however, if it has taken place, must be made known, and therefore the things set forth under n. 53, 2, are to be observed.
3. Unnatural intercourse perpetrated with a blood-relative or affine, equally as direct intercourse had with them, takes on the malice of incest; likewise of adultery, if it is perpetrated with a married woman.

Note. Inquiry should not be made into unnatural intercourse with a person of diverse sex; for if the penitent is silent about it, it is presumed not to have taken place. Besides, if intercourse was had outside the anus and mouth, the penitent should not be asked in what part of the body it occurred, because, as we have noted, that matter is irrelevant.

Scholion I. On Some Other Modes of Lying Together

59 **I.** Intercourse with a dead woman, necrophilia, seems to be pollution in act, with an affection toward fornication added (St. Alphonsus III, 466). The same must be said of intercourse with a statue or picture representing a woman.

60 **II.** Intercourse with a demon is reduced to bestiality, because it is with a diverse and living species. But there is added a sin of superstition on account of commerce with a demon; likewise an affection toward fornication or toward sodomy according as the demon presents itself under the form of a person of diverse or of the same sex as the one lying with it. But the fact that the demon presents itself under the form of a married woman, a nun, or a blood-relative does not cause there also to be present an affection toward adultery, sacrilege, or incest; for from the woman as married and so forth, pleasure and affection commonly abstract (St. Alphonsus III, 475).

61

Scholion II

Scholion II. On Canonical Penalties Against the Lustful

What things have been established by the Church against those guilty of concubinage, rape, and sodomy, we have inserted in their own place. But for the sake of completeness, it is pleasing to present a complete view of the penalties decreed.

Canon 2353: One who, with a view to marriage or for the sake of satisfying libido, has carried off an unwilling woman by force or deceit, or a woman of minor age who indeed consents but without the knowledge or against the will of her parents or guardians, is held *ipso iure* excluded from legitimate ecclesiastical acts and furthermore is punished with other penalties according to the gravity of the fault.

Canon 2354, § 1: A layperson who has been legitimately condemned for the crime... of rape of impubescent persons of the other sex... is held *ipso iure* excluded from legitimate ecclesiastical acts

and from any function, if he has one in the Church, the burden of repairing damages remaining firm.
- But a cleric is to be punished from § 2 of the same canon with various penalties according to the gravity of the fault.

Canon 2356: Bigamists, that is, those who, with the conjugal bond standing in the way, have attempted another marriage, even only a civil one, as they say, are *ipso facto* infamous; and if, after the warning of the Ordinary has been disregarded, they persist in illicit cohabitation, let them be excommunicated or punished with personal interdict according to the diverse gravity of the guilt.

Canon 2357: Laypersons legitimately condemned for crimes against the sixth commandment committed with minors under the age of sixteen years, or for *stuprum*, sodomy, incest, or pandering, are *ipso facto* infamous, besides other penalties which the Ordinary shall judge should be inflicted (§ 1). - Those who have committed the public crime of adultery, or who publicly live in concubinage, or who have been legitimately condemned for other crimes against the sixth precept of the Decalogue, are to be excluded from legitimate ecclesiastical acts until they have given signs of true repentance (§ 2).

Canon 2358: Clerics constituted in minor orders, guilty of some crime against the sixth precept of the Decalogue, are to be punished according to the gravity of the fault, even by dismissal from the clerical state if the circumstances of the crime recommend it, besides the penalties of which canon 2357 speaks, if there is place for these.

Canon 2359: Concubinary clerics in sacred orders, whether secular or religious, after a warning has been uselessly given, are to be compelled to withdraw from illicit cohabitation and to repair scandal by suspension from divine offices, deprivation of the fruits of office, benefice, and dignity, with the prescription of canons 2176-2181 observed (§ 1); canons 2176-2181 treat the manner of proceeding against concubinarians. - If clerics in sacred orders have admitted a crime against the sixth precept of the Decalogue with minors under the age of sixteen years, or have exercised adultery, *stuprum*, bestiality, sodomy, pandering, or incest with consanguineous persons or affines in the first degree, let them be suspended, declared infamous, deprived of any office, benefice, dignity, or function which they may have, and in graver cases deposed (§ 2). - If in another way they have offended against the sixth precept of the Decalogue, let them be restrained by fitting penalties according to the gravity of the case, not excepting deprivation of office or benefice, especially if they have care of souls (§ 3).

Chapter IV. On Non-Consummated Lust

62 **I. Notion.** Non-consummated lust is the disordered use of venereal things which does not reach a completed act. Of this sort are: in a man, a motion of the genital organs prior to effusion; likewise distillation which is joined with venereal commotion; in a woman, non-extreme venereal commotion (n. 10). To this also belong acts, for example touches and looks, insofar as they are placed with venereal commotion, whether sought or voluntarily admitted.

63 **II. Morality.** 1. *Non-consummated lust is intrinsically evil*, because it involves the use of venereal things which is not ordered to the natural end of venereal things, that is, to the good of the species (n. 27).

2. *Non-consummated lust is in itself gravely evil.* It is proved first by authority. The Holy Office, to the question whether smallness of matter is given in the crime of solicitation, responded on February

11, 1661: "Negative, because in venereal matters there is not given smallness of matter, and if it were given, it is not given in the present matter." Then Clement VIII and Paul V commanded that those be denounced to the Inquisitors of the faith who assert that kisses, embraces, and touches had for pleasure are not mortal sins. Add proposition 40 condemned by Alexander VII: "The opinion is probable which says that a kiss had for carnal and sensual pleasure which arises from the kiss, with the danger of further consent and of pollution excluded, is only venial." Now, considered according to the obvious sense of this proposition, at least some venereal commotion must be held as grave by reason of itself. But if you admit this concerning some commotion, it is scarcely seen why it should not be affirmed concerning others. For all venereal commotions seem to differ only as more and less, so that, if some one of them is gravely evil by reason of itself, this ought to be said of all.

Objection. The proposition could have been condemned because every venereal pleasure voluntarily sought or admitted carries with it the proximate danger of further consent and of pollution. "Observe," says Billuart, "that that proposition sins, not because it says that such a kiss is venial if the danger is excluded, but because, says Steyaert, in order to cover its own shamefulness, it supposes that which is impossible, or certainly of metaphysical rarity, namely, that in such a case the danger of further consent can be excluded."¹

¹ *De temperantia*, diss. 5, art. 2.

64 Response. I deny the assertion, both because that explanation is in no way congruent with the obvious sense, and because it is scarcely admitted that to every voluntary venereal commotion there is annexed a proximate danger of further consent and of pollution. Who would say this, for example, of married persons?

Next, the proposition is proved from the fact that a non-consummated act is not - what it ought to be - a proximate and natural preparation and way to a legitimate consummated act, but rather a proximate and natural preparation and way to an illegitimate consummated act; these things are grave (St. Alphonsus III, 415; n. 28).

Finally, a non-consummated act is commonly gravely sinful also by reason of the danger of pollution. Wherefore especially as regards the unmarried these words of Billuart hold: "For since nature from its corruption is most fragile in this matter, and wholly inclined to these pleasures, and moreover this untaught passion, once voluntarily admitted, blinds the mind and seizes the will with such force that to set bounds to it is most difficult, not to say impossible, it can scarcely, or not even scarcely, happen that someone directly consents to carnal pleasure in itself without there being proximate danger of consenting to something further and more shameful. But that which of itself would be venial becomes mortal by reason of the proximate danger of falling into mortal sin."¹

Concerning the opinion of St. Thomas, one can compare I-II, q. 74, a. 8; II-II, q. 154, a. 4; *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate*, XV, a. 4; *Quaestiones disputatae de Malo*, XV, a. 2, ad 18.

Corollary I. Even for betrothed persons an incomplete venereal act, or venereal commotion, is unlawful not only by reason of the danger of pollution, but also gravely unlawful in itself. A few teach that this is of itself only lightly unlawful for them, among whom are Cajetan² and Sanchez.³ But this opinion must be altogether rejected, since the reason on which it rests is destitute of all value. They say: "Betrothals are the beginning of marriage; therefore they confer a right to an incomplete venereal

act." To these things the response is: 1. Betrothals are the beginning of marriage in this sense, that they confer the right of entering marriage with the betrothed person, or of receiving a right in the use of the body of the betrothed. But the right of receiving at some time a right in the use of the body in no way carries with it a right here and now - even initially, as they say - of using the body (St. Alphonsus VI, 854). 2. If the argument had force, it would prove too much, namely that betrothals cause a non-consummated act to become lawful, just as marriage causes a consummated act to become lawful.

The things said do not prevent touches, looks, and kisses which are not immodest from being lawful for betrothed persons, even if perhaps some commotion follows from them, provided that they neither intend it, nor consent to it, nor that there is grave danger of consenting to it. Namely, the fostering of betrothal love is a sufficient reason for permitting the evil effect in question; this reason indeed is not similarly present for others.

Corollary II. One who, when venereal commotion has arisen beyond the intention, does not positively, directly or indirectly,⁴ dissent, but behaves merely passively, sins gravely, at least if the commotion is graver. The reason is that, considering the vehemence of the pleasure, he exposes himself to grave danger of consenting. Nevertheless indirect resistance is not rarely to be preferred to direct resistance, especially if the motions are lighter, more prolonged, or more frequent (cf. St. Alphonsus V, 7, 8).

Corollary III. This corollary concerns sensible carnal pleasure (n. 11), concerning which, because of the connection of the matter, I judge it practical to add certain things. Now one who seeks or consents to sensible carnal pleasure places an act which in itself is indifferent. But if pleasure of this sort is directly and fully deliberately sought or admitted, especially by persons apt for intercourse, and especially if those acts are had with some affection and with delay, according to St. Alphonsus a grave sin is regularly, that is, for the most part, committed, because of the proximate danger of falling into and consenting to venereal commotion (III, 416).⁵

¹ *De temperantia*, dissert. 5, a. 2.

² On II-II, q. 154, a. 4.

³ *De Matrimonio*, l. IX, disp. 46, nn. 48 and 55.

⁴ Directly, for example by fighting the motion through an act of displeasure; indirectly, for example by praying, by thinking about other things, by continuing the work begun.

⁵ Several authors report the opinion of St. Alphonsus less accurately.

Scholion. On Indirectly Voluntary Lust

65 **I. Notion.** Indirectly voluntary lust, or lust voluntary in its cause, is understood as a venereal effect, whether pollution or venereal commotion, which is not intended, but which is foreseen as going to follow from an action and ought to be guarded against. It is said:

1. *Which is not intended*; for if the venereal effect is intended, it is directly voluntary.
2. *Which is foreseen as going to follow from an action.* A venereal effect which does not follow from an action, but flows from nature alone, is merely natural and is so called, as if diurnal or nocturnal pollution arises from superabundance of semen, from temperament, from weakness of the nerves,

from the natural warmth of the body, or even from the action of the demon (II-II, q. 154, a. 5; III, q. 80, a. 7; St. Alphonsus III, 480; V, 20).¹

3. *And ought to be guarded against.* But to what extent it ought to be guarded against, or to what extent, if it is not guarded against, it is imputed, the principles now to be stated will explain.

¹ Merely natural pollution has place in some twice, in others once in a week, in others once in a month, and in others very rarely.

66 II. Principles. 1. Man of himself cannot promote the loss or consumption of venereal things, that is, of himself he cannot place an act from which a venereal effect is going to follow. For since venereal things as such have been entrusted to the individual for the good of the species, man, just as he cannot directly squander them, so of himself he cannot exercise an influence toward their loss, that is, place an act from which a venereal effect is going to follow. If he places the act without a proportionate reason, the effect is imputed as fault. And these things which we have said agree with the opinion of St. Thomas, since he teaches that pollution is imputed as fault if it has been caused by superfluity of food or drink (II-II, q. 154, a. 5), that is, from a cause influencing pollution only by accident. Finally, note well that the argument holds even if the venereal effect is merely permitted, that is, is not intended.

2. The more the act to be placed has the character of a cause, the graver in itself is the obligation of avoiding the act, and the graver is the cause required to render the act lawful. This being laid down, it seems altogether to be concluded that there is, of itself, a grave obligation of avoiding an act which has the character of a perfect cause, that is, one which both by its nature and gravely influences the venereal effect; the venereal effect, I say, that is, the pouring out of venereal things, which both depends on the will and is not ordered to the good of the species, and therefore involves a disorder, and indeed a grave one (n. 28).¹

Nor is St. Alphonsus more benign when he declares that "pollution is not mortal unless it proceeds from a cause mortal in itself, in the genus of lust" (III, 484). For he understands a cause which by its nature and gravely influences lust, and for this reason can be said to exist as mortal in itself and, as leading to lust, in the genus of lust; this is deduced from the fact that immediately afterward he proceeds thus: "One sins mortally who places shameful actions, of themselves proximately exciting to pollution or commotions. Otherwise, if the cause is remote, ... he will sin only venially" (loc. cit.).

¹ According to St. Thomas, lust is opposed to the life of man in potency. In human semen "there is man in potency ... and therefore disorder concerning the emission of semen concerns the life of man in proximate potency" (*De Malo*, q. 15, a. 2; q. 2, a. 10).

67 III. Applications. From the principles stated, particular norms are deduced both with regard to pollution, to which are equated vehement venereal commotion and distillation which occurs with great libido, and with regard to light venereal commotion, to which is equated distillation which occurs with lesser libido (St. Alphonsus III, 477).

1. Pollution is imputed:

a. *As grave fault*, if an action is placed which both by its nature and gravely influences it; for an action of this sort has, as we have already noted, the character of a perfect cause (St. Alphonsus III, 482). A reason of necessity or of notable utility excuses.

Actions both by their nature and gravely influencing are, for example: intense and rather prolonged thought about venereal things; kisses, whether columbine, that is, with the tongue put into the mouth of another, and repeated several times, or held with notable delay, or repeated very often; deliberate looking, whether at human intercourse, or at the naked breasts of a beautiful person, or at the obscene parts of a person of diverse sex, or, if the looks are prolonged, at obscene statues or pictures; touch of the obscene parts of another person, of naked breasts, and, at least if it is done lingeringly, of the genitals of animals; prolonged and tender conversation with a person loved inordinately, etc. (St. Alphonsus III, 417 sq.; 482).

68 Corollary. On account of an excusing cause, it is lawful, notwithstanding the pollution that will follow, to study venereal matters, to hear the confessions of women, to practice the surgical art, and to serve the sick or those going into the bath (St. Alphonsus III, 420, 483).

b. As *light fault*, if an action is placed which either by its nature, but only lightly, or by accident, influences it; for actions of this sort have only the character of an imperfect cause (St. Alphonsus III, 484). A just cause excuses; yet this is not had if there is question of an action influencing by accident but sinful (St. Alphonsus III, 483, 3, 4, 5; 484 at the end).

Actions influencing by their nature but only lightly are, for example: looking at the chest of a woman, at lightly immodest spectacles, and, at least if it is done in passing, at a naked person of the same sex; a light kiss of a girl; touch of one's own genitals done in passing, etc. - Actions influencing by accident are called those which are outside the matter of lust, such as excess in food, drunkenness, riding, etc. (St. Alphonsus III, 481).

Corollary. "It is lawful, even when pollution has been foreseen, to ride for the sake of utility ... and also for the sake of recreation ... It is lawful to lie in some position in order to rest more conveniently ... to take warm foods or drinks moderately" (St. Alphonsus III, 483).

It is disputed whether pollution is imputed as grave fault or as light fault if someone places an action which by its nature only moderately influences pollution, but which, in view of some person's peculiar disposition toward venereal things, is probably going to be followed by it. Now St. Alphonsus teaches that in the case pollution is imputed as grave fault, because on the one hand the action placed has, with respect to this subject, the character of a perfect cause; on the other hand it is not so burdensome to abstain from causes moderately influencing that a person is excused from the whole or from so much on that account. The contrary must be said if someone is frequently polluted from light causes, "because it is, as it were, morally impossible for men commonly to avoid all these causes" (St. Alphonsus III, 484).

Actions both by their nature and moderately influencing are, for example: looking at shameful spectacles from vanity, the intercourse of larger animals, and, at least if the look is continued, at a naked person of the same sex; touch of one's own genitals, etc. (St. Alphonsus III, 484).

2. Light venereal commotion is to be judged more mildly than pollution and vehement commotion; both because, although the disorder is grave, it is nevertheless lesser, and especially because of the burden of avoiding commotions of this sort. Hence, with sufficient probability, it is imputed only as light fault, even if someone places an action which both by its nature and gravely influences it; the same must be said a fortiori if the action, either by its nature and lightly, or only by accident, even if gravely, influences it (cf. St. Alphonsus III, 477, 2). A just cause excuses, even

more in the case of light influence. If the said commotions follow from an honorable action, it is commonly better not to attend to them.

68. Corollary I. Note that more often, under the appearance of indirectly voluntary lust, direct lust is in reality had, especially when someone, on account of a reason not proportionate or merely pretextual, performs actions which of themselves and gravely influence a venereal effect. Reasons not proportionate, or even merely pretextual, are not so rarely: the advancement of knowledge, the care of one's own health or another's, pain, ignorance, the dissipation of a neighbor's scrupulosity, etc.; these, namely, are put forward as pretexts, while in reality, although with a certain tacit sense, the thing proceeds from an intention of lust. A manner of acting of this sort is called by Vermeersch *masked lust*.¹

Corollary II. Pollution had in sleep is to be judged thus:

1. It is not imputed as fault if it comes from a merely natural cause, as from superabundance of semen (n. 65). Indeed in that case it cannot in any way be called evil, so that it is even lawful to desire it with an inefficacious affection and to rejoice over it when it has arisen (St. Alphonsus III, 480; V, 20). Nevertheless it is in no way lawful to procure it, or in any way to help toward it, or to do something for the end that it happen, because then it would no longer be merely natural. "But if some celibate man has experienced spontaneous nocturnal emissions as more difficult or rarer, and for that reason has been badly affected nervously during the day, he can with a safe conscience take a suitable medicine, not indeed so that he may obtain some definite pollution, but so that evacuation in general may be rendered easier. For he directly effects nothing else than so to temper his body that nature can act regularly."²
2. It is imputed as grave fault: "1. if before it was directly or formally procured, that is, if it was intended, and the cause has not been retracted; 2. when after sleep it was pleasing and was approved on account of venereal pleasure; otherwise not" (St. Alphonsus III, 485; *Homo Apostolicus*, tract 9, n. 34). The reason why otherwise it is not imputed as grave fault is that sleep itself causes the cause placed before sleep not to be able to be called proximately influencing.
3. It is imputed as light fault if, without just cause, an immodest action is placed from which it is sufficiently foreseen that pollution will follow. And thus indeed it must be said theoretically; but practically it is difficult to determine when some action influences the pollution of which there is question, all the more because according to some, those phantasms rather recur during sleep with which one was less occupied during the day than those with which one was more occupied.³

One who, having awakened, notices that pollution is imminent or has begun, and generally one who suffers pollution involuntarily begun, is not bound to inhibit the flow of semen, because it is most difficult to avert the exit of semen already released from the loins. Care must nevertheless be taken that the danger of consent be averted, for example by praying or by thinking about other things (St. Alphonsus III, 479). If he consents, he sins gravely, if he is fully in possession of himself; otherwise, if he is not fully awake.

Corollary II. Great itching in the shameful parts can be driven away by rubbing, even if pollution follows, if the itching comes from acrimony of the blood, but not if it comes from the ardor of libido. The reason is that in the former case pollution is not a means of obtaining the good effect, but in the

latter it is. Moreover, the itching can be presumed to come from acrimony of the blood unless, once pollution has been had, it suddenly ceases (St. Alphonsus III, 483, 2; *Homo Apostolicus*, tract 9, n. 35).

Corollary III. Great irritation of the nerves in the genitals, which as it were compels toward touches or motions that induce pollution, must be judged like the itching of which there was just discussion; namely, it can be extinguished by touch or motion if it is from acrimony of the blood, but not if it is judged to arise from the ardor of libido. But the fact that, for example, a motion of the body cannot be made for driving away irritation which comes from the ardor of libido does not prevent it from being made for another end - for example so that a truly troublesome position in bed may cease, etc. - and pollution be permitted. Meanwhile let that pitiable man beseech God, lest he consent to pollution.

¹ *De castitate et de vitiis contrariis*, nn. 388-389.

² Vermeersch, op. cit., n. 330.

³ Vermeersch, op. cit., n. 385.

Part II. On Chastity Insofar as It Regards Acts which Are Ordered to Venereal Things, or on Pudicity

We shall speak first briefly about the virtue itself of pudicity, then about the vice opposed to it, or immodesty.

Section I. On the Virtue Itself of Pudicity

69 Pudicity is chastity insofar as it moderates acts which are ordered to venereal things, such as looks, kisses, embraces, and immodest touches. "The name of pudicity," says St. Thomas, "is taken from shame; and therefore pudicity is properly concerned with those things about which men are affected by shame or are ashamed. But men are most ashamed concerning venereal things and the signs of venereal things, such as immodest looks, kisses, and touches. And because these, that is, signs, are more often detected, therefore pudicity regards such exterior signs more; but chastity regards rather the venereal commingling itself; and therefore pudicity is ordered to chastity, not as a virtue distinct from it, but as expressing a certain circumstance of chastity" (II-II, q. 151, a. 4).

Section II. On the Opposite Vice, or Immodesty

Chapter I. Principles

70 **I. Notion.** Under the name of immodesty come external acts which by their nature influence venereal motion and are placed inordinately. Such acts can be looks, touches, embraces, and kisses (St. Thomas, loc. cit. and II-II, q. 154, a. 4, ad 2).

71 **II. Morality.** 1. The acts enumerated above are in themselves indifferent; if they were evil in themselves, they would never be lawful (St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 4).

2. The acts enumerated, indifferent in themselves, can become unlawful by reason either of scandal and cooperation, or of intention, or of the danger of provoking a venereal effect, or of the danger of consenting to a venereal effect (cf. St. Thomas, II-II, q. 154, a. 4; St. Alphonsus III, 426). It is said:

a. *By reason of scandal and cooperation*; in which case the morality must be judged according to the doctrine of theologians concerning scandal and cooperation in general.

b. *By reason of intention*; namely, they are always gravely evil if they are done with the intention of exciting pollution or some venereal commotion.

c. *By reason of the danger of provoking a venereal effect*; in this case the morality must be defined according to what has been said concerning indirectly voluntary lust (nn. 65-68).

d. *By reason of the danger of consenting to a venereal effect*; that is, if that danger is grave and remains, an immodest act must be avoided under grave obligation.

3. The acts enumerated, and unlawful on account of one of the assigned causes, differ in species as follows:

- a. Considered in themselves they do not differ in species, so that, for example, a sinful look at a girl and a sinful touch of a girl contain the same species of lust.
- b. The acts enumerated and unlawful of themselves take on the species of the completed act in the same species, that is, of fornication, sodomy, or bestiality, insofar as they regard a person of diverse sex, a person of the same sex, or a beast; but you should not apply this to looks, because they are not judged to be the natural beginning of a completed act. I said *of themselves*, because otherwise one must speak differently if they are referred by the agent to an act completed in another species (n. 50).
- c. The acts enumerated and unlawful also contract a species: 1. from the circumstances of the subject, or of the one sinning, insofar as he, if he is married, contracts the species of adultery; if he is a sacred person, the species of carnal sacrilege, etc.; 2. from the circumstances of the object, insofar as, if they regard a married person, they again put on the character of adultery; if a sacred person, the character of carnal sacrilege; if a blood-relative or relative by marriage, the character of incest. These things, however, again do not hold concerning the act of looking, unless the affection of libido is determined toward the person, for example a married person, *as such*. The reason for the distinction is that touches, kisses, and embraces, since they reach such a person concretely and materially, cannot abstract from the circumstance inhering in the person. Looks, which are less material, commonly abstract from the person as such. There is added the fact that, as we said, they are not judged to be the natural beginning of a completed act.

Note. For how honorable kisses, embraces, touches, and looks are to be judged if they are done from sensible carnal pleasure, see n. 64.

Chapter II. Applications

72 Before we apply the principles set forth to particular cases, these things should be noted:

1. In what follows, *immodest parts* are understood to be the genitals and the parts near them; *less honorable parts*, the chest and legs; and those *middle between both*, the breasts.
2. Touches of themselves influence more than looks and thoughts; touches of a human being more than of a beast; of another's body more than of one's own; of a person of diverse sex more than of the same sex; looks and touches done lingeringly, ardently, repeatedly, more than those admitted in passing, calmly, or once.

Moreover, the resolutions which we shall deduce from the established principles: 1. regard the things which commonly occur, so that exceptions are not excluded; 2. abstract from excusing causes, which can bring it about that things which are unlawful of themselves become lawful by accident.

Article I. On Looks

73 I. Commonly it will be grave:

1. To look deliberately at the immodest parts of a person of diverse sex or at human intercourse (St. Alphonsus III, 421). Make exception if it is done from afar and in passing; or if an infant is looked at, because this moves less. Therefore maids, who, while caring for boys entrusted to them, look

at their shameful parts, are immune from grave fault; indeed in practice, on account of a cause, they are commonly altogether excused.²

2. To look lingeringly at the breasts of a beautiful woman, wholly uncovered or covered only with a very thin veil. But in itself it is not grave to look at nursing women, or at the bare chest of another woman, or of a girl not yet formed (St. Alphonsus III, 423).
3. To look at representations, for example in motion pictures, or at dances truly obscene by reason of nudity or movements.
4. To look lingeringly at sculptures or images which exhibit obscene acts or the naked shameful parts of a person of the other sex and of more mature age (St. Alphonsus III, 424). Exception is made if they are looked at from a distance, or if the picture moves less by reason of age.

II. Commonly it is only venial:

1. To look at the immodest parts of a person of the same sex (St. Alphonsus III, 420). Make exception if the look is very lingering. Hence, in themselves, persons of the same sex swimming together with the shameful parts uncovered are excused from grave fault; nevertheless it is very much to be advised that they not swim together without a loincloth. Moreover, concerning swimming, it should be noted that it often happens that boys swimming together do immodest things among themselves. Besides, swimming near a public road easily takes on the character of scandal on account of persons of diverse sex passing by.
2. "To look at ... the less honorable parts ... of a woman" (St. Alphonsus III, 423); yet if the look is prolonged, it will be mortal for many. A look at the honorable parts of a person of diverse sex is in itself without fault. Nevertheless a prolonged look will commonly be venial, indeed mortal, if someone is affected by inordinate love toward the person looked at (St. Alphonsus III, 422).
3. To look at one's own genitals, likewise at the genitals or intercourse of brute animals; nevertheless a prolonged or often repeated look will again not rarely be mortal for many (St. Alphonsus III, 419).

Note. As regards "those who use baths, as they say, of air or of sun, for strengthening health and increasing the vigor of the nerves, they act lawfully in themselves, if cautions are employed. The cautions are the following: with a reasonable end standing, curiosity with respect to oneself or another should be excluded; at least the shameful parts should be covered. It would be better if a very thin and ample garment were used, clothed in which the patient would attain the intended end equally easily. The modern theory concerning the advisability of accustoming the eyes to the sight of nudity is altogether to be rejected. It smells of the sense and lust of pagans."³

III. The practice of painters and sculptors of taking naked persons as models seems to be judged thus, provided, namely, as those skilled in the art assert, that this is necessary or useful for acquiring the art:

1. Directors of an academy who promote such a practice are excused; the students themselves are commonly in a necessary occasion, and are to be treated according to the rules for treating such an occasion.

2. Parents who thus expose their daughters to danger can theoretically be excused on account of urgent necessity, but in practice scarcely can be excused.
3. Persons presenting themselves as models by command of their parents are commonly in a necessary occasion, and must be treated thus; those who are their own masters are excused only by urgent necessity.⁴

¹ For the sake of practice, we apply the principles set forth also to speeches, songs, and readings, although, strictly speaking, they are occasions of internal lust rather than immodest acts.

² Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 636.

³ Marc-Gestermann, *Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae*, I, n. 814, note.

⁴ Cf. Marc-Gestermann, op. cit., I, n. 815.

Article II. On Touches

74 I. Commonly it will be mortal:

1. To touch, over the nude body, the immodest parts of a person of diverse sex, with the exception of nurses and maids who care for infants entrusted to them, unless they touch lingeringly; likewise to touch the said parts over clothing, although this, if it is done in jest and in passing, can sometimes be excused from grave fault (St. Alphonsus III, 420).
2. To touch on purpose or with delay, even over clothing, the immodest parts of a person of the same sex; if it is done in jest and in passing, grave sin will often be absent (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).
3. To touch with delay either the naked breasts or the less honorable parts of a woman (St. Alphonsus III, 430). Indeed Benedict XIV condemned a book which said that touching the breasts of an honorable woman, with wicked affection and intention excluded, was in itself only venial. Likewise a young man sins gravely who holds a girl sitting on his lap; and the girl who allows this. But to touch the breasts in passing, or the honorable parts of a woman with delay, is venial.
4. To touch lingeringly or rather often the immodest parts of one's own body will be mortal for some, venial for others; otherwise it is held as venial (St. Alphonsus III, 419).
5. To touch the genitals of brute animals up to the pollution of the beast; otherwise it will in itself be venial (St. Alphonsus III, 420).

II. One who, for example a girl, permits herself to be touched is to be said to sin in this way:

1. If the touch, kiss, etc., is indecent or immodest in itself, she sins by permitting it, and indeed gravely or lightly according as the touch is gravely or lightly immodest.
2. If the touch, kiss, etc., is decent in itself, but by the intention of the one touching is libidinous, she does not sin: 1. if the touch is done in public, for example in dances, because both modesty and the avoiding of the infamy of the one touching involve a sufficient cause for permitting the sin of one's neighbor; 2. if the touch is done secretly and the wicked affection is not established. If it is established, she sins (St. Alphonsus III, 430).

Article III. On Kisses

75 I. Commonly it is mortal:

1. To kiss the breasts of a woman; likewise the less honorable parts of a person of diverse sex. To kiss parts that are indeed honorable but less customarily kissed of a person of the other sex will more often be grave (cf. St. Alphonsus III, 417).
2. To kiss a person of diverse sex on the cheek for a long time or very often; or on the mouth with notable delay or often; or with the tongue put into the mouth of another, that is, columbine kisses, with delay or several times. This last, done once or another time and without delay, will rather often be mortal (cf. St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).
3. To kiss while the lower parts of the body are pressed against the body of another.

General note. Honorable kisses, embraces, and touches between persons of diverse sex:

1. If done as a sign of friendship, are without fault (St. Alphonsus III, 417). "Decorum, however, must be observed here; for in many regions it is not becoming for ecclesiastical men, especially religious, to testify friendship toward women with a kiss, even if they were joined by blood."¹
2. If done from levity, are venially evil (St. Alphonsus III, 418).
3. If done from sensible carnal pleasure, are venial (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.); when they become mortal, see n. 64.

¹ Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 636.

Article IV. On Speeches and Songs

76 I. Commonly it will be mortal:

1. To speak about very shameful matters, as about the genitals, about intercourse, about the ways of performing it, etc. (St. Alphonsus III, 426); if it is done among married persons, grave fault will more easily be absent.
2. To speak shameful things with a person of the other sex, especially a younger person; likewise prolonged and vain conversation with a girl loved inordinately (St. Alphonsus III, 422);¹ to speak shameful things with persons of the same sex, if the shameful conversations are prolonged.
3. To narrate one's own shameful acts boastfully (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).
4. Finally, those are commonly to be judged to sin gravely by speaking shameful things who speak shameful things on any occasion whatever, or continue conversations for a long time, likewise those who are very corrupt.

II. Commonly it will be venial:

1. To speak shameful things in passing, for the sake of a joke (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).
2. To institute tender conversations with a person of the other sex.

Note. Penitents who accuse themselves of shameful speech are to be asked: 1. only generally, whether they instituted very shameful conversations; 2. by reason of scandal, whether they held conversations in the presence of married or unmarried persons, adults or boys or girls. "For girls and boys are more

easily scandalized than adults, especially those who are habituated in this vice" (St. Alphonsus, *Praxis Confessarii*, n. 40).

III. Those who hear shameful things sin thus:

1. They sin gravely: 1. who linger with pleasure over a shameful thing heard, or expose themselves to grave danger of lingering pleasure; but not those who are pleased only by the elegant manner of speaking; 2. who, by manifesting their pleasure, cooperate in the grave sin of the speaker, or do not prevent shameful speech, although by office they are bound to prevent it. Others, who do not prevent such things out of embarrassment, commonly do not sin gravely. Indeed, if hope of fruit is lacking, all sin can be absent.

Note 1. The things said about speeches must also be applied to songs.

Note 2. The reading of shameful books is commonly gravely sinful; the reading of somewhat shameful books is venially evil; nevertheless even the reading of these latter is more often grave sin for younger persons.

Note 3. To smell menstrual blood, semen, and other things of this sort is judged a grave, light, or no disorder, according as the danger of falling into an external venereal act, or into internal sin, is grave, light, or none.

¹ St. Thomas (*Opusculum* 64, section 8, *De Fluxu libidinis*), speaking of distillation, says that vain conversations with those loved inordinately are to be fled under pain of mortal sin, if distillation proceeds from them.

Scholion I. On Hypersexuality, Contrary Sexuality, and Sexual Perversion

77 **I. Hypersexuality** consists in an abnormal propensity toward venereal things. As regards this matter, with Eschbach,¹ three classes of men can be distinguished, according as some suffer common and intermittent temptations, or more vehement and almost continual temptations, or wholly unrestrained temptations. But concerning the latter, whom we are chiefly considering here, the praised author writes these things: "Celibates are sometimes found laboring under such an unrestrained and cruel libido that it now seems to be not simple libido, but a physical and almost unconquerable propensity toward venereal things. Certainly, among so many and so great miseries and hardships to which we know the human body to be subject, one of this kind is also numbered by physicians; if there is question of males, it is called satyriasis, as though making satyrs; among women it is called uterine fury, or nymphomania. They say that the nature of both is situated in a lesion or irritation of the brain and nervous plexus, commonly called neurosis; but they assign causes either moral, for example evil habits, erotic readings, etc., or merely physical; finally experience teaches that the effects are too much to be lamented. For these unhappy celibates, whether they wish it or not, almost the whole day and night are occupied with the most foul thoughts, phantasms, and desires of immodesty and pleasure; they continually and violently seek carnal intercourse, without ever being able, if they yield, to be satisfied; if they are deprived of venery, they are driven into rage and erotic delirium; they cast off all shame, which is especially true of women, indeed these women often conduct themselves like brute animals."

¹ *Disputationes physiologico-theologicae*, pp. 532-533.

78 **II. Contrary sexuality** is had when the sexual inclination is borne toward persons of the same sex; in a woman it is called lesbian or sapphic love; if it is borne toward boys, it is called pederasty.

79 **III. Sexual perversion** consists in this, that someone's libido is excited by thoughts, things, or acts foreign to sexual life. Sadism, masochism, and fetishism are distinguished.

1. Sadism, from the Marquis de Sade, who was affected in this way, is present if libido is excited by perpetrating acts of cruelty, for example by pricking a girl with a knife.
2. Masochism, from Sacher-Masoch, who describes these things in romantic works, is so called if libido is excited by suffering acts of cruelty.
3. Fetishism is present if libido is excited by the imagination or handling of things or of parts of the body which do not pertain to venereal things, such as the hand, foot, hair, garments, etc.

General note. Much discretion is needed for passing judgment concerning the imputability of those who are borne into venereal things by a very great and truly abnormal force. For it often seems that faith cannot be given to the testimony of those who suffer these things; for sometimes they falsely judge that they acted voluntarily, although from other indications it appears that this is not true. A safer judgment is indeed formed concerning those who live piously; there is much greater difficulty in those who care little for piety.

¹ Cf. Capellmann-Bergmann, *Pastoral-Medizin*, p. 196 sq.; Noldin, op. cit., p. 47.

Scholion II. On Remedies Against Lust

We are considering especially those who are given to lust, especially to pollutions. Remedies, however, are distinguished as natural and supernatural.

80 **I. Natural remedies** are, for example: 1. to use tonic foods, light and of easy digestion, but by no means exciting foods and drinks; 2. to avoid idleness and solitude, and to be occupied with useful work, which work, insofar as it can be done, it is expedient to assign; 3. to lie in a harder bed,¹ on the side, not on the back, with the arms crossed over the chest; to use a light covering and not to indulge in too much sleep;² 4. when using baths, to be washed with cold water; 5. finally, certain medicines seem useful for tempering venereal things, such as lupulin, heroin;³ likewise the so-called chaste tree.⁴ The Salernitan aphorism also is known: "Camphor through the nostrils castrates males by its odor"; which, however, Gemelli does not admit.⁵

II. Supernatural remedies, besides flight from occasions, frequenting of the sacraments,⁶ and prayer, are: 1. a firm persuasion concerning the gravity and harms of the evil, which the confessor should endeavor to instill into him, fatherly indeed, but seriously and effectively; 2. courage added to the miserable sinner, and the raising up of his mind and heart for battle; 3. a manly resolution, and this renewed from time to time, especially morning and evening; 4. filial devotion toward the Blessed Virgin Mary, with the added custom of reciting daily, morning and evening, three times the Angelic Salutation together with the invocation enriched with indulgences: "Through thy Immaculate Conception, O Mary, render my body pure and my soul holy" (indulgence of 300 days, Pius X, December 5, 1904); 5. chastisement of the body and fasts, but account should be taken of the persons; 6. diversion of the mind to another object as soon as temptation first arises; likewise invocation of the Most Holy Names of Jesus and Mary; 7. if there is question of a more cultivated person, the incitement of the mind toward noble duties and duties useful for the common good; 8. finally, marriage is commonly to be urged most of all (St. Alphonsus, *Praxis Confessarii*, nn. 15, 16).⁷

¹ "The body should never rest on feathers, which warm, provoke itchings, even touches: frequent causes of pernicious habits. The bed should be rather hard than soft" (Bossu, in Eschbach, op. cit., p. 532).

² "Sleep lasts six to eight hours, as an average term. Habit has the greatest influence on this state of the economy." "Rising early preserves health and holiness" (St. Francis de Sales). (Brachet, in Eschbach, loc. cit.).

³ Gemelli, *Non moechaberis*, c. 5, p. 171 sq.

⁴ "Agnus castus was formerly celebrated; we ourselves have sometimes advised its use, and despite the assertion of modern physicians who deny it all efficacy in this kind, we have received the most satisfactory reports about its employment." (*Catechisme du V. Cesar de Bus*, annotated by Bonhomme, t. II, p. 354).

⁵ Loc. cit.

⁶ "I scarcely think that there is any other effective remedy, except very frequent confession with one and the same confessor ... for this sacrament is the greatest bridle, and one who does not use it should not promise himself amendment except by a miracle." Thus St. Alphonsus (VI, 464) with Toletus.

⁷ If the means have remained ineffective, "recourse must be had," says Antonelli, "to amputation of the clitoris, that is, clitoridectomy, in women, even adults. This operation is very easy and altogether harmless ... It is true that some doctors by no means approve this operation, because through it the woman is deprived of the chief place of pleasure. But this reason must be counted as nothing, because, if there is question of a married woman, normal intercourse with pleasure and fecundation is in no way impeded; but if there is question of an unmarried girl, this operation removes the cause of so many sins and brings only great advantages to her health" (*Medicina Pastoralis*, I, n. 504). To these things I note: Apart from the fact that an amputation worthy of note is lawful only for the direct good of the whole, in this case the clitoris as such, that is, insofar as it is the seat of venereal pleasure, is amputated. But the clitoris as such, since it regards the good of the species, cannot be amputated for the good of the individual.

Book II. On Conjugal Chastity in Particular

(St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 49, aa. 4-6; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis*, VI, 900-954; *Homo Apostolicus*, tract XVIII, nn. 35-50).¹

As we noted above, conjugal chastity is that by which spouses exclude the unlawful use of venereal things, but prudently moderate the lawful use. We shall discuss first lawful things, then unlawful things; and in treating lawful things, we shall also explain to what extent they are perhaps obligatory for spouses.

¹ Cf. Sanchez, *De matrimonii sacramento*, book 9; De Smet, *De sponsalibus et Matrimonio*, I, nn. 207-248; Vlaming, *Praelectiones iuris matrimonii*, II, nn. 623-638.

Part I. On the Lawful Acts of Spouses

The principal act, or conjugal intercourse, and accessory acts are distinguished.

Section I. On Conjugal Intercourse

Chapter I. On the Lawfulness of Conjugal Intercourse

81 That conjugal intercourse is lawful in itself, or objectively, is clear both from Sacred Scripture (Gen. 1:28; 1 Cor. 7:3; Heb. 13:4) and from Canon Law (can. 1081, § 2 and 1111), and from the fact that it is a means ordained by God for propagating the human race. But in order that intercourse here and now be honorable or lawful, it is required: 1. that there be absent an impediment which forbids it; 2. that there be absent a harm to be feared which ought to be guarded against and therefore forbids intercourse; 3. that it be done from a right end; 4. in the due place and manner. I judge it more practical to discuss the absence of impediments and of harm in the last place.

Article I. On the End

82 **I.** The intrinsic ends of conjugal intercourse, namely, of the work itself, are: the principal end is the procreation of offspring; the secondary ends are the quieting of appetite or concupiscence, both in oneself and in the partner, the signification of conjugal love, and the increase of this love (cf. can. 1013, § 1). Finally, many other ends can be intended by the one acting, as for example the procuring of health, etc. (St. Alphonsus VI, 882, 883).

II. Intercourse, if it is performed, can be performed only for an honorable end. Nevertheless any honorable end suffices, and it is enough that the honorable end be virtually intended. I said:

1. *Intercourse can be performed only for an honorable end.* For every human act, in order to be good, must be done only for that end which befits the nature of man, that is, rational nature. But it befits rational nature to act for an honorable end, and not for another (St. Thomas, I-II, q. 4, a. 2, ad 2; St. Alphonsus V, XLIV).

Corollary I. It is unlawful to have intercourse for pleasure alone, as is clear from what has been said and from proposition 9 condemned by Innocent XI, which said: "The work of marriage exercised for pleasure alone is entirely free from fault and venial defect" (St. Alphonsus VI, 912). Nevertheless one who performs intercourse for pleasure alone sins only venially, since the disordered use of a thing lawful in itself, such as intercourse, does not contain grave disorder, since the defect does not fall upon the substance of the act. Make exception if someone actually or virtually had pleasure as his ultimate end (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

Corollary II. It is unlawful to have intercourse also for pleasure, by resting also in it as such, because pleasure as such is not an honorable end. Yet to someone this will seem lawful, insofar as the honorable act and its pleasurable constitution constitute one thing.

Corollary III. It is lawful to have intercourse for pleasure insofar as, from the intention of the Author of nature, it entices to an act ordered in itself, that is, to conjugal intercourse; likewise insofar as it conduces to the well-being and operation of the body or soul. The reason is that pleasure considered

as such has the character of an honorable end (St. Alphonsus VI, 912; cf. St. Thomas, I-II, q. 34, a. 1; II-II, q. 141, a. 6, ad 2; II-II, q. 168, a. 2; *Contra Gentiles*, book 3, c. 9, n. 1).

2. *Any honorable end suffices*, whether of the work or another intended by the agent, whether conceived specifically or in a vague way. The reason is that the ends of the work themselves do not fall under precept; this being laid down, it is free to the agent to set before himself another honorable end (St. Alphonsus VI, 927, compared with 882 and 883).¹ Many, however, judge, as we shall note presently, that the end of the work itself is at least implicitly intended by the very fact that it is not positively excluded.

Corollary. Spouses do not sin who, in intercourse had for an honorable end, desire that conception not follow, provided the act placed is of itself apt for the primary end, or the procreation of offspring (St. Alphonsus VI, 831, 927).

3. *It is enough that an honorable end be virtually intended*, or that intercourse be virtually referred to an honorable end; this follows from the fact that, in view of the nature of such a relation, intercourse is truly referred by it to an honorable end; and this suffices (St. Alphonsus V, XLIV).

It is disputed whether one who performs intercourse, and does not positively exclude the honorable end of the work, for example procreation, by that very fact intends an honorable end, at least implicitly. Most more recent authors affirm this, but it seems that it must be denied. For what is distinguished from the work is not implicitly intended by the very fact that the work is performed. But the end of the work, for example procreation, is distinguished from the work itself as effect from cause; hence, in order that it be intended, a new act of the will is required. But the controversy is less practical, because one who places in due manner and order an act which by its nature is ordered to an honorable end, and does not positively exclude that end, commonly positively includes that end, although perhaps only confusedly and weakly.

¹ St. Thomas teaches thus: "In two ways alone spouses come together without any sin, namely, for the sake of procreating offspring, and for rendering the debt; otherwise there is always sin there, at least venial" (Supplement, q. 49, a. 5). And again: "But if someone through the act of marriage intends to avoid fornication in his spouse, there is no sin, because this is a certain rendering of the debt, which pertains to the good of fidelity; but if he intends to avoid fornication in himself, thus there is some superfluity there; and according to this there is venial sin there; nor was marriage instituted for this except according to indulgence, which concerns venial sins" (loc. cit., ad 2). Finally: "It must be said that although to intend the preservation of health is not evil in itself, nevertheless this intention becomes evil if health is intended from something which of itself is not ordered to this; as if someone were to seek only bodily health from the sacrament of baptism; and similarly also in the proposed case, in the act of marriage" (loc. cit., ad 4).

Article II. On Place and Manner, or Position

83 As regards place, it is enough to note that it ought to be profane and secret. One who has intercourse in a church sins gravely, unless necessity urges (St. Alphonsus III, 458). One who would have intercourse before others would give grave scandal.

I. The natural position is that spouses have intercourse lying down, and that the wife be beneath and supine, that is, with her face turned toward the husband, the husband lying upon her. It is unnatural when intercourse is done sitting, or standing, or from behind in the manner of beasts, or from the side, or with the husband beneath (St. Alphonsus VI, 917).

II. Obligation of the natural position. The unnatural position is rather commonly held in itself as unlawful, because it imports some inversion of the order indicated by nature. This, however, is in itself only venial, because it does not pervert the substance of the act, which of itself remains apt for generation. Nor does it become mortal because perhaps part of the semen will certainly or probably perish, since this is judged to happen by accident; and that is not called grave if the act itself is ordered to generation, for which the smallest part of semen suffices (St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. 31, exposition of the text at the end; St. Alphonsus VI, 917).

III. Excusing causes. A just cause excuses from the natural position, for example the stoutness of the man, the weariness of the woman, the coldness of the spouses, if, namely, they are more excited by an unnatural position, foul breath, the danger of abortion to be guarded against, etc. (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

Note. If penitents accuse themselves of intercourse had from behind, in practice it will be doubtful whether they mean quasi-sodomitic intercourse, that is, in the preposterous vessel or in the anus, or only intercourse performed in an unnatural position. In order that this be clear, it is enough to ask whether they proceeded in such a way that generation could have followed. If generation could have followed, insemination took place in the right vessel, that is, in the vagina; otherwise, in the preposterous vessel, in which case unnatural lying together took place (n. 57).

Article III. On the Absence of an Impediment

Impediments can be: 1. a promise made to the partner not to use marriage; 2. a vow of chastity; 3. impotence for intercourse; 4. doubt concerning the validity of marriage.¹

¹ Affinity, taken in the sense in which it was formerly accepted, sometimes impeded the use of marriage by force of ecclesiastical law; it no longer stands in the way of that use.

§ 1. On a Promise Made to the Partner

84 I. Effect of the impediment. One who is bound by a promise not to use marriage: if he has obligated himself from fidelity, exacts the debt lawfully but unlawfully; if he has obligated himself from justice, he exacts the debt neither lawfully nor licitly. He can nevertheless ask amicably, because the partner is able to remit the promise. Thus theoretically, because in practice a promise of this sort will easily be invalid, or at least will not be able to be urged.

85 II. Cessation of the impediment. A promise made by one party can be remitted by the partner; one made by both can be removed by the consent of both.

§ 2. On a Vow of Chastity

85. I. Effect of the impediment. 1. A spouse bound by a vow asks the debt in itself lawfully,¹ but illicitly; nevertheless he can, indeed is bound to, ask:

1. If the partner is in danger of incontinence. The reason is that in this hypothesis the obligation of asking arises from the end itself of marriage; and this obligation prevails over the obligation that would follow from the vow.
2. If the partner, although not asking for intercourse, for example out of shame, nevertheless desires it; for then there is equivalently a petition. One bound by a vow cannot ask because of the danger

of his own incontinence; for this danger, to be overcome, is intrinsic to the vow (St. Alphonsus VI, 930).

2. A spouse bound by a vow is bound to render the debt as long as the partner asks it lawfully and licitly; he can, but in practice is not bound to, render it if the partner asks it lawfully but illicitly (n. 99); he cannot render it if the partner has yielded the right of asking or has been deprived of it by adultery (n. 97).

Note. The impediment of a vow regards not only intercourse, but also imperfect acts.

II. Cessation of the impediment. 1. If the wife is bound by a vow, the husband can, with sufficient probability, directly annul the vow; if the husband has vowed, the wife enjoys only the faculty of indirectly annulling it; if both have vowed, the husband can directly annul the vow of the wife, but she, once freed from her vow, can indirectly annul the vow of the husband (cf. St. Alphonsus III, 239).

2. Bishops and regular confessors can dispense married persons in a vow emitted either before or after marriage: 1. if the vow is not reserved;² 2. if it is reserved, but then only in order to the right use of marriage,³ except, for both cases, the vow which both emitted after marriage by mutual consent, in which the Supreme Pontiff alone can dispense (cf., however, what was said under 1). This is drawn, as regards Bishops, if there is question of a non-reserved vow, from can. 1313, 1; if of a reserved vow, from immemorial custom; as regards Regulars, from their privileges not yet revoked (St. Alphonsus VI, 986, 987; *de Privilegiis*, n. 108 sqq.).

Note. In order that Regulars may use the privilege, the deputation of the General or Provincial must be added, or, as others add, of the local Superior; according to some, a special deputation is not required (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). Moreover, the dispensation can also be granted outside confession.

¹ For a vow of itself does not involve the cession of right with respect to the partner, but only an obligation toward God.

² Private vows reserved to the Apostolic See are only the vow of perfect and perpetual chastity and the vow of entering a religious institute of solemn vows, which were emitted absolutely and after the completed eighteenth year of age (can. 1309).

³ Therefore a dispensed spouse sins also against the vow if he injures chastity outside the use of marriage; after the death of the partner the vow fully revives.

§ 3. On Impotence for Intercourse

86 Those able to have intercourse, and therefore not bound by the impediment, are men who can place an act of itself apt for generation; likewise wives who are capable of admitting acts of this sort. But an act of itself apt for generation consists, on the part of the man, in this: that the man penetrates the woman's vagina and pours forth true semen there; on the part of the woman, in this: that she permits the penetration of the male member and the effusion of semen in the vagina. These things laid down, I say:

87 I. They lawfully have intercourse:

1. Those who are only incapable of generating, such as sterile women; or old men who lack fertile semen (St. Alphonsus VI, 1095).

2. Women who cannot retain semen.

3. Women whose uterus or ovaries have been removed. For to those to whom marriage must be permitted, the use of it is also permitted. But marriage must be permitted to the aforesaid women.¹ The final reason for affirming this, however, is that in the case the act placed is of itself apt for generation.

4. Women who have undergone oophorectomy. Oophorectomy consists in the division of the oviduct or canal by which semen is led to the ovaries; hence it only brings it about that the semen of the man cannot ascend to the ovaries, but it does not prevent its being poured forth into the vagina, or prevent an act of itself apt for generation from being placed.

87. II. It is disputed whether one who has undergone vasectomy and a castrated man lawfully have intercourse.

1. *One who has undergone vasectomy.* Vasectomy consists in this: that, after an incision has been made through the scrotum, the organ carrying semen elaborated by the testicles is cut away, so that the way to ejaculation is broken off for the semen. From this it follows that one who has undergone vasectomy cannot, after the emptying of the epididymis, pour forth semen into the vagina;² hence, if the completed act of venereal things is admitted, he is truly polluted.

2. *A castrated man.* To him both imperfect intercourse, or penetration of the vagina, and incomplete acts seem lawful. For a castrated man, by force of marriage, received and retains the right to perfect intercourse. Now the right to perfect intercourse carries with it the right both to the act which is an essential part of perfect intercourse, that is, to penetration of the vagina, and to the acts which by their nature are referred to perfect intercourse, that is, to incomplete acts.

Objection 1. No one can have a right to something unlawful. But perfect intercourse is radically and irremediably unlawful for a castrated man.

Response. Perfect intercourse for a castrated man is rather impossible than unlawful (cf. St. Alphonsus VI, 933).

Objection 2. Since a castrated man is unfit for an act of itself apt for generation, that is, since he cannot pour semen into the vagina, the insemination of the wife becomes mere pollution.

Response. Since the wife, from the act which is an essential part of perfect intercourse, that is, from penetration of the vagina, seems to receive the right to insemination, this is undeservedly called pollution. But as to the fact that the insemination of the wife is frustrated of its end, both the man and the wife permit this.

Question. Whether marriage and its use can be permitted: 1. to a man lacking testicles, into whose scrotum the testicles of an animal have been inserted, which we know sometimes has taken place; 2. to a woman for whom a vagina has been made artificially.

Response. As regards the former case, it seems that it must be answered affirmatively as soon as, in view of the declaration or doubt of an expert, the testicles must be judged at least probably to have become part of the body and to produce human semen, although infertile. Likewise as regards the other case, it seems that it must be answered affirmatively as soon as, again considering the declaration or doubt of an expert, the vagina has at least probably become part of the body (cf. can.

1068, § 1). In both cases, however, the future partner must be warned. Moreover, it is certainly to be advised that, when the case occurs, ecclesiastical authority be consulted.

¹ Cf. Sacred Congregation of the Council, December 16, 1905; Sacred Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments, April 2, 1909.

² Namely, those who have undergone vasectomy, and likewise castrates whose testicles have been crushed in mature age, can for some space of time emit semen kept in the epididymis; but after the said semen has been emitted, they can indeed preserve the erectability of the member and penetrate the vagina, and even ejaculate a certain liquid, but this liquid is not true semen, but some watery humor secreted by the prostate gland (De Smet, *De Matrimonio*, II, n. 550).

§ 4. On a Doubtfully Valid Marriage

88 If there is doubt concerning the validity of the marriage, the truth must be investigated, except in the case in which the investigation is foreseen to be useless. Now:

I. During the due investigation, the one doubting cannot ask the debt; he is nevertheless bound to render it if the other party does not doubt and therefore asks in good faith; and this holds as long as he is not certain or almost certain of the nullity of the marriage; nor is he bound to warn the other party. - If both parties doubt, neither can ask or render the debt (St. Alphonsus VI, 903).

II. If the doubt perseveres after the due investigation, or already before investigation appears invincible:

1. One who entered the marriage in good faith, that is, without doubt concerning its validity or at least without fault, can also ask the debt; he can ask, however, as long as he is not certain or almost certain of the nullity of the marriage. The reason is that the common good requires that, in doubt concerning the validity of an act placed in good faith, one can act as if the act placed were valid. - The same, for the same reason, holds with sufficient probability even if the marriage was contracted in bad faith. Yet make exception, for both hypotheses, for the case in which there is doubt about the death of a prior spouse; this exception is deduced from chapter 2, *De secundis nuptiis*, from the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1792,¹ and from the fact that a marriage previously contracted and probably persisting prevails over a doubtful later marriage (St. Alphonsus VI, 904-907). Make exception, moreover, for the case in which the marriage is doubtful because the parties are probably related by blood in some degree of the direct line, for example father and daughter, or in the first degree of the collateral line, that is, brother and sister, because then marriage is prohibited (cf. can. 1076, § 3).
2. The one doubting is bound to render the debt as long as he is not certain or almost certain of the nullity of the marriage. Make exception: 1. if there is doubt concerning the death of a prior spouse and the partner asks the debt in bad faith; otherwise, if he or she asks it in good faith (chapter 2, *De secundis nuptiis*); 2. the case in which the marriage is doubtful because the parties are probably related by blood in some degree of the direct line or in the first degree of the collateral line.

¹ Cf. Bucceroni, *Enchiridion morale*, n. 833.

Article IV. On the Absence of Harm to Be Averted

Intercourse can be prohibited by reason of harm that would follow from it, and this under grave or under light obligation according as grave or light harm is feared. A grave cause excuses from grave

harm; a just cause excuses from light harm.

Harms can arise especially from certain circumstances in which the wife chiefly can be situated; therefore take these more determinate points:

89 I. During the time of menstruation, according to many, intercourse is in itself venially unlawful because of indecency; yet according to others, since this indecency is physical rather than moral, it does not suffice to constitute sin. Nevertheless by accident it is prohibited under venial sin, because the woman's organs, which at the time of menstruation are in a certain congestion, are irritated more by intercourse, whence congestions of the uterus can arise. But the harm commonly is not of such a kind that intercourse is prohibited under grave obligation. Moreover, intercourse during the time of menstruation is to be dissuaded, because on account of indecency it can harm mutual esteem; make exception if, according to the judgment of a physician, that time seems more suitable for the fecundation of a woman hitherto sterile. Moreover, spouses are accustomed to be turned away from intercourse during the time of menstruation by natural nausea.

Note. During the time of extraordinary flow some harm easily threatens from intercourse.¹ But if, according to the advice of a physician, it is certain or probable that grave injury will follow for the wife, intercourse in itself is prohibited under grave obligation; nevertheless it would be lawful on account of the danger of incontinence. If only light harm is feared, intercourse is practically lawful, because the said flow is perpetual or prolonged, so that the husband is excused by inconvenience, to which the danger of incontinence will often be added (St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. 32, q. unica, art. 2, sol. 2; St. Alphonsus VI, 925).

¹ Antonelli, *Medicina Pastoralis*, t. II, n. 375; Capellmann-Bergmann, *Pastoral-Medizin*, p. 345.

90 II. During the time of pregnancy, intercourse is commonly lawful. The danger of abortion can indeed sometimes be present, namely in the first period or even in the first months after conception. But first, at the beginning there is no certainty about conception. Then, danger is rather to be feared from the fact that intercourse is performed too often or vehemently. Finally, danger perhaps to be feared from compression of bodies can be removed by a change of position.¹ But as to the fact that, pregnancy standing, a new conception does not follow and therefore semen is frustrated of the end of generation, this must be ascribed to something which has occurred by the working of nature, and not to the act, since the act of itself is ordered to generation (St. Alphonsus VI, 924).²

¹ Capellmann-Bergmann, op. cit., p. 317.

² Capellmann-Bergmann judge that, according to the opinion of St. Alphonsus, intercourse during the time of pregnancy is in itself venially unlawful, and therefore that an honorable cause is required which excuses from fault. But the Holy Doctor requires an honorable cause only insofar as intercourse ought to be ordered to an honorable end (cf. VI, 924, compared with n. 813, to which St. Alphonsus refers).

91 III. During the time of puerperium or purgation, grave harm is to be feared for the woman in the first days after birth, indeed according to Capellmann-Bergmann¹ for two weeks. Moreover, in itself it is to be advised that intercourse be abstained from until the woman's organs have been fully restored, namely for about six weeks.

¹ Op. cit., p. 316.

92 IV. During the time of lactation, intercourse is lawful. A new conception will indeed diminish the secretion of milk; but besides the fact that a new conception at that time is little probable,

provision can be made for the child in another way¹ (St. Alphonsus VI, 911).

¹ Capellmann-Bergmann, op. cit., p. 317.

93 V. During the time of illness, intercourse is lawful as follows:

1. If the illness is not contagious, lying together is permitted, provided the illness is light and does not affect the woman's genitals. If it is grave and joined with great pain or great fevers, likewise if the woman's genitals are diseased, intercourse is prohibited under grave obligation, since there is grave danger that the illness will become much worse.¹ Nevertheless a grave cause, for example the danger of incontinence, excuses, although even then the sick person can deny the debt (cf. St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 64, a. 1; St. Alphonsus VI, 909, 950).

Note. If an imminent danger of death will follow from intercourse, which is sometimes to be feared if the woman suffers from cardiac disease, the use of marriage is altogether forbidden; for there would be, as it were, homicide. If a physician declares that the wife will be brought into very grave danger from childbirth, a grave cause, such as the danger of incontinence, renders intercourse lawful, because it does not introduce a proximate danger of death that will follow. There is added the fact that conception is doubtful, and that physicians not so rarely exaggerate the danger.

2. If the illness is contagious, one must speak thus:

- a. If it is syphilis, or the French disease, as it is called, intercourse is gravely unlawful, in view of the horrible consequences of that disease and the moral certainty of infecting the partner. Nevertheless even in this case, on account of a grave cause, intercourse seems to be permitted, though it is not to be imposed upon the other party, provided the partner is warned of the contagion (St. Alphonsus VI, 909). They say besides that ointments have been discovered by which contagion is averted, and indeed certainly if the member is anointed before or immediately after intercourse, less certainly if it is anointed within the space of one or another hour after infection.² If these things are confirmed by experience, one who uses those ointments in time must be judged more mildly. Finally, under the moral aspect another venereal infection, namely gonorrhea, is almost equated with syphilis, at least in the wife.³

- b. If there is question of another contagious illness, one must see what the nature of the illness is, and how great the danger of infection is.⁴

Note. In the preceding points we have supposed that from intercourse had during the time of illness there does not threaten harm to offspring already conceived. But if this has place, for example if an illness communicated to a pregnant wife through intercourse would also infect offspring already conceived, intercourse remains unlawful. But as to the fact that offspring to be conceived will be born diseased, for example affected by consumption, or will even die before birth, that is not a reason why one must abstain longer from intercourse. For what St. Thomas says about the offspring of lepers holds: "It is better for him to be thus than not to be at all" (Supplement, q. 64, a. 1, ad 4; St. Alphonsus VI, 951).

¹ Capellmann-Bergmann, op. cit., p. 326 sq.

² Vermeersch, *De castitate*, n. 48.

³ Cf. Capellmann-Bergmann, op. cit., p. 321.

⁴ Phthisis does not infect the partner through intercourse, but it can infect her in another way, for example through kisses, sputum, etc.; in addition it is hereditary, that is, it communicates to offspring a disposition toward phthisis. But since this can be permitted, phthisis in itself is not a reason why one ought to abstain from intercourse. More frequent intercourse, however, can greatly harm those suffering from phthisis.

94 **VI. After a meal or bath**, commonly no harm worthy of note is to be feared from intercourse¹ (St. Alphonsus VI, 910).

¹ Capellmann-Bergmann, op. cit., p. 329.

95 **VII. During sacred time**, that is, feast days and days of fasting, intercourse is not prohibited. On those days, as being dedicated to divine worship or penance, to abstain from asking for intercourse is a counsel, unless, however, a danger of incontinence is present (St. Alphonsus VI, 923; cf. Roman Ritual, at the end of the Mass for bridegroom and bride).¹ Nor is intercourse prohibited on the day of communion to be received or having been received, although it can be a counsel on that day to abstain from intercourse, just as from many other delights. These things, however, should be left to the devotion of individuals.

¹ St. Thomas is stricter (Supplement, q. 64, a. 5).

Chapter II. On the Obligation of Conjugal Intercourse

96 **I.** The obligation of asking for the debt is absent in itself, because no one in itself is bound to use his own right. By accident there can be an obligation, and indeed of charity, for example if the partner seems to be in danger of incontinence, or if otherwise quarrels cannot be ended or averted (St. Alphonsus VI, 929).

97 **II.** The obligation of rendering the debt is circumscribed by these points:

1. *Existence of the obligation.* There exists an obligation of rendering the debt to one who reasonably and seriously asks for it. "Let the husband," says the Apostle, "render the debt to the wife; and likewise also the wife to the husband. The woman does not have power over her own body, but the man. Likewise also the man does not have power over his own body, but the woman."¹ Moreover, it is an obligation of justice, as is clear both from the fact that the Apostle speaks of the debt to be rendered, and repeats the obligation from the fact that spouses have power over the body of the partner; and from can. 1111; and from the nature of marriage, which is an onerous contract. Moreover, the obligation from the cited canon exists from the beginning of marriage, and therefore the so-called two-month privilege has been abrogated, that is, the privilege by which a spouse deliberating about entering a Religious Institute strictly so called could deny the debt for two months after contracting marriage. Finally, note that a spouse, in practice the husband, is bound to render the debt even if "the wife tacitly only demands it, for example if she shows some indication which signifies a tacit petition; because in women, on account of their innate modesty, such signs are held as a true petition" (St. Alphonsus VI, 928; St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 64, a. 2).
2. *Gravity of the obligation.* The obligation of rendering the debt is commonly grave, because there is question of an act or of a matter which is grave. Make exception: 1. when the partner asks less insistently, for example if he asks weakly, or, when asked to desist from the petition, easily consents; 2. if the debt is rarely denied to one who asks often, for example once in a month; for

this, in view of the frequency, does not seem grave. Besides, a brief delay, for example from day to night, is easily excused from grave and even from light fault. Nevertheless if, in the excepted cases, the partner were cast into danger of incontinence by the denial, there would be a grave obligation of charity (St. Alphonsus VI, 940).

Corollary. They sin gravely: 1. wives who show great delay in rendering, or do not grant the debt unless coerced, or reproach the husband insultingly for his petitions; 2. husbands who, whether in order to avoid offspring or from love conceived toward others, never or almost never know the wife, although they ought to presume that the wives bear this with difficulty.

3. *The causes excusing from the obligation are:*

a. *Cessation of the right of demanding the debt*, namely by the spontaneous renunciation of the spouses. Renunciation can be made explicitly or implicitly, by both or by only one party. It is presumed to have been made implicitly if both spouses, by mutual consent, emit a vow of chastity; nevertheless, in itself it is not repugnant that those vowing retain the right to intercourse (St. Alphonsus II, 61 and VI, 944, 948).

b. *Deprivation of the right of demanding the debt*, namely through adultery, sodomy, unnatural lying together with a person of diverse sex, or bestiality; according to that saying: Let faith be broken with the one who breaks faith. But the innocent spouse is excused until that spouse has condoned the crime or committed a similar crime (St. Alphonsus VI, 945, 960, 966; St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. 35, q. unica, a. 1, corp.; Supplement, q. 62, a. 1; can. 1129, 1130).

c. *Defect of reason in the one asking*, as if intercourse is asked by one perfectly insane or wholly drunk. The reason is that a petition of this sort is not a human act. There is added the danger lest offspring be born defective in mind and body² (St. Alphonsus VI, 948). Nor is there an obligation of rendering the debt if one perfectly insane or wholly drunk is in danger of incontinence, because an act materially evil can be permitted on account of the harm to offspring to be feared. - To one semi-insane and semi-drunk, and likewise to an insane person who has a lucid interval, the debt is in itself to be rendered (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). Moreover, on account of the harm to be feared, it is generally and in itself to be advised that intercourse with a drunk or insane person be avoided.

d. *A grave inconvenience to be feared either for the one asking, or for the one rendering, or for offspring already conceived*. The reason is that in all debts great difficulty excuses from payment (St. Alphonsus VI, 950, 952; cf. St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 64, a. 1).

Many grave inconveniences, such as death, notably harmful infection, another disease, or a notable increase of this disease, not only excuse from rendering the debt, but also render the rendering unlawful, unless a grave cause, for example the danger of incontinence of oneself or of the partner, or a grave quarrel to be avoided, is present (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.); nevertheless a grave cause does not render intercourse lawful if death is proximately going to follow from it (n. 93).

Other inconveniences, such as very sharp pains either in intercourse or in childbirth, or immense fatigue, can indeed excuse from rendering the debt, but, as is clear, do not in themselves prohibit it.

Finally, if, for example, the husband has truly vexed the wife during the day and asks in the evening, the psychological difficulty itself seems to excuse the wife, unless the husband either explicitly or implicitly, for example by his manner of asking, has offered some satisfaction to her.

It was said: "A grave inconvenience to be feared for offspring already conceived excuses from intercourse." For the inconvenience of offspring to be conceived commonly does not excuse from rendering the debt, because it is always better for the offspring to be thus than not to be (St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 64, a. 1, ad 4; St. Alphonsus VI, 951). If, however, a woman has learned by experience that she gives birth to dead children, she is excused from rendering the debt if, according to the judgment of a physician, it is rightly feared that the death of the fetus in the uterus would expose the mother herself to grave danger (St. Alphonsus VI, 953).

Note. To grave inconvenience is also referred an immoderate petition, either absolutely, as if someone habitually is not accustomed to be content with one or another act of intercourse daily, or, for example, were to ask four times in a night; or relatively to weakness of body, for example on account of incipient phthisis or some other chronic infirmity (St. Alphonsus VI, 940).

¹ 1 Cor. 7:3-4.

² Capellmann-Bergmann, op. cit., p. 328; Von Olfers, op. cit., p. 69, judges that the danger is absent if intercourse is had with one who is drunk only actually, not habitually; yet others contradict him.

98 Question 1. Whether fear of more numerous offspring, for whom sufficient provision cannot be made, excuses from rendering the debt.

Response I. If the evil threatens through the fault of the husband, it seems that one must answer affirmatively, "because you are not compelled to render his right to another, if he refuses to render yours to you" (St. Alphonsus IV, 999). But in the proposed case the husband refuses to render to the wife the cooperation owed to the bodily education of offspring by force of marriage and of intercourse had. Therefore the wife is not bound to render his right to the husband until he has amended himself. The argument is confirmed, or is even proposed, by this reasoning: let faith be broken with the one who breaks faith. Now, since the education of offspring, together with their procreation, is the primary end of marriage (can. 1013, § 1), cooperation toward the bodily education of offspring, equally as cooperation toward their procreation, seems to pertain to the matrimonial fidelity owed to the wife; this fidelity, in the hypothesis laid down, is broken by the husband. Therefore.

Response II. If the evil threatens without fault of the husband, it is disputed. Some judge that the wife is excused, provided the danger of incontinence is absent. The reason alleged is that in all debts great inconvenience excuses from payment. Others deny this, because the inconvenience of which we speak is intrinsic to the conjugal debt. Moreover, because in practice the danger of incontinence will scarcely be absent, for there is question of continually denying the debt, otherwise the end of the denial would not be obtained, in practice the debt cannot be denied (St. Alphonsus VI, 941).

99 Question 2. Whether a spouse is excused from the debt if the partner forbids the offspring to be educated Catholic.

Response. It seems that one must answer affirmatively, because, as we said above, you are not compelled to render his right to another if he refuses to render yours to you. But in the case the partner stands in the way of the partner's right to educate the offspring Catholic. Therefore. And this holds whether the spouse has promised or has not promised Catholic education.

e. A *sinful petition* excuses as follows:

1. If the petition is sinful because an act is asked for in circumstances which render it unlawful, or because an unlawful thing is asked, for example sodomitic intercourse or intercourse to be performed before others, the partner is not only excused from rendering the debt, but is also forbidden to render it. The reason is that no one enjoys a right of asking for an unlawful thing. If, however, the malice of the act or unlawful thing is only venial, for example if without a just cause intercourse to be performed from behind is asked for, there is easily present a reason which renders the rendering lawful, though not obligatory (St. Alphonsus VI, 943, 946).
2. If the petition is sinful because the one asking is held by an impediment, for example by a vow, it is lawful to render the debt. The reason is that an impediment which holds one party does not deprive the other of the right of having intercourse. It is disputed whether in the case there is an obligation of rendering the debt. Now it seems that this must be affirmed, because intercourse in the case, although asked illicitly, is nevertheless asked lawfully, and therefore the petition must be satisfied, "just as if someone were to emit a vow not to exact from you the money owed, if he later asks, you are bound to render it, because through the vow the creditor did not lose his right" (St. Alphonsus VI, 944). Moreover, when "a spouse foresees that the other, impeded by a vow or another impediment, will ask illicitly, then it will be safer for the spouse himself to forestall it; and if the other has already asked, then he himself should also ask, saying: I wish you to render to me. But Sanchez rightly says that wives are rarely bound to this, because it would be a great burden to them, on account of the natural modesty of women, to be bound always to ask" (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).
3. If the petition is sinful on account of the manner of asking, for example if it is made for pleasure alone, intercourse ought to be granted, because it is asked lawfully, indeed also licitly if the one asking so wishes (St. Alphonsus VI, 946).

100 **III. Consequences of the obligation set forth.** From the obligation of rendering, indeed sometimes of asking, the debt, there follow:

- a. *The obligation of cohabiting.*¹ Now it belongs to the husband, since he is the head of the conjugal society, to choose the domicile. Moreover, the obligation of cohabiting is essentially mutual. Hence one cannot be absent from the other for a rather long time without necessity or the consent of the partner. But the husband who must be absent for a long time is bound to take the wife with him, if she desires this and it can conveniently be done; and the wife must follow the husband if he requires this, unless, however, a grave reason excuses (St. Alphonsus VI, 939).
- b. *The obligation of using at least the same bedroom or chamber;* that is, the right and obligation of using the same marriage bed or bed ought not to be urged, provided they spend the night in the same bedroom and can come together at will. Besides, the obligation seems to be satisfied if, as is in use in some families, wife and husband indeed have a distinct bed and room, but the room is adjoining, and free and easy access to the other's room and bed lies open to each, although this practice is very much to be dissuaded.²
- c. *The obligation not to render themselves impotent for the debt.* A spouse who by unlawful means renders himself impotent for the conjugal debt sins mortally, because the law of justice obliging to the rendering of the debt also forbids that anyone by unlawful means render himself impotent. Hence a husband who, whether by frequent pollutions or by access to other women, renders himself

impotent, or notably less apt, for paying the debt, beyond the sin of adulterous pollution or of adultery, seems to commit a new fault against the law of justice. Indeed a spouse could sin gravely who, by works in themselves lawful but indiscreet and by no means necessary, such as excessive mortifications, vigils, or labors, rendered himself notably less fit³ (St. Alphonsus VI, 942).

Note. Vasectomy (n. 87), oophorectomy (n. 86), and excision of the ovaries, admitted for the end that procreation of offspring be impeded, are gravely unlawful, both because they contain mutilation which is not necessary for the preservation of the whole, and because, done for that end, they are directly opposed to the good of the species; besides, if they are done without the consent of the partner, they are opposed to that partner's right.

¹ Cf. Gen. 2:24; c. 1, *de coniug. lepros.*, IV, 8; can. 1128; Civil Code, arts. 161, 162.

² Cf. Gasparri, *Tractatus Canonici de Matrimonio*, n. 1077.

³ Cf. *Theologia Mechliniensis de Sponsalibus et Matrimonio*, n. 43, q. 10.

Section II. On Accessories to Intercourse

Accessories to intercourse chiefly are: touches, kisses, embraces, and looks, both modest and less modest and immodest, whether done with venereal commotion or without it. But accessory acts are either mutual or solitary.

101 I. Mutual acts are to be judged thus:

1. *If they are referred to intercourse*, that is, if they are done with the intention of carrying out intercourse, whether absolutely or conditionally, namely if danger of pollution presses, they are lawful; and this holds even if the acts are very immodest. The reason is "because to him for whom the end is lawful, the means also are lawful; and to him to whom the consummation is lawful, the beginning also is lawful. Hence they lawfully excite nature by such things toward intercourse" (St. Alphonsus VI, 932). The danger of pollution, indeed, ought of itself to be avoided; but if the acts are referred to intercourse, the danger is commonly absent, unless you except certain acts which are of such a kind that pollution can hardly be timely averted. Such is, for example, begun intercourse from which the spouses desist before insemination. Acts of this sort, therefore, are scarcely free from grave sin, unless with respect to those who know by experience that grave danger of pollution is absent (St. Alphonsus VI, 934). On the insertion of the male member into the mouth of the wife, see n. 107.
2. *If they are not referred to intercourse*, they are lawful provided the danger of pollution is absent. The reason is that for those to whom intercourse is permitted, that is, the perfect mutual act, those acts also are lawful which by their nature are ordered to intercourse, that is, to the perfect mutual act; and of this kind are incomplete mutual acts. And this holds even if intercourse itself were forbidden to the spouses because of illness, or impossible because of impotence which had supervened; but otherwise if the spouse were bound by a vow of chastity (St. Alphonsus VI, 933; n. 85). If grave danger of pollution is present in either spouse, they are of themselves gravely unlawful; they become lawful if a proportionate cause for permitting the danger of pollution is present.¹ Moreover, the more an act influences pollution, the graver the cause required. Mutual love to be fostered makes honorable even less modest acts; indeed, generally a serious petition of the partner is a sufficient cause for admitting even more shameful acts, unless they are quasi-

begun pollution, that is, such that pollution can scarcely be averted, according to what was said under 1 (St. Alphonsus VI, 934).

Note. What has been said about the obligation of asking and rendering intercourse is also applied to mutual accessory acts, with the things set forth above preserved, especially with the danger of pollution excluded.

¹ As is clear, it is not lawful to consent to a pollution that will follow; but many spouses are ignorant of the malice of consent in pollution following beyond intention, nor is it commonly expedient to warn them about that malice.

102 II. External solitary acts are certainly gravely unlawful if they bring with them grave danger of pollution; if they do not induce that danger, but nevertheless are placed with venereal commotion, they must be spoken of thus:

1. *If they are referred to intercourse now to be had*, they are lawful, as was said about mutual acts referred to intercourse (n. 101).
2. *If they are not referred to intercourse*, there is dispute. Some judge that the said acts are not unlawful in themselves, because venereal commotion in spouses always by its nature has an order to conjugal intercourse. Others hold acts of this sort to be gravely unlawful: first, because the spouse of himself does not have a right over the use of his own body, but only accidentally insofar as the use of it is referred to intercourse, that is, to the use of the body of the partner, according to these words of the Apostle: "The woman does not have power over her own body, but the man. Likewise also the man does not have power over his own body, but the woman."¹ Then, they say, incomplete solitary acts of themselves seem to be ordered to a complete solitary act, that is, to pollution. St. Alphonsus (VI, 936) says that the stricter opinion is to be advised; and let this also be done by those who adhere to the more benign opinion, because rarely will every danger of pollution be absent.

¹ 1 Cor. 7:4.

103 III. Internal acts, if they are concerned with an act unlawful to spouses, such as morose pleasure concerning intercourse with a third party, are manifestly sinful, as is explained more fully in the appendix (n. 120). If they are concerned with an act lawful to spouses, such as morose pleasure concerning intercourse with the partner, joy over intercourse had with that partner, or the proposal of having intercourse with that partner, they are likewise unlawful if they carry with them grave danger of pollution. If they do not induce that danger, even if they are exercised with venereal commotion, they are, with sufficient probability, equated with the mutual acts of which it was said under I, that is, they are lawful (St. Alphonsus V, 25;¹ n. 118 and 121).

Corollary. Of himself the spouse does not sin who excites himself to intercourse by looking at, or representing to himself, either shameful images or, for example, a beautiful person distinct from the partner, provided that he does not with complacency revolve in his mind an act which would be unlawful for him with respect to that person.

¹ Cf., however, St. Alphonsus VI, 937 and *Homo Apostolicus*, tr. 18, n. 42; these places create difficulty unless we say that the Holy Doctor is speaking there of graver venereal pleasure, which always brings on danger of pollution.

Part II. On the Illicit Acts of Spouses

104 The following must especially be noted:

I. Pollution, which in spouses in a certain way takes on the character of adultery, insofar as it involves the use of one's own body and thereby injures both the partner's right over it and the sanctity of the sacrament, which confirms the rights and duties of spouses.

105 **II. Acts committed with a third party** constitute adultery (n. 35), or take on its character, as was explained (n. 71).

106 **III. Artificial fecundation**, which consists in this: that a physician receives in a small vessel semen emitted by a man solitarily or onanistically, and with the help of a small tube infuses it into the genital organs of the woman. That this manner of acting is gravely evil is clear from the fact that fecundation is obtained by means of, or after there has first been, pollution or the sin of onanism. There is added the declaration of the Holy Office of March 24, 1897.¹ Otherwise, with sufficient probability, one must speak of artificial fecundation improperly so called, which consists in this: that the physician draws out with the help of a small tube semen infused into the female vessel through intercourse, and then inserts it more deeply into the female organ. For on the one hand intercourse is rightly performed and is assisted by art so that it may attain its end, namely fecundation; on the other hand it is not evident that the semen, through the physician's act which is completed by a further insertion of the semen into the female organ, is deprived by its ordination of its end, or that, during the action, it had been formally deprived of the said ordination.

¹ To the doubt, "Whether artificial fecundation of a woman can be employed," it answered: "It is not lawful."

107 Corollary. Likewise, for a grave cause it seems lawful to draw out semen from the husband's epididymis and infuse it into the wife's vagina. I said *for a grave cause*, because the natural order requires that offspring be procreated through intercourse. But it is unlawful to take in this way the semen of another man, even if the husband and the wife of the said man consent, because in a procreation of this sort, as proceeding from persons not bound by the bond of marriage, the education of the offspring would not be sufficiently provided for (n. 33).¹

107. **IV. Intercourse in the wife's undue vessel** is called imperfect sodomy if it is in the preposterous vessel (n. 57), and irroration if it is in the mouth (n. 57); these sins seem not to differ from one another (n. 57).

Question. Whether imperfect sodomy or irroration is had if intercourse is begun in the undue vessel with the intention of completing it in the due vessel. Many deny this, and consequently judge that in the case not even grave sin is had. But St. Alphonsus, with others, affirms it, because the intention of consummating intercourse in the due vessel does not prevent a perverse commingling, of which we spoke in n. 57, from being had as begun, although not to be consummated (VI, 935). I said, however, *in the undue vessel*, because the matter must be resolved otherwise if the man merely rubbed the male member on the surface of the preposterous vessel or of the closed mouth, because commingling is not had (n. 57); nevertheless an affection toward sodomy improperly so called, or toward irroration, can be joined to it. Lying together on a part of the spouse's body distinct from the anus and the mouth belongs to pollution.

¹ Cf. Vermeersch, *De castitate*, n. 241.

108 **V. Onanism**,¹ which must be treated more fully.

¹ Forstmann-Ausems, *Het Neomalthusianismus*.

109 **1. Notion and division.** Onanism¹ is twofold: natural and artificial. Natural onanism consists in this: that intercourse, rightly begun, is broken off without a legitimate reason in such a way that the semen is poured out outside the vessel. I said *without a legitimate reason*; for because of a grave reason intercourse can be broken off, even if the pouring out of the semen outside the vessel follows from this, for example so that scandal may be avoided, or because intercourse cannot be continued on account of pain; in circumstances of this sort the loss of semen can be permitted (St. Alphonsus VI, 918). Artificial, or modern, onanism² is situated in the use of a preservative means or instrument by which it is brought about that the semen does not touch the vagina. It is called the English cloak, and is a thin membrane with which the male member is clothed, and by which the semen is caught and withdrawn after intercourse. The following are commonly referred to onanism: 1. the use either of an occlusive pessary, that is, an instrument which is introduced into the vagina near the mouth of the uterus, so that the ascent of the semen from the vagina to the uterus is impeded, or of a sponge, which likewise is introduced into the vagina as far as the opening of the uterus; 2. the use of a certain powder, which before intercourse is blown into the vagina and substantially corrupts the semen; 3. the use of a medicine which moistens the mouth of the uterus and so tightens and closes it that the semen cannot enter the uterus; 4. the use of a siphon or irrigator by which the semen after intercourse is washed out of the vagina.

109. 2. Morality. a. Onanism, both natural and artificial, is intrinsically and gravely evil, nor can it ever for any reason become lawful.

It is *intrinsically evil*, because it involves a use of the semen which lacks ordination to the natural end of semen, that is, to the good of the species (n. 19).

It is *gravely evil*, because it involves a use of semen which is neither apt for generation nor ordered to the education of the one to be generated; these privations are grave (n. 28).

Nor *can it ever for any reason become lawful*. For this could not happen unless there were an intermediate end to which the good of the human species is subordinated, so that it would be lawful to pursue that intermediate end while neglecting the good of the species. But such an intermediate end does not exist, since the good of the human species is immediately ordered to the ultimate end, which is God (n. 29). There are added the responses of the Holy Office, which declare onanism to be "forbidden by natural law" (May 21, 1851) and "intrinsically evil" (April 19, 1853). Add the very grave evils which threaten both spouses and offspring and society from onanism.³ Furthermore, onanism is unlawful even in a case in which, in appearance, it benefits some society, namely because in some region only weak and miserable offspring is usually born. For first, evils are not to be done so that good things may come about. Then, for offspring it is always better to be thus than not to be (n. 97).

Moreover, it is clear that not only the onanistic husband sins gravely, but also the wife who desires, approves, or advises the husband's manner of acting, or who in another way, for example by complaining about more numerous offspring, brings it about that the husband commits onanism.

b. Likewise all those manners of acting which we said are referred to onanism (n. 108) are gravely evil, because all of them, by directly bringing it about that the emitted semen cannot attain its end, directly impede the good of the species (n. 44). There is added the fact that the use of a pessary or sponge seems to bring it about that intercourse is not apt for generation, as we shall soon explain more fully (n. 110).

¹ Physicians more often designate by the name onanism what theologians call masturbation.

² Artificial onanism is often called Neo-Malthusianism; that is, Malthus, an Englishman by nation, in the book *Essay on the Principles of Population*, in order to diminish the number of offspring, advised that the liberty of nuptials be restricted. The Neo-Malthusians, however, went further and devised means for frustrating fecundation.

³ "The spouses themselves often suffer many evils from this; for just as children are a common good and a common bond by which spouses are more firmly and closely joined, so conversely those who lack offspring much more easily disagree and separate from each other. Nor should it be said that one or another child suffices for attaining this end; for the more numerous the offspring, the firmer the union of the spouses. Moreover, onanists are not rarely punished by the premature death of one or another child whom they had begotten; hence parents of an only child are often pressed by anxieties and fears lest perhaps this child be taken from the living and the family name be blotted out. - Furthermore marital intercourse which, when legitimately performed, is a remedy for concupiscence, does not soothe it but inflames it when it is completed onanistically; especially the woman is not completely delighted, nor does she rest unless the womb is irrigated with male semen tempering its ardor. - Hence physicians also proclaim with one voice that onanists are liable to many diseases, which arise especially from the excitation of the nerves; for the commotion which lying together causes is not soothed except by the natural effusion and reception of male sperm.

"Offspring also not rarely suffer some detriment from the onanism of the parents, which the Council of Poitiers (1868) describes thus: It happens very often that that child is educated too indulgently, or by God's command ends life briefly, or, having become worse with age, destitute of the sweet love and protection of brothers and sisters, loving himself, not obeying his parents, proud, ungrateful, without affection, afflicts his family with ignominy and sorrow.

"Nor does onanism harm society less. Since, indeed, the chief strength and protection of society is situated in the number and manly education of citizens, onanism, by impeding generation, diminishes the number of citizens, so that nations once flourishing gradually decline. It likewise stands in the way of the manly education of boys: for where there is an only son, generally he is educated too indulgently, is devoted to pleasure rather than to duty, and often becomes wholly useless to his fatherland" (Tanqueray, *Supplementum ad tractatum de Matrimonio*, nn. 41-43; cf. Eschbach, *Disputationes physiologico-theologicae*, p. 569; Forstmann-Ausems, *Het Neomalthusianismus*).

110 Question 1. Whether a man can complete intercourse: 1. if the wife uses an occlusive pessary or sponge and refuses to remove it; 2. if the wife has used a powder which, blown into the vagina, substantially corrupts the semen, and refuses to abstain from it; 3. if the wife has tightened the mouth of the uterus by medicines and refuses to remove them.

Response. The man is certainly bound to forbid the things mentioned and to oppose them as far as can be done. But if he has lost his oil and labor, one must speak thus:

To I. It seems that it must be denied, because for right intercourse there is required an effusion of semen into a vagina which is not substantially vitiated. But the vagina, which is a fleshy member with an opening as far as the uterus, or like a canal proceeding as far as the uterus, seems, although it remains physically intact, to be substantially vitiated, morally speaking, through occlusion. What has

been said generally is confirmed by the fact that from declarations of the S.C.C.¹ it seems one must deduce that a naturally occluded vagina is substantially vitiated. I acknowledge, however, that this confirmation cannot be urged with certainty, because in our case there is question of an artificial occlusion, which leaves the vagina physically intact.²

To II. With sufficient probability it is affirmed, because the vagina is not substantially vitiated by the powder introduced, but only accidentally, almost as the vagina of a woman who can receive semen but cannot retain it (n. 86).

To III. It is to be affirmed, because the vagina itself is not vitiated by the said medicine. The fact that the mouth of the uterus is tightened does not prevent intercourse from being considered apt in itself, as is clear from the fact that intercourse is lawful for pregnant women, who have the mouth of the uterus closed (n. 90).

¹ The responses of the said S.C.C. in the Salernitana, March 21, 1863; in the Verulana, January 24 and June 22, 1871; and in the Monasteriensis, December 16, 1899, declare null the marriage of a woman who lacked a uterus and had a short vagina closed near the uterus. Now the lack of a uterus and the shortness of the vagina do not stand in the way of potency (n. 86); therefore it remains that the occlusion of the vagina stands in the way.

² So also, with his opinion changed, teaches Vermeersch (*Periodica de re canonica et morali*, 1926, p. 65). The Bishops of Germany speak thus: "If the husband knows that the wife herself wishes to frustrate conception by the use of instruments or means inserted into the female vessel, he must very decisively hold her back from this, and, if possible, remove and destroy any instruments. If he does not succeed in this, or if despite his best will he has not been able to prevent the use of chemical preparations, one will not be able to require of him that he always practice abstinence. Rather, the conjugal act will be permitted to him for a grave cause whenever it is grave for him to lack the conjugal act, or if he himself were in danger of incontinence. But the presupposition is that he seeks the conjugal act moderately and in an ordered manner, and intends to complete it rightly; that he does not consent to the woman, and that he not merely warns her away from her criminal conduct, but seeks to hold her back from it as well as possible" (*Instructio pro confessariis de usu et abusu matrimonii*, § 5). From these things Vermeersch (loc. cit.) deduces that the said Bishops adhere to the more benign opinion. But regarding these things the *Zeitschrift fuer katholische Theologie* notes: "Must the Instruction necessarily be interpreted in this sense? In the first sentence of § 5 there is question of the use of instruments or means, chemical means; whether, therefore, it is a mechanical closure or only a chemical means, the husband must demand its removal. But in the second sentence, where for a grave cause intercourse is still permitted to the man if the woman does not obey, there is no longer question of instruments, a pessary, but only of chemical means which leave the vagina in natural connection with the uterus" (1927, p. 311).

111 **Question 2.** What can or must the wife of an onanistic husband do?

Response. She is bound from piety to admonish the husband to perform intercourse rightly, if there is hope of fruit and the admonition can be made without danger of grave inconvenience, for example of grave discord.¹ Yet in these cases, "toward the woman herself one must incline to severity rather than to laxity, lest it come to this, that with men rejected from the Sacraments, women indulging in onanism may be admitted everywhere by a subtle distinction."² With these things premised, one must speak thus:

I. *If the husband is about to commit natural onanism*, the wife:

1. *Is not bound to render the debt.* Some indeed judge that the wife is bound to this, because the husband asks the debt by right; but it is not sufficiently evident that the wife is bound to grant intercourse, that is, a mutual act, which she foresees is going to be deprived by the husband of an essential and due element.

2. *She can render the debt*, at least for a grave cause. The reason is that the wife on her part gives cooperation to a lawful thing, namely to intercourse insofar as it is rightly begun, not insofar as it is broken off; on the other hand, she is not bound, with grave inconvenience, to impede the sin of the husband. There are added the responses of the Sacred Penitentiary.³ Indeed, in practice perhaps not even a grave cause is required; this is drawn from the fact that the wife, with regard to the right of the husband, is with equal probability bound to render it (St. Alphonsus VI, 947).
3. *She can ask the debt for a grave cause*, because she asks, as is supposed, for right intercourse, nor is she bound to impede the sin of the husband with grave inconvenience. That a grave cause is required is deduced from the fact that, when the husband is not urging his right, she cooperates with the sin of the husband, which from piety she is bound to forestall (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). The wife has a grave cause "if she herself were in danger of incontinence; or if otherwise she would have to be deprived of her right of asking more than once or twice, with perpetual scruple whether there is a sufficiently grave inconvenience for her, or whether then she could contain herself" (St. Alphonsus VI, 947).

II. *If the husband, with an English cloak employed, is going to have intercourse*, the wife can neither ask nor render the debt, but is bound to resist as a woman who is oppressed. Therefore only for a most grave cause, namely for fear of death or of an evil equivalent to it, would it be lawful for her not to resist the oppressor. The reason is that in the case the act is totally vitiated from the beginning. So also the responses of the Holy Office⁴ and of the Sacred Penitentiary.⁵

Corollary. As often as the wife lawfully asks or renders the debt, she also lawfully excites herself and consents to the pleasure annexed to her act.

¹ Sacred Penitentiary, November 15, 1816; February 1, 1823.

² Instruction of the Bishops of Belgium, June 2, 1909.

³ The Sacred Penitentiary, on November 15, 1816, responded: "Approved and serious moral theologians agree in this, that ... it is lawful for a wife to render the debt, namely to a man asking onanistically, if from her denial she is going to be badly treated by the man and can fear grave inconvenience to herself from it; for in this case, they say, the wife is not judged to cooperate formally in the sin of her husband, but only to permit it for a just and reasonable cause. Nevertheless let the petitioner admonish a wife of this sort that she not cease prudently to admonish her husband to desist from this shamefulfulness." Likewise the same Sacred Penitentiary, on February 1, 1823, to the question, "Bertha has a husband whom by constant experience she knows to be an onanist. In vain she has tried all means to withdraw him from so unspeakable a crime; indeed very grave or at least grave evils now probably threaten her, so that either she must incur these evils or flee from the house of her husband unless she sometimes permits the abuse of marriage," responded, I say, to the said question: "Since in the proposed case the woman on her part does nothing against nature and gives cooperation to a lawful thing, while the whole disorder of the act proceeds from the malice of the husband, who instead of consummating withdraws himself and pours out outside the vessel, therefore if the woman, after due admonitions, accomplishes nothing, while the husband insists by threatening beatings or death or other most grave evils, she herself will be able, as approved theologians teach, to behave permissively without sin, since in these circumstances she simply permits the sin of the husband, and does so from a grave cause which excuses her, because charity, by which she is bound to impede it, does not oblige with so great an inconvenience." Finally, on April 3, 1916, the Sacred Penitentiary declared: "If the husband in the use of marriage wishes to commit the crime of Onan, namely by pouring out the semen outside the vessel after intercourse has been begun, and likewise threatens the wife with death or grave molestations unless she accommodates herself to his perverse will, the wife, according to the opinion of approved theologians, can lawfully in this case have intercourse thus with her husband, since she on her part gives

cooperation to a lawful thing and action, while she permits the sin of the husband from a grave cause which excuses her; because charity by which she would be bound to impede it does not oblige with so great an inconvenience."

⁴ May 21, 1851; April 19, 1853.

⁵ The Sacred Penitentiary, on June 3, 1916, rescripted these things:

1. Whether a woman, in a case in which the husband wishes to use an instrument for exercising onanism, is bound to positive resistance?
2. If negatively, whether reasons equally grave as for natural onanism, without an instrument, suffice to make passive resistance honorable on the part of the woman, or rather whether most grave reasons are altogether necessary?
3. Whether, so that this whole matter may be developed and taught by a safer path, a man using such instruments ought truly to be equated with an oppressor, to whom therefore the woman ought to oppose that resistance which a virgin must oppose to an invader.

The response was:

To the first: Affirmatively.

To the second: Provision has been made in the first.

To the third: Affirmatively.

112 3. Remedies against onanism.¹

- a. First of all, let it be indicated that onanism is a most grave sin, since it is opposed to the primary end of marriage and of the conjugal act.
- b. Let the effects of onanism be prudently explained, effects which not so rarely are punished by God in the offspring born, and which besides easily harm health, especially by weakening the nervous system (n. 109).
- c. If the reason for onanism is difficulty in feeding and educating more numerous offspring, confidence in God should be stirred up. Moreover, appeal should be made to a fact confirmed by daily experience: that numerous families, generally speaking, are happier than others; for in them the natural energies of the members are splendidly exercised; in them a greater union and manly love reign.
- d. If death from a new childbirth is feared, it can generally be said that the danger is easily exaggerated by some physicians; besides, the medical art has so advanced that the danger can now commonly be averted.
- e. Finally, those things can prudently be suggested which we are going to say in n. 117 about a time less apt for fecundation.

¹ Cf. Instruction of the Bishops of Belgium, June 2, 1909; *Ned. Kath. Stemmen*, 1909, p. 356.

113 4. **The manner of treating onanists,**¹ although it ought to be done according to the general rules, is usually assigned specially on account of the importance of the matter - for there is question of a crime very harmful and spreading most widely.

a. With regard to *the interrogation to be made*, the confessor should regularly ask penitents prudently,² if there is a founded suspicion that they are addicted to onanism; for example, by asking whether anything troubles their conscience regarding marriage, or even more clearly, whether regarding the number of children they submit themselves to the divine Will.

b. With regard to *the admonition to be made*, observe these things:

alpha. The confessor, as is clear, can never positively permit onanism.

beta. One who is doubtful already lacks good faith; hence one who asks the confessor should be taught the gravity of the sin.

gamma. When good faith occurs, the penitent should be admonished according to the common rules of admonition; that is, he should be instructed if there is hope of fruit, or if from silence the common good can suffer detriment. He should be left in good faith if hope of fruit is absent and the common good is not exposed to danger by silence. The common good is exposed to danger if it is feared that the silence of the confessor will become widely known.

Nevertheless, note that good faith rarely occurs, both because the vice is repugnant to the natural inclination of completing intercourse, and because the faithful are forewarned against that vice both by books and newspapers, both by sermons and instructions. Sometimes, however, especially if the wife is ill or grave danger is feared from a new childbirth, it can happen that the penitent, more easily indeed the wife, is in good faith.

c. With regard to *the remedies against onanism* to be impressed upon the penitent, cf. what was said under 3, n. 112.

¹ Cf. Instruction of the Bishops of Belgium, June 2, 1909; N. K. Stemmen, 1909, p. 359.

² Cf. Holy Office, May 21, 1851; Sacred Penitentiary, March 10, 1886, to the question: "When there is a founded suspicion that a penitent who is wholly silent about onanism is addicted to this crime, is it lawful for the confessor to abstain from prudent and discreet interrogation, because he foresees that many will be disturbed out of good faith and many will abandon the Sacraments? Or rather is the confessor bound to ask prudently and discreetly?" It responded: "Considering that the unspeakable vice of which there is question in the case has spread widely, ... regularly, negatively to the first part, affirmatively to the second."

114 VI. Incomplete intercourse.

1. With regard to it, it is first asked whether intercourse of this sort is of itself apt for generation, in other words, whether conception follows from it of itself or only accidentally. If it is not of itself apt for generation, it is intrinsically evil; indeed, those who cannot perform intercourse more perfectly labor under impotence. Now the said intercourse, in our opinion, is of itself apt for generation. This is first deduced from the fact that intercourse which, as to its substance, follows the manner indicated by nature ought to be judged of itself apt for generation. But incomplete intercourse, as to its substance, seems to follow the manner indicated by nature. For it involves some penetration of the vagina; moreover, a more perfect or less perfect penetration does not seem to differ except according to more and less, or they are judged substantially similar to each other. Then - what we have already noted - if the contrary opinion is admitted, those who cannot have intercourse more perfectly would be impotent; and no theologian up to now has taught this.

Therefore it suffices for an act of itself apt for generation that one infuse semen into a vagina which is not substantially vitiated.¹ Nevertheless:

2. Incomplete intercourse, although of itself apt for generation, nevertheless is of itself unlawful. This seems first to be deduced from the declaration of the Holy Office dated November 23, 1923. The Holy Office, to the questions II: "Whether a confessor is to be censured who, after all remedies for turning a penitent abusing marriage away from this evil have been tried in vain, teaches him to exercise incomplete intercourse in order to forestall mortal sins. III: Whether a confessor is to be censured who, in the circumstances under II, advises incomplete intercourse already otherwise known to the penitent, or, when the penitent asks whether this manner is lawful, answers simply that it is lawful, without any restriction or explanation"; to these questions the Sacred Congregation responded: "To II and III, affirmatively." Now this declaration is not well understood if you admit that incomplete intercourse is of itself lawful. There is added the authority of theologians; for, as far as I know, no author declares the said intercourse immune from every fault. There is added a twofold reason. First, intercourse ought to be done in the manner which nature itself teaches. But the figure and form, construction and dimensions, which the Author of nature gave to the genital apparatus both of the man and of the woman, demonstrate that intercourse is consonant with nature only when the man has introduced the member so deeply into the wife's vagina that the glans or summit of the member, together with the opening through which sperm is ejaculated, reaches the bottom of the vagina, to the neck of the uterus, and is carried wholly before the orifice of the uterus, into which the ejaculated semen can immediately enter.² Then, true disorder is to choose a manner of having intercourse which renders notably less probable the attainment of the end to which the use of semen must be ordered under grave obligation. Nevertheless, since the act remains of itself apt for generation, it is not evident that there is a grave disorder or a substantial inversion of order.
3. Incomplete intercourse is excused by impossibility of having intercourse more perfectly, grave pain if intercourse is had more perfectly, and so forth; but not by more numerous offspring, since this inconvenience is intrinsic to perfect intercourse. Hence the Holy Office on November 23, 1923 rightly responded negatively to the question: "Whether it can be tolerated that confessors of their own accord teach the practice of incomplete intercourse and advise it indiscriminately to all penitents who fear lest more numerous offspring be born."

¹ According to Dr. Batenburg (*Brief aan Dr. Ausems*), incomplete intercourse is not of itself apt for generation: first, because semen infused at the entrance of the vagina, on account of the upper walls of the vagina, which in intercourse of this sort remain closed or rather joined to each other, can scarcely ascend; then, because the vaginal fluid, in which case the neospermata are enveloped, easily and quickly corrupts them. From this, he says, conception follows much more often from complete intercourse than from incomplete intercourse. But even if the assertions were proved, nevertheless they would not prevent the act, according to what was set forth above, from being substantially placed; and once this is admitted, it must be said that the end is more often not obtained accidentally only, not of itself.

² Taskin, apud *Ned. Kath. Stemmen*, 1923, p. 198 sq.

115 **VII. Deposition of semen outside the vagina** - that is, at the exterior part of the vulva, or, after the vulva has been penetrated, at the mouth of the vagina - is not of itself apt for generation, and therefore must be called true pollution. For, first, ch. 6, tit. 15, *de frigidis et maleficiatis*, declares that an impediment of impotence is had if the man cannot penetrate the woman's vagina. Then, an act which

in no way follows the manner indicated by nature cannot be judged of itself apt for generation. But the act of which there is question in no way follows the manner indicated by nature, since it excludes every penetration of the vagina. Hence those who cannot have intercourse more perfectly are impotent; and those who deliberately have intercourse in this way sin gravely. This, however, does not prevent those who have tried in vain to penetrate the vagina, as long as there is some hope of penetrating, from being able to try it again (St. Alphonsus VI, 954, dub. 2).

116 VIII. An act committed after intercourse. I speak of vaginal washings,¹ which indeed are commonly done for various reasons, for example so that conception may be impeded, or so that cleanliness or health may be cared for. Now:

1. Vaginal washings cannot be done with the intention that conception be impeded; for this is the same as directly expelling the semen and therefore directly impeding the good of the species (n. 44). Nor are they lawful so that cleanliness may be cared for, if the intended cleanliness is obtained precisely through the expulsion of the semen: both because evils are not to be done so that good things may come about, and because the said privation of cleanliness is intrinsic to intercourse. Nor are they permitted so that cleanliness may be cared for in the case in which cleanliness is not obtained precisely through expulsion of the semen, because the good effect does not correspond to the evil effect.

2. Outside the aforesaid cases, one must speak thus:

- a. Vaginal washings can be done at the time when the semen remaining in the vagina can be considered corrupted, that is, two hours after intercourse. Namely, it is already rather commonly admitted by experts that all spermatozoa remaining in the vagina after intercourse are, at least by that time, corrupted by the reacting vaginal secretions.²

- b. For a grave cause, washings can be done before the time indicated under 1, even immediately after intercourse. This must be said in view of the principles which regard an act with a double effect. The case would occur, for example, if a woman were forced to admit intercourse by a man infected with syphilis or another contagious disease, and the washing were a means of driving away the danger of infection. In that case there would be an action with a double effect following equally immediately: one effect would be the driving away or sterilization of bacilli, that is, of spirochetes producing infection; the other, the driving away or sterilization of semen.³ Yet take care to note that a grave cause is also required when the danger of losing all the semen has ceased, that is, four or five minutes after intercourse;⁴ for even the loss of part of the semen seems grave in itself, except with sufficient probability in the case in which the partial loss of semen happens on the occasion of an act of itself ordered to generation (n. 83). Besides, the things said about a grave cause which would permit a washing are almost merely theoretical. For a grave cause must commonly be sought from a motive of health. Now vaginal washings regularly harm health, far from favoring it;⁵ nor do they avert the infection of which mention was made above.⁶ There is added the fact that washings, in the case in which they are useful, must be done by an expert.⁷

¹ Cf. *Ned. Kath. Stemmen*, 1922, p. 43; *R. K. Artsenblad*, June 1927.

² Van Bouwdijk-Bastiaanse, however, judges that living spermatozoa are commonly still found in the vagina after three hours.

³ *N. K. Stemmen*, loc. cit.

⁴ As is evident from the latest experiments, immediately after coitus spermatozoa already begin to enter the neck or cervix of the uterus. They have been found four or five minutes afterward. Now neither in the neck of the uterus, and much less in the uterus itself, can they be reached by that irrigation which women can perform by themselves without a physician (N. K. Stemmen, loc. cit.).

⁵ R. K. Artsenblad, 1927, pp. 133-147.

⁶ R. K. Artsenblad, 1927, pp. 147-153.

⁷ R. K. Artsenblad, loc. cit.

117 IX. Doubts and Responses.

1. Spouses lawfully abstain from intercourse at the time when fecundation is judged easier, and perform it at another time.¹ Now conception is less probable: according to some, from the fifteenth day after menstruation has begun until a few days (three or four) before it; according to others, only during the time which immediately follows the cessation of the menses, while the week preceding the menses would be more favorable to fecundation; according to others, during the week which follows and the week which precedes the menses. And so this matter is so uncertain that it has scarcely any practical value.²
2. The wife does not sin by rising or urinating immediately after intercourse, because, once intercourse has ended, the vaginal walls immediately adhere to one another, so that the semen is not expelled. She would sin, however, if she acted in this way with the intention that the semen be expelled (St. Alphonsus VI, 954).
3. Spouses who in the act of intercourse restrain semination do not sin, provided that each consents and neither is exposed to danger of pollution. The reason is that that penetration of the female vessel is then reputed an incomplete mutual act, or even an essential part of perfect intercourse; married persons have a right to these things. I said *provided that each consents*, because each has a right to the semination of the partner. I said *provided that neither is exposed to danger of pollution*. But since that danger is easily present, in practice this cannot be permitted except to those who know by experience that the danger of pollution is absent (St. Alphonsus VI, 918; n. 101).
4. The husband sins gravely who without a just cause restrains semination after the wife has seminated or is prepared to seminate. The reason is "because then he himself is the cause that the semen of the wife is wasted" (St. Alphonsus VI, 918), that is, deprived of its end. The wife, however, who does not consent to the husband's manner of acting, can seminate, since from begun intercourse, that is, from penetration of the vagina, she seems to receive a right to semination. - A wife who restrains semination after the husband has seminated does not sin gravely, except in the case in which the husband does not consent. For since the semination of the wife is not necessary for generation, she, by restraining semination, is not the cause that the husband's semen is wasted, that is, deprived of its end.
5. The wife can excite herself to semination immediately after intercourse rightly had, because in this case the wife's semination, which is the complement of intercourse, is sufficiently united with the act of the husband (St. Alphonsus VI, 919). The same, for the same reason, must be said about the wife's semination immediately before intercourse.

¹ Sacred Penitentiary, June 16, 1880.

² Cf. Capellmann-Bergmann, *Pastoralmedizin*, p. 289 sq.; Antonelli, *Medicina pastoralis*, I, n. 114.

118 **Question.** Whether the wife can also seminate immediately before and immediately after intercourse to be performed or already performed onanistically.

Response I. If there is question of intercourse to be had or already had onanistically, but in the natural manner, the wife lawfully excites herself immediately before the intercourse to be had. For on the one hand, morally speaking, it is of itself the same thing to seminate immediately before as during the penetration itself; on the other hand, it must be attributed to the husband, as we suppose, that the wife's semination will be frustrated of its end. Otherwise one must speak of excitation immediately after intercourse has been performed, because in this case the wife herself frustrates her semination of its end. Nor should you say that the wife, by force of the intercourse had, has received a right to semination; for she cannot receive a right to a semination whose frustration she herself will be the cause of. Now if she seminated after intercourse had been broken off, she herself would frustrate the semination. Yet it will often be preferable to leave the wife in good faith.

Response II. If there is question of intercourse to be had or already had onanistically and in the artificial manner, the wife can in no way seminate, because such intercourse is totally vitiated from the beginning (n. 111).

Corollary. From what has been set forth there follows that, with respect to things lawful and unlawful for spouses, these rules are rightly established by theologians:

1. What is according to the end of marriage is lawful, such as intercourse and accessory acts, whether mutual or solitary, referred to that intercourse now to be had.
2. What is against the primary end of marriage is gravely evil, such as pollution and its grave danger admitted without a sufficient cause, etc.
3. What is apart from the end is either lightly prohibited, such as an unnatural position, or in itself not prohibited in any way, such as mutual acts, and solitary acts, as others add, not referred to intercourse now to be had.

Appendix I. On Internal Sins Against Chastity

(St. Thomas, I-II, q. 74, a. 8; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia Moralis* V, 12-28.)

Internal sins are distinguished as three: morose pleasure, desire, and joy, according as the will is borne toward an act as such, with abstraction made from its present, past, or future execution; toward an act to be committed, or toward an act committed. And so joy regards the past, desire regards the future, while morose pleasure abstracts from both, indeed also from the present, because pleasure concerning a present act coincides with the act itself. We shall speak singly about morose pleasure, then about desire and joy, and indeed about the latter in one treatment, because they are governed by almost the same rules. Pleasure concerning a present work we pass over, because, as we have said, it coincides with the work itself.

I.

I. On Morose Pleasure

119 **I. Notion.** Morose pleasure¹ is the free complacency of the will concerning an evil act objectively considered. It is called:

1. *Complacency*, that is, rest in some object.
2. *Of the will*, that is, of the rational appetite. And so, strictly speaking, there is no question of the complacency of the sensitive appetite, but of the consent of the will in the complacency of the sensitive appetite. For the will is not immediately delighted by a sensible object, but mediately, that is, through the sensitive appetite (cf. St. Thomas, I-II, q. 74, aa. 6 and 8).
3. *Free*, that is, to which the will, after advertence of the intellect to the malice of the act, assents.
4. *Concerning an evil act objectively considered*, without addition. Hence the object of morose pleasure, as we have already intimated, is not an evil act as future or to be committed, nor as past or committed, nor as present or being committed here and now; nor is its object the thought about an evil act; nor even the evil act thought about, although the thought is the condition without which the will cannot be borne toward the evil act, or the operation by which the evil act is presented to the will. The object of morose pleasure is the evil act itself objectively considered. "One thing, therefore," says St. Alphonsus, "is pleasure concerning an evil work, so that the evil work is the object of the pleasure, which is always evil. Another is pleasure concerning the thought of an evil object, so that not the evil work, but the very thought about the work, is of itself the object of the pleasure" (V, 17).

¹ It is called *morose* not from a delay of time, but from the delay or lingering of the will, which can take place in an instant.

120 II. Morality.

1. Morose pleasure concerning an act which is opposed to chastity is evil, and indeed gravely or lightly evil according as it regards an act gravely or lightly unlawful. The reason is that, as is clear from the notion handed down, it involves an affection of the will toward an evil act. But an affection of the will toward an evil act is evil, and indeed gravely or lightly evil according as it regards an act gravely or lightly unlawful (St. Thomas, I-II, q. 74, a. 8; St. Alphonsus V, 17). "But that," says St. Thomas in the cited place, "someone thinking about fornication is delighted in the very act thought about happens from this, that his affection is inclined toward this act; hence that someone consents in such pleasure is nothing else than that he consents in this, that his affection is inclined toward fornication: for no one is delighted except in that which is conformed to his appetite. But that someone by deliberation chooses that his affection be conformed to those things which according to themselves are mortal sins, is a mortal sin; hence such consent in the pleasure of mortal sin is a mortal sin."
2. Morose pleasure takes species:
 - a. *From the object, considered according to its lowest species*. Some indeed deny this, because a lustful affection seems to be general rather than special, that is, directed to venereal pleasure generally rather than to such an object. But the contrary seems altogether to be admitted, because the lowest species of the object, such as fornicatory or sodomitic intercourse, enters into the object of pleasure, and therefore specifies the affection of the will which is borne toward the object (cf. St. Alphonsus, *Praxis confessarii*, n. 39, 1). Here, however, note that immodest acts, for example the sight and touch of an obscene thing, do not differ in species according to themselves (n. 71).

b. *From the circumstances of the subject.* Hence one bound by a vow of chastity, if he is morosely delighted concerning an act of lust, also commits a sin against religion, and indeed personal sacrilege, at least if he is bound by a public vow; for a vow of chastity also excludes internal sins. Many affirm the same concerning the circumstance of marriage, because matrimonial fidelity also seems to forbid an affection toward sin with another woman.

c. *From the circumstances of the object,* if the pleasure is also concerned with those circumstances, because then the circumstance pertains to the object of pleasure. Otherwise, against others, it seems that this must be denied, because where pleasure concerning the circumstance is absent, that circumstance does not seem to enter into the object of pleasure. Hence if someone is morosely delighted concerning intercourse with a blood-relative or a married woman as such, he contracts the malice of incest or adultery; but not if he is delighted, as commonly happens, concerning intercourse with a blood-relative or a married woman as beautiful. Yet morose pleasure must be said to take species from a circumstance of the object if it induces the proximate danger of desiring the act, for example intercourse with a blood-relative (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). But in order that this malice be contracted, attention must be given to it; this commonly does not happen. Hence for the most part there is no obligation of declaring the aforesaid circumstances in confession or of asking about them.

121 **Corollary I.** It is lawful for spouses to be morosely delighted concerning intercourse or immodest acts with the partner, even if on account of that partner's absence they cannot take place here and now. The reason is that the pleasure regards acts lawful for spouses (St. Alphonsus V, 25). Nevertheless, if the pleasure occurs with graver venereal commotion, danger of pollution will easily be present. If it occurs with light commotion and the danger of pollution is absent, an act of this sort, as regarding the partner, is with sufficient probability by its nature ordered to intercourse, or is to be equated with incomplete mutual acts, and therefore seems lawful (St. Alphonsus V, n. 103).

Corollary II. With St. Alphonsus and others, although many contradict, it seems that one must say that it is unlawful for widowed persons to be morosely delighted concerning intercourse had, or for betrothed persons concerning future intercourse. The reason is that in the case the object of pleasure is not intercourse had or future intercourse *as such* - for as such it is the object of joy or desire - but intercourse had as objectively or in itself considered. But every intercourse objectively considered is intrinsically evil for widowed persons and betrothed persons. Therefore the object of the pleasure of which we are speaking is evil, and consequently the voluntary pleasure itself concerning it is also evil (St. Alphonsus V, 24). Those who judge that the aforesaid pleasure is lawful in itself nevertheless warn that it easily becomes sinful accidentally, on account of the danger both of exciting venereal commotions and of consenting to them.

It is lawful, however, for betrothed persons to rejoice in the fact that intercourse will be lawful, and likewise to desire it, or to have the will of exercising it after marriage has been entered, because the intercourse then to be had is good and therefore the object of such desire is good (St. Alphonsus V, 24).

Corollary III. It is lawful to be morosely delighted concerning an act lawful in itself and prohibited only by positive law, for example concerning the imaginary eating of meat on a day of abstinence, provided the pleasure is not concerning the act *as prohibited*. The reason is that in the case the pleasure concerns the eating of meat objectively considered. But the eating of meat objectively considered is good, and therefore the object of the pleasure is good (St. Alphonsus V, 27).

Corollary IV. It is lawful to be morosely delighted concerning the manner, for example concerning an ingenious metaphor by which obscene things are expressed (St. Alphonsus V, 18).

Corollary V. The knowledge or habitual cognition of lustful acts is not evil of itself, because of itself it does not involve an affection of the will toward those acts; indeed it can be joined with the greatest aversion from acts of that sort. Likewise and for the same reason, thought about a lustful act is not evil of itself; nor consequently is morose pleasure concerning knowledge or thought of a lustful act evil of itself, namely because the very object of pleasure of this sort is not evil (St. Thomas, I-II, q. 74, a. 8; St. Alphonsus V, 17). Nevertheless thoughts and pleasures of this sort can become evil, and very often do become evil, by reason of the danger either of exciting venereal motions or pollution, or of being morosely delighted concerning the evil act which is thought about. Hence St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.: "Thought can be good if there is a just cause for thinking, for example for the sake of study, consultation, etc., with abhorrence of the object; or it can be venially evil if it is done from curiosity, etc.; or it can sometimes even be gravely evil if there is proximate danger of consent." Besides, in this matter the descent is easy from pleasure in the thought to pleasure in the thing thought about, especially if it is a useless and vain thought; hence one who lingers over it for a long time exposes himself to danger.¹

When it is doubted whether the pleasure was concerning the thought itself or concerning the thing thought about: if the thought with pleasure frequently intrudes itself without necessity or usefulness, this is a sign that the pleasure is concerning the thing thought about, because frequency of thought of this sort without necessity or usefulness seems to arise from a depraved inclination of affection toward the things themselves. But if such thought is not importunate, but follows the judgment and moderation of reason, it is a sign that the pleasure is only concerning the thought itself.²

Corollary VI. Thought and morose pleasure concerning an object which, if it were seen or touched, would be apt to excite venereal motions, for example concerning an obscene part of the body which someone represents to himself, are not evil of themselves, because the object itself is not evil. Nevertheless they easily become evil by reason of the danger annexed to such thought and pleasure, for example of exciting venereal motions, etc.; wherefore apply what was said in corollary V about thought of a lustful act and about morose pleasure with respect to such thought.³

¹ Billuart, *De temperantia*, diss. 6, art. 15, § 1.

² Billuart, loc. cit.

³ Cf. Duynstee, *De leer der kuisheid*, p. 136.

II.

II. On Desire and Joy

122 I. Notion and division. Desire is distinguished into simple desire and proposal. Simple desire is the act by which the will is indeed borne toward a work to be executed, but which nevertheless does not reach a proposal of executing that work. Proposal is the act by which the will proposes to execute the work. It is distinguished into absolute and conditioned, according as someone resolves absolutely or conditionally to commit the act.

Joy here is understood as deliberate complacency concerning an act committed. Joy expressed in words is called boasting.

123 II. Morality.

1. Simple desire, proposal, and joy concerning an evil act are evil, and indeed gravely or lightly evil according as the act is gravely or lightly evil. For they involve an affection of the will toward an evil act which they embrace: desire toward the future, joy toward the past. But an affection of this sort is manifestly evil, and indeed gravely or lightly evil according as the act is gravely or lightly evil. Add these words of Sacred Scripture: "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife."¹

¹ Exod. 20:17.

124

2. Simple desire, proposal, and joy take species both from the object considered according to its lowest species, and from the circumstances both of the subject and of the object. The reason is that they tend toward the act as it is or was on the part of the thing, with all its circumstances. It is said:

a. *From the object considered according to its lowest species.* Hence one who proposes to himself to commit, for example, pollution or fornication, contracts the guilt of pollution or of fornication.

b. *From the circumstances of the subject,* as was said about morose pleasure (n. 120).

c. *From the circumstances of the object.* Hence one who takes up the proposal of sinning with a married person, a blood-relative, etc., becomes guilty of adultery or incest.

The aforesaid things hold even if the desire or joy regards an act materially only evil. Hence proposition 14 was deservedly proscribed by Innocent XI: "It is lawful for a son to rejoice over the parricide of his parent, perpetrated by himself in drunkenness, on account of the enormous riches thereafter obtained by inheritance" (St. Alphonsus V, 20). It is lawful, however, to rejoice that an act materially evil happened rather than formally evil.

Note. Boasting about a sin truly committed commonly carries with it joy properly so called concerning the sin. But boasting about a fictitious sin seems to involve rather morose pleasure than joy properly so called; indeed sometimes it involves pleasure only concerning the manner of the depraved work. Hence to this boasting let those things be applied which we said about morose pleasure either concerning the work or concerning the manner alone (St. Alphonsus V, 26).

125

3. A conditioned proposal concerning an act which, with the condition set aside, would be depraved:

a. *Is evil*, if the condition does not remove the malice of the object; this occurs if the condition does not regard the malice of the act, as if someone were to say: I would steal, if there were no hell; I would kill my enemy, if I had a sword; I would fornicate, if I were not a religious, etc. (St. Alphonsus V, 13).

b. *Is not evil*, at least gravely, if the condition removes the malice of the object. "And this can happen not only in things forbidden by positive law, as if you were to say: I would eat meat in Lent unless the Church forbade it, but also in things forbidden by natural law, in a case in which the object could be lawful, namely by saying: If God permitted it, I would want to carry off that thing of Titius; if I were

not a priest, I would marry; and similar things. We said: at least gravely; for ordinarily desires of this sort are not excused from venial sin, since commonly they are dangerous or at least idle" (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

c. What if someone were to say that he would do something which is intrinsically evil, by adding the condition: if it were lawful; for example, if you were to say: "If it were not a sin, I would want to blaspheme, perjure myself, commit adultery, fornicate, avenge myself, and similar things" (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). Now most authors accuse him who speaks thus of sin, because the condition is impossible and therefore cannot remove the malice of the object. Granted; but deservedly it is doubted whether in the case there is true desire, or, to use the words of St. Alphonsus, "it is said with sufficient probability that when the will desires some impossible evil object under the condition *if it were lawful*, it never effectively consents to it; for when you choose that object by saying *if it were lawful*, and you know that it is not and cannot be lawful, you do not truly choose it, but only show your inclination. But it would be otherwise if you were to choose that evil object not to be prohibited, because to will the order and law of nature to be inverted is evil of itself" (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.). So also Cajetan,¹ the Salmanticenses,² and Suarez.³

¹ In I-II, q. 13, a. 5.

² *Tractatus 20, De principiis moralibus*, c. 13, n. 62.

³ *De legibus*, l. 3, c. 13, n. 10.

126 Corollary I. It is lawful to rejoice and to be delighted concerning a good effect, for example concerning a temptation quieted through pollution, or concerning offspring conceived from fornicatory intercourse, etc. The reason is that the object of the pleasure is good. Nevertheless, "pleasures of this sort sometimes are not without danger" (St. Alphonsus V, 20), because the transition is easy to pleasure concerning the depraved act itself, which was the cause of the effect. Likewise, once an evil act is supposed, it is lawful to desire its good effect, for example that someone, if he sins again, be punished and amended. But it is not lawful to desire that someone sin again, even for the end that he be punished and come to his senses.

It is disputed whether it is lawful to rejoice and to be delighted concerning an evil act, for example concerning fornication, insofar as, not because, it was the cause of a good effect. With St. Alphonsus (V, 20), against many, it seems that this must be denied, because that thing, *insofar as it was the cause of a good effect*, or *as the cause of a good effect*, is not really distinguished from the evil act, so that joy concerning such an act *as the cause of the effect* in reality embraces the evil act itself, and therefore from an evil object becomes evil.

Corollary II. It is lawful, for an honorable end, to rejoice concerning merely natural pollution, because it is not a sin, not even a material one (St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. 9, q. 1, a. 4, sol. 1, ad 5; St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.; n. 65). Otherwise one must speak of another pollution, even if it was only a material sin (St. Alphonsus, loc. cit.).

Appendix II. On Instruction in Relation to Chastity

I.

I. Sexual Instruction

127 **I. To what extent is it to be recommended?** Sexual instruction of young men and girls is of itself to be dissuaded, because the said instruction, on account of fallen human nature and its inclination toward sexual and venereal things, easily hastens both the development of sexual life, or venereal commotions, and dangerous thoughts and desires; desires, I say, of seeing and experiencing the things signified. Each of these things is more dangerous the weaker virtue is in youthful age. There is added the ancient practice, which confirms this opinion. Accidentally, so to speak, that is, in some cases, instruction is useful or even necessary, namely if greater evils are feared from instruction being omitted than from instruction being given. Hence instruction should be given:

1. If there is danger that instruction may be given by a perverse person, or at least by one who is less fit for it.
2. If and insofar as there is danger that something may be held to be a sin, or a grave sin, which is not a sin or not a grave sin; likewise if it is to be feared that someone through lack of instruction may contract a depraved habit.¹
3. If an eagerness to know sexual matters has been aroused, and therefore there is danger that it may be satisfied in a less fitting way.
4. Especially and more often instruction is to be urged if a son or daughter is sent to a higher school; if girls educated in an institute are dismissed to seek service; if a girl is being courted, and a fortiori if marriage is approaching.

Objection. Sexual instruction ought to correspond to the development of body and soul, lest the moral equilibrium be disturbed.

Response. If, from sexual instruction being passed over, the moral equilibrium would be so disturbed that greater evils would have to be feared from this than from instruction being given, then certainly instruction would have to be carried out. But I would deny that this of itself occurs if instruction does not correspond to the development of body and soul, on account of the reason brought forward under I. Hence from the circumstances of the person, etc., let it be judged what seems preferable.²

¹ "There are not so few adolescents who, by some chance, for example riding, or from a nocturnal dream, or at the instigation of a companion, have experienced pleasure, began to indulge it, and soon, ignorant, commit material sins in such a way that from ignorance they contract a habit which is already in itself pernicious and tenacious" (Vermeersch, *De castitate*, n. 188).

² "Because the duty rests on us to give guidance and to warn where dangers threaten, we conclude with the declaration that we stand very hostile toward the sickly opinion of those who wish to give sexual instruction to everyone. We must hold to a cautious instruction, given in honorable words, to adults who are in circumstances where they cannot lack that knowledge without danger for their virtue." Thus His Excellency P. Hopmans in *Sancta Maria*, 1928, p. 139.

128 **II. By whom is it to be given?** By the parents, and indeed by the mother if there is question of a daughter; it is also better carried out by her if perhaps there is question of a son to be instructed before puberty. After puberty the matter is better fulfilled by the father with regard to sons. If anything prevents the parents from giving the instruction, let a suitable woman take the place of the mother, and a suitable man the place of the father. Therefore let the priest refer a girl who perhaps must be instructed to her mother, or, if circumstances suggest something else, to another woman; but let him abstain from that business himself, persuaded that conversations of this sort are not to be

undertaken by a priest with a woman;¹ indeed, let him refer her to a book rather than teach her himself. There will be discussion in another scholion about the instruction which is called matrimonial.

¹ Provincial Council of Mechlin, 1920, n. 57.

129 III. How is it to be given?

1. Common instruction in schools is to be rejected. "With all Catholics," says Vermeersch, "and with most prudent writers, a collective or common exposition of the matter in elementary schools (*primaires*) and schools of middle grade is of itself to be disapproved: both because instruction of this sort cannot be adapted to the variety of pupils, who differ in quality or virtue, culture, strength, and necessity; and because in this way pupils are almost invited, which is worst of all, to discuss this among themselves after school; and because a prudent exposition supposes in the teacher an authority and skill which are by no means present in all."¹ Otherwise one must speak of a priest who is placed over some institute of young men or girls who are governed under the guardianship of another, or over something similar, and who teaches them sexual matters at an opportune time.
2. Instruction, according to circumstances, etc., should either be handed on partly or gradually, namely according as the inconvenience to be removed requires it (cf. especially 2 and 3 under I), or should be given more or less completely. It is fitting to append a specimen of complete instruction.

¹ Op. cit., n. 199. The Bishops of Germany speak thus: "Insofar as instruction is required, it should not be offered publicly, not in school, not in youth writings, but one-on-one. But the chief thing is and remains the education of the child to modesty from early on, reasonable care of body and health, habituation to work, to self-conquest and renunciation, strengthening of the will, keeping away the moral dangers unfortunately so numerous in the present time, and above all a religious formation begun in tender childhood and guided circumspectly" (Circular Letter, 1913).

130 Come now, my N., I wish to speak to you about a certain matter, about which I do not doubt that you have already sometimes thought, I mean about the procreation of man. For it is fitting for a young adolescent of your condition to know these things. Nor are these matters evil; but with younger boys, for whom it is not relevant to know these things, discussion is not undertaken about these matters. Whether here and there you have heard something about these matters, I do not know; it is pleasing now to explain the whole matter plainly.

You know, I think, that an infant is brought into the light by the mother; nevertheless I doubt whether you hold the very manner in which this happens. Therefore, see now: in the lower body of the woman there is a member implanted, whose name is "uterus." In this uterus, in certain circumstances, there is a little egg from which, with God favoring, an infant can develop. This development lasts for nine months, during which time the infant is nourished by those things which are drawn from the mother's blood. When those nine months have passed, the infant can live outside the maternal body; therefore it must be brought into the light. This happens in this way: from the uterus, in which the infant is present, a certain passage leads downward. By this passage the infant is brought forth into the light. For when the infant has been in the uterus for nine months, the uterus begins to contract; by these contractions the infant is expelled from the uterus into that passage, and from the passage outside; when this has been done, the infant has been born. This bringing forth of

the infant is called "parturition"; very great pains commonly accompany this parturition; these are "the pains of the woman in childbirth."

I said just now that the little egg which is in the female uterus can develop into an infant. But what is needed for this to happen? See now: God willed that not only the mother but also the father should cooperate so that an infant might come forth into life. By what manner does this happen? By the conjunction of the thing which is called "male semen" with the little egg in the female body. Therefore in the body of the man semen is formed, and this in the member which, presenting the form of a small pouch, hangs from the lower part of the man's body.

Now then, how is the male semen joined with the little egg which is in the woman's body? The man penetrates into the female body the member by which urine is rendered, and which is called the "male member," namely into the passage by which the infant is expelled outward from the uterus; the name of this female member is "the female genital organ." When this has been done, the male semen is naturally ejaculated into the passage which leads to the uterus; then by its own force the semen penetrates into the uterus itself, and there, if it meets the little egg, joins itself with it; when this happens, what is called "conception" has taken place.

God wills that work by which the human race is procreated, but only if it is such as God willed it to be. Since, however, infants must not only be brought into the light but also educated, and this education requires the stable marriage of father and mother, only those who are joined in marriage may perform the work of generation. But if it is done by those who are unmarried, a great sin of lust is committed.

Now behold all that I wished to say to you. If any doubt should later arise spontaneously, you may freely propose it. For the rest, quietly remove from your mind the things explained. For it is now enough for you to know these things, and it is not useful to linger longer in thinking about them. We can use our time in a better way. Indeed, these thoughts can become more dangerous, for we always strive after what is forbidden. Therefore, if we turn these matters over vainly in the mind, it can happen that we both desire and do these evil things. Finally, take care not to chat about these matters with friends.¹

¹ *Mannenadel en Vrouweneer*, 1927, p. 36.

II.

II. Matrimonial Instruction

131 I. Necessity and matter of the instruction. "Let the pastor not omit," says canon 1033, "to teach the betrothed according to the diverse condition of the persons."

1. "The sanctity of the sacrament of matrimony," that is, the nature and dignity of matrimony and the manner of preparing themselves worthily for the reception of the sacrament; wherefore "let him strongly exhort them that before the celebration of matrimony they diligently confess their sins and piously receive the Most Holy Eucharist."
2. "The mutual obligations of spouses," especially the lawful use of marriage.
3. "The obligations of parents toward offspring," first of all the manner of conferring Baptism in a case of necessity. Likewise:

4. "At least the first elements of Christian doctrine, if the bridegroom or bride is found ignorant; but if they refuse this instruction, there is no place for rejecting them from marriage according to the norm of canon 1066," that is, let him assist only if a grave cause urges, concerning which, if it can be done, let him consult the Ordinary.¹

II. The instructor and the time of instructing. The instruction should be given by the pastor (cited canon), for example on the occasion of the examination of the betrothed; but advisedly before proceeding to the publications. But the more complete instruction, so far as it concerns the use of marriage and the manner of baptizing in a case of necessity, will more advisedly be done a little before or immediately after the marriage has been contracted.

III. The manner of instructing. We shall hand down in different languages a specimen for teaching those about to marry, insofar as there is question of the use of marriage and of Baptism to be conferred.

¹ Pontifical Commission, June 2-3, 1918, IV, 3.

In Latin

132 The Church desires, or rather commands, that certain things be set forth by her minister for those entering matrimony; this I shall now do. Now:

I. The principal ends of matrimony are: 1. the procreation of offspring; 2. mutual help to be furnished by spouses to each other.

II. With regard to the primary end of matrimony, many things are lawful for spouses, but certain things are unlawful.

1. *What things are lawful for you?* 1. The use of marriage, as it is called, which is completed by the union of bodies. In this, however, it must be observed that the woman lie underneath and on her back. Without cause let it not be done in another way. 2. All those things are lawful which are necessary or useful for the use of marriage, such as mutual touches of spouses.

2. *What things are unlawful for you?* 1. Under grave sin there is prohibited such a use of marriage that procreation cannot take place. Hence if someone advises you to restrict the number of offspring, you must reject that advice. Besides, trust in divine Providence, which, having given you offspring, will help you in educating them. 2. It is furthermore unlawful for you to excite vehement commotions in each other, unless you can and will proceed to the use of marriage.

III. The use of marriage is not only lawful but also obligatory if it is seriously asked by either party. Hence do not deny the requested use unless a grave reason, for example illness, is present.

IV. If the Lord has blessed your marriage, let the wife prudently avoid things which can harm the offspring conceived, of which sort are: very grave labor, the carrying of heavy burdens, violent motions either of body or of soul, such as more intense use of a bicycle, vehement anger or sorrow. Let the man also take account of this condition of his wife, then especially taking care that she not be affected by bitter sorrow. Finally, at that time let each of you pray to God that the infant be born alive and be given Baptism.

V. Finally, certain things must be observed concerning the Baptism of an infant:

1. *Whether an infant must always be baptized?* It must always be baptized, even in a case of abortion, that is, when the fetus or infant comes forth from the uterus before the time; even if it does not yet have a human appearance; even if no sign of life appears in it; even if the fetus is still enclosed in membranes.

2. *Who ought to baptize the infant?*

a. In ordinary circumstances, when the infant has been born healthy, it must be baptized in church and by a priest.

b. If the infant is in danger of life, it must be baptized by one of those standing by. Father and mother, with regard to the Baptism of their own infant, come in the last place. But if no one else is present, or the one who is present does not know the manner well, or cannot do it decently, then the father or mother ought to baptize their offspring in a case of necessity. In abortion this very often will have to be done by the parents themselves.

3. *How ought you to baptize the infant?*

a. *If you can baptize the infant on the head*, baptize in the ordinary manner. That is, cleanse the head in such a way that you can certainly touch it with water. Then take ordinary water - lukewarm, if you have it at hand; blessed water is not necessary - therefore take ordinary water and wash the head with it, pronouncing the words: *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*

If the first time you cannot baptize on the head, but you can on another member, then you must baptize on that member, however small it is, for example on a finger of the hand or a toe of the foot, but always on the principal member among those on which you then can.

But if you have the occasion of baptizing again on a more primary member, for example on the hand or foot, then you must baptize again on that member, and do this as often as you can on a worthier member 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 of the hand or foot, you can immediately baptize on the head, then omit the other members which I named between these two extremes, and baptize at once on the head.

In cases in which you cannot at once baptize on the head, at each 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.* If finally you baptize after the head has come forth, say: *If you are not baptized, I baptize you,* etc.¹

b. *How is it fitting to baptize if the fetus does not yet have a human appearance, or when the embryo is still enclosed in membranes?*

I wish you to attend carefully, for in these circumstances very often the father or mother must baptize, and the eternal salvation of the offspring can then depend on their manner of acting. For an infant not baptized cannot enter heaven; wherefore in this matter every solicitude is needed, so that the little infant may be baptized and, as well as possible, baptized rightly.

Therefore if anything abortive has come forth after the use of marriage, even if it is in the first days and you do not know what it is, you ought not rashly and at once to cast it out; but it must be

investigated whether perhaps a fetus, a little infant, is present in it. The fetus is enclosed in a certain little bladder filled with liquid, which liquid is of a whitish color.

After you have found this little bladder, place it on a table or in a basin or dish, and put a basin of water near it. Then first you must pour some water over the little bladder,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 little bladder somewhat obliquely in the basin of water, open it with the thumb and index finger of each hand, so that the liquid flows out of it. Then again, I say, moving the fetus a little 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 take the fetus out of the water again.³

¹ Thus the matter is proposed practically. Theoretically, more perfectly thus: In cases in which you cannot baptize at once 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. If finally, when the head has come forth, you baptize: *If you are not baptized, I*, etc. (cf. Roman Ritual, tit. II, ch. 1, n. 16; can. 746, §§ 2 and 3).

² Thus practically; theoretically more perfectly thus: Then first you must either pour some water over the little bladder or immerse the little bladder itself in the water of the basin, meanwhile, etc.

³ Cf. Rath, *Institutiones de Sacramentis in genere necnon de Baptismo et Confirmatione*, n. 419.

In Dutch

133 The Holy Church desires, or even commands, that the priest set forth certain matters for those who are going to enter marriage. I shall now proceed to this.

I. The principal ends of marriage are: 1. the procreation of children; 2. the mutual help of the spouses.

II. With regard to the first end, several things are permitted to married persons, while others are forbidden.

1. *What is permitted to you?* 1. The use of marriage, as it is called, which consists in the union of bodies. Here you must take into account that the woman ought to lie underneath and on her back. Without reason let it not happen in another way. 2. Further, everything is permitted which is necessary or useful for preparation for the use of marriage, such as mutual touches, etc.

2. *What is forbidden to you?* 1. Every such use of marriage that the procreation of a child cannot take place. Therefore, if someone should advise you to limit the number of children in an unnatural way, then you must reject that advice. Trust in divine Providence. If He grants you children, He will not let you lack the necessary help in educating them. 2. Further, it is forbidden to arouse each other to vehement feelings unless you can and will proceed to the use of marriage.

III. The use of marriage is not only permitted, but also obligatory, if it is seriously asked by one of the two. Then you may not refuse it, unless a weighty reason, for example sickness, excuses you.

IV. If the good God has blessed your marriage, let the wife carefully avoid everything that could harm the child, such as: very heavy work, carrying heavy burdens, violent outward or inward movements, strenuous bicycling, vehement anger or vehement sorrow. The man too must take account of that condition of the wife, and then especially must not cause her great sorrow. Finally, both must

fervently pray to the good God that their child may be born alive and receive the benefit of holy Baptism.

V. Now I must note some things with regard to holy Baptism.

1. *Must the child always be baptized?*

Always; even in miscarriage, that is, when the fruit, the child, comes forth before the time; even if the child does not yet have human form; even if it gives no sign of life; even if the fruit is still enclosed by membranes.

2. *Who must baptize the child?*

a. In ordinary circumstances, when a child comes healthy into the world, it must be baptized in the church and by the priest.

b. If the child is in danger of dying, it must be baptized by one of those present. Father and mother come in the last place for the baptizing of their own child. But if no one is present, or the one present does not know it well, or cannot do it decently, then father or mother must baptize their own child in time of need. In miscarriage this will usually have to be done by the parents themselves.

3. *How must you baptize the child?*

a. *If you can baptize the child on the head*, then you baptize it in the ordinary way. Namely, you clean the head in such a way that you can certainly touch the head with the water. Then you take ordinary water - lukewarm water if you have it at hand; blessed water is not necessary - then you take ordinary water and wash the head with it while pronouncing the words: *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*.

If the first time you cannot baptize on the head, but can on another member, then you must baptize on that member, however small it may be, for example a finger or toe, but always on the foremost member on which you can baptize. If, however, you get a chance to baptize again on a more principal member, for example hand or foot, then you must baptize again on that member, and indeed as often as you will be able to do it again on a more principal member, for example on breast, back, or shoulders, up to the head; for only then, when you have baptized well on the cleansed little head, is one of the baptisms certainly good. If, however, after having baptized on finger or toe, you can at once baptize on the head, then skip all the intermediate members.

As often as you cannot baptize on the head the first time, you must always use these words during the washing: *If you can be baptized, then I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*. And if finally you baptize the head after it has come outside the body, you say: *If you are not baptized, then I baptize you*, etc.¹

b. *How must one baptize if the child does not yet have human form, or if the fruit is still enclosed by membranes?*

Pay close attention, for in these circumstances father or mother usually must baptize, and the salvation of a soul can be involved in it. For a child that is not baptized cannot come into heaven, and therefore every care is necessary here, that it be baptized and baptized as well as possible.

If therefore something comes forth after the use of marriage, even if it is in the first days, something of which you do not know what it is, then you must not just clean it up at once; rather, you must

investigate whether perhaps the fruit, the child, is present. The fruit is enclosed in a little bladder filled with fluid; this is whitish in color.

When you have found this little bladder, you place it on the table or on a plate and put a bowl of water near it. Then first you must pour water over the little bladder,² while you say: *If you can be baptized, then I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* Then you hold the little bladder somewhat slanting in the bowl with water, open it with the thumb and index finger of both hands, and let the fetal water run out. Then you say again, while you move the fruit in the water a little back and forth: *If you can be baptized, then I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* Afterward you must take the fruit out of the water again.³

¹ Cf. p. 118, note.

² Cf. p. 119, note 1.

³ Cf. Rath, *Institutiones de Sacramentis in genere necnon de Baptismo et Confirmatione*, n. 419.

In Italian

134 It is the desire, indeed the command, of the Church that the priest set forth certain necessary doctrines to those who intend to contract marriage; these are:

I. The principal ends of marriage are: 1. the generation of children; 2. the mutual help of the spouses.

II. With regard to the first end it must be noted that some acts are permitted to spouses, while others are prohibited.

1. It is permitted: a) The conjugal act, which consists in the union of bodies. Let it be noted that for the conjugal act the woman must lie supine, and the man must place himself over her; and without a reason this position ought not be changed. b) Everything is lawful that is necessary or useful for the completion of the conjugal act, for example mutual touches, etc.

2. It is prohibited: 1. Under grave sin, everything that can prevent generation. Therefore you must not listen to anyone who advises you to limit the number of offspring. Have confidence in divine Providence, which, by giving you children, will also give you the means to rear them. 2. It is prohibited to excite grave sensual commotions in yourselves mutually, except in the case in which you can and wish to complete the conjugal act.

III. The conjugal act is not only lawful, but becomes obligatory when one of the spouses seriously asks it. In this case it is not lawful to refuse without a grave reason, for example in case of sickness.

IV. If the Lord deigns to bless your marriage, the woman must avoid everything that can harm the fetus which she bears in her womb, such as great labors, lifting heavy weights, grave internal and external emotions, for example of anger or sadness, the immoderate use of the bicycle, etc. Let the husband take account of the condition of his wife, and during this time let them pray to God for the happy birth of the child, so that it may be able to receive Baptism.

V. Finally, I must make some observations concerning Baptism.

1. Must the fruit of the woman's delivery always be baptized?

Yes; and this is so both in the case of miscarriage, that is, premature birth, and also when a child born regularly gives no sign of life, and even when it is still enclosed in the membranes.

2. Who must baptize the child?

a) In the normal case, when the child is healthy, it must be baptized in church.

b) If there is danger of death, it must be baptized by one of those present. The father and mother can do it only when there is no other person who knows how, or who can do it decently, and there is urgent necessity of baptizing the child. In case of miscarriage Baptism will generally have to be administered by the father or by the mother.

3. How must Baptism be administered?

a) If the child can be baptized on the head, let him be baptized in the ordinary manner; that is, you will first clean his head in such a way that the water can wet it. Then take ordinary water, lukewarm if you have it ready; blessed water is not necessary. With it wet the head of the child, saying: *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*

But if you cannot baptize the child on the head, baptize him on any other member, however small it may be, even on a finger of the hand or foot. If afterward some other more important member should come to light, such as the hand or foot, baptize him again on this member, until you succeed in baptizing him on a notable part of the body, such as the breast, the back, the shoulders, and finally the head; for only then can one be certain of the validity of Baptism, when it has been administered on the head. On the contrary, if after having baptized him on a finger you can baptize him on the head, omit the Baptism on the intermediate members. Every time you cannot baptize on the head, in the ablution of the member you will use this formula: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* If finally you succeed in baptizing on the head, you will say: *If you are not baptized, I, etc.*¹

b) How must Baptism be administered when the fetus does not have human form, or is still enclosed in the afterbirth membranes?

In these cases it belongs to the father or mother to administer Baptism. Great attention is needed, since the salvation of a soul is at issue, because an unbaptized child cannot enter heaven. Therefore, if after the conjugal act, even if only a few days have passed, the woman should expel a substance of uncertain nature, you must not simply throw it away, because the fetus could be there. The fetus is enclosed in a little bladder full of a whitish fluid. If you find this little bladder, place it on a cloth. Then pour a quantity of water over the little bladder,² saying: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you, etc.* Then, keeping it always immersed in the water somewhat obliquely, break it with the thumb and index finger of the hands, making the fluid come out; and then, while moving the little bladder a little in the water, say: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you, etc.* Then remove the membrane from the water.

¹ Cf. p. 118, note.

² Cf. p. 119, note 1.

In French

135 The Church desires, and even commands, that the priest set forth to persons who are going to contract marriage certain truths which it is indispensable for them to know.

These truths are as follows.

I. The principal ends of marriage are: 1. the procreation of children; 2. the support, or assistance, which spouses owe each other mutually.

II. With regard to the first end of marriage, it must be observed that certain acts are permitted to married persons, and that others are forbidden to them.

1. *What is permitted in marriage?*

a) First, the conjugal act, which consists in the union of bodies. Here it must be pointed out that the woman ought to be lying under the man, on her back. Except for a reason, one ought not depart from this manner of acting.

b) Everything that is necessary or useful for properly accomplishing the conjugal act, for example the mutual touches of spouses.

2. *What is forbidden in marriage?*

a) Under pain of grave sin, everything that can prevent the procreation of children is forbidden. Therefore, if someone should encourage you to restrict the number of children by fraudulent practices, the man or woman who gave you this counsel would commit a grave sin, and you would commit a grave sin by following it. For the rest, have confidence in divine Providence, which, in giving you children, will help you to rear them.

b) Moreover, it is forbidden for you to excite each other mutually to grave sexual emotions, unless you are able and willing to proceed to the conjugal act.

III. The conjugal act is not only lawful, but obligatory, when your spouse asks it of you seriously and legitimately. Therefore it is not permitted to refuse it, unless there is a grave reason, for example in case of sickness.

IV. When God deigns to bless your marriage, the woman must carefully avoid everything that could harm the child whom she carries, such as giving herself to labors that are too fatiguing, lifting heavy burdens, causing physical jolts, for example by the immoderate use of the bicycle and, in certain cases, of the automobile; or abandoning herself to violent moral emotions, for example great anger or great sadness. The husband, for his part, is bound to take the condition of his wife into serious consideration. Both of them must pray to God for the life of the child, and especially that he may be able to receive Baptism.

V. Some very important observations on the subject of Baptism.

1. *Must every fetus to which the woman gives birth be baptized?*

Yes, even in the case of a miscarriage, that is, when the child arrives before term; even when he gives no sign of life; even when he is still enveloped in the membranes.

2. *Who must baptize the child?*

a) In normal cases, when a child is brought into the world in good health, he must be baptized in church by the priest.

b) If the child is in danger of death, he must be baptized by one of the persons present. The father or mother will do it themselves only in default of another person who knows how to do it suitably. This will generally be the case when there is a miscarriage.

3. *How must the child be baptized?*

a) If the child can be baptized on the head, you will baptize him in the ordinary way; that is, you will clean the head so that the baptismal water can certainly touch it. Then you will take ordinary water - lukewarm water, if you have some at hand; there is no need to take blessed water. With this ordinary water you will wash the head of the child, pronouncing at the same time these words: *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*

If you cannot at once reach the child's head, baptize him on a part of the body, however small it may be, for example a finger of the hand or of the foot, always choosing, among the parts of the body that you can touch, the principal one.

If, afterward, it is possible for you to reach a more important part of the body, such as a hand or a foot, begin again on it, and this as often as it happens that you reach a more important part of the body: the breast, the back, the shoulders, and finally the head; for it is only when you have baptized on the well-cleaned head that you will be altogether sure that you have administered a valid Baptism.

Of course, if, after having baptized on a finger of the hand or of the foot, you can immediately reach the head, you will pass over the intermediate parts.

At each ablution that you perform elsewhere than on the head, at the same time that you perform the ablution you will say 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.* If finally you baptize on the head, you will say: *If you are not baptized, I, etc.*¹

b) How must one baptize when the child does not yet have a human form, or when he is still surrounded by his membranes?

Pay close attention here; for in those circumstances it is ordinarily upon the father or mother that the duty of baptizing falls. Now, the salvation of a soul can depend on it. For an unbaptized child cannot enter heaven; therefore in this case one must take great care that the child be baptized, and baptized as well as possible.

Therefore, if after conjugal union, even on one of the first days following, the woman gives birth to a substance of which you do not know what it is, carefully guard against simply disposing of it. Examine whether perhaps the child is there: he is enclosed in a little bladder filled with a whitish fluid.

When you have found this little bladder, place it on a table or on a plate, and put beside it a basin of water. Then pour a good quantity of water over the little bladder,² 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 hold the little bladder in the basin of water, a little obliquely; open it with the thumb and index finger of both hands, and make the fluid contained in the little bladder come out. Then you will say again, while moving the fetus a little 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.* After that, you will remove the fetus from the water.

¹ Cf. p. 118, note.

² Cf. p. 119, note 1.

In German

136 Holy Church desires, indeed commands her priests, to give some explanations to those betrothed before their entrance into marriage. I now wish to do this.

I. The chief purposes of marriage are the following: 1. the generation of children; 2. the mutual assistance of the spouses.

II. With regard to the first purpose, some things are permitted to married persons, but some things are also forbidden.

1. *What is permitted to you?* Permitted to you is: 1. the use of marriage, that is, the mutual union of bodies. In this union you should take care that the woman lies under the man on her back. One ought not depart from this manner without reason. Permitted to you is, 2. everything that appears necessary or serviceable for the use of marriage, such as, for example, the mutual touches of the spouses.

2. *What is not permitted to you?* 1. Under grave sin it is forbidden to you to use marriage in such a way that conception cannot take place. Therefore, if someone gives you the counsel to restrict the number of children, reject this counsel. Trust in divine Providence. If it grants you children, it will not fail to provide the necessary help for the education of the children. 2. It is unlawful to excite each other mutually to vehement carnal excitements, unless you are in a position and willing to have the marital act follow immediately.

III. The use of marriage is not only permitted, but even a duty, when one of the spouses asks for it in earnest. Therefore you may not refuse this duty, unless an important cause, for example an illness, excuses from it.

IV. When the dear God has blessed your marriage, then the wife must in a reasonable manner avoid everything that can inflict harm on the child in the mother's womb, such as, for example, very heavy labor, carrying heavy burdens, vehement internal and external agitations, such as excessive bicycling, vehement anger or pain. The husband too must take account of the circumstances of his wife, and now above all avoid everything that could cause the wife severe sorrow. Both, however, should beg the dear God very fervently that the child may come living into the world and receive holy Baptism.

V. Finally, some remarks concerning the Baptism of the child:

1. *Must the child be baptized in every case?* Yes, in every case, even in the case of a miscarriage or premature birth, that is, when the fruit is expelled from the mother's body before the time; even when the fruit still shows no human form; even when it gives no sign of life; even when the fruit is still enclosed in the egg membranes.

2. *Who must baptize the child?*

a) Under ordinary circumstances, when the child comes healthy into the world, it must be baptized in the church, and indeed by the priest.

b) If the child is in danger of life, it must be baptized by one of those present. Among those present, father and mother come in the last place. But if no one else is present, or the person who may be present does not know how to baptize, or for reasons of decency may not do it, then father or mother must baptize their own child in case of necessity. In a miscarriage the parents will probably most often have to fulfill this duty.

3. *How must you baptize the child?*

a) If Baptism can be conferred on the child on the head, then baptize it in the ordinary way. That is, first clean the head of all dirt, so that the baptismal water can certainly touch the skin. Then take ordinary water - best lukewarm, if it is at hand; blessed water is not necessary - pour some of this ordinary water over the head of the child and meanwhile speak the words: *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*

If Baptism cannot be conferred immediately on the head, but can be conferred on another member, then it must be given on this member, whatever this member may be, for example on the fingers or on the toes, but always on the member that is the more excellent among those that can presently be reached.

But if afterward a more excellent member presents itself for Baptism, for example the hand or breast, then Baptism must be repeated on this member; and this repetition must happen again and again as often as a more important member is reached, for example on the breast, on the back, or on the shoulders, until finally Baptism can be given on the head. For only then, when one has rightly conferred Baptism on the cleaned head, is it certain that one of the Baptisms is valid.

If, after the first Baptism on the fingers or the toes, one can immediately confer Baptism on the head, then all members lying between these two must be passed over, and Baptism must be given immediately on the head.

As often as you cannot confer Baptism immediately on the head, but first on another member, then when you pour the baptismal water over the member in question, speak the words: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* When you can finally baptize on the head, then say: *If you are not baptized, I baptize you in the name, etc.*¹

b) How must Baptism be conferred when the fruit still shows no human form or is still enclosed in the egg membranes?

Pay good attention here. For under these circumstances the father or the mother generally must perform the Baptism, so that the eternal salvation of the child can then depend on your manner of acting. An unbaptized child cannot enter heaven, and therefore every care is needed that the child be baptized, and indeed baptized as well as possible.

Therefore, if after marital union, even after the first days, something passes from the woman, of which you do not know what it means, you must not simply leave it unnoticed and remove it. Rather, you must investigate whether perhaps the fruit is hidden beneath it; for the fruit is enclosed in a little bladder, which is filled with a whitish fluid.

If you have found this bladder, place it on the table or on a plate, and set beside it a vessel with water. Then first pour water over the bladder,² and while doing so speak the words: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father*, etc. After that, hold the bladder somewhat slanting in the vessel of water, open it with the thumb and index finger of both hands so that the amniotic fluid can flow out of it, move the fruit a little back and forth in the water, and while doing so speak again: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*. After that, lift the fruit out of the water again.

¹ Cf. p. 118, note.

² Cf. p. 119, note 1.

In English

137 The Church desires and even prescribes that the priest explain to those contemplating marriage certain truths, which are necessary for them to know. These truths are:

I. The principal ends of matrimony: 1. the procreation and education of children; 2. the mutual aid which husband and wife should give to each other.

II. With regard to the procreation of children it must be noted that some acts are lawful, while others are unlawful.

1. Lawful are all those acts which are necessary or useful, such as mutual touches, to the generation of offspring. Here it is well to remark that the marital act, which is the union of the bodies of husband and wife, is to be performed with the wife lying in a reclining position and the husband superimposed. And this position should not be deviated from except for a legitimate reason.

2. Unlawful are all those acts which frustrate the laws of nature in the generation of offspring. Therefore, the direct exclusion of offspring or the limiting of its number by positive means, by positively preventing the course of nature or in any way impeding the generation of children, is forbidden. Moreover, it is prohibited to mutually excite each other to violent motions of the flesh, unless husband and wife can and wish to complete the marital act.

III. The marital act is not only entirely lawful, but must be rendered whenever one of the parties reasonably and seriously asks it. It is sinful therefore to refuse the marriage debt, except for a grave reason, to the partner who so asks it, as in case of serious sickness.

IV. If God bless the union with offspring, the mother should carefully avoid everything that could in any way harm the fetus during the time of pregnancy, such as fatiguing labor, the lifting of heavy objects, grave internal or external emotions, violent anger or great sadness, immoderate use of the bicycle. The husband also should take into account the condition of his wife. During the time of pregnancy husband and wife should pray fervently to God that the child may be brought into the world safely and receive the grace of Baptism.

V. Some observations are in order here in regard to the Baptism of the child.

1. It is necessary to baptize every living body that results from parturition. This holds good also when the fetus is prematurely expelled from the womb, even though a short time after conception.

2. When the child is born normally and is in good health, it should be taken to the church and there baptized by the priest.

When the new-born child is in danger of death, it should be baptized by one of those present. In this case the father or mother must not presume to administer Baptism, unless there be no one else present who knows how to baptize and can do so becomingly. In case of miscarriage generally the parents ought to baptize their child.

3. Manner of administering Baptism:

a) *If the child can be baptized on the head*, then the Sacrament is administered in the ordinary way, that is, you cleanse the head, so that the water may really touch it. Then you take ordinary water, Holy Water is not necessary for this purpose, pour it on the head of the child, at the same time pronouncing the words of Baptism: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*.

If you cannot baptize the child on the head, then you must baptize it on another member of the body, however insignificant that member may be, even though it be only a digit of the hand or foot, choosing always the principal member that can be reached with the water.

If afterwards a more important member protrudes, for instance the hand or foot, then you will rebaptize the child, and you will repeat this as many times as a more important member becomes accessible, until you have been able to baptize the child on the head. Only when you have administered Baptism on the head of the child, can you be certain of having baptized validly.

Whenever you cannot baptize the child on the head, you should in the act of ablution use the following words: *If you are capable of Baptism, I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*. If you finally succeed in baptizing on the head, say: *If you are not baptized, I baptize thee*, etc.¹

b) If the fetus be devoid of human form or is still enveloped in its membranes, it is generally incumbent on the mother or father to administer the Baptism. This is a point of great importance, because the salvation of a soul may depend on it, since an unbaptized child cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Therefore if the wife after intercourse with her husband is delivered of a substance of uncertain nature, she should not cast it away, since it may be a fetus. In this case place it on a table or on a plate and pour tepid water over it,² saying at the same time: *If you are capable of Baptism, I baptize thee*, etc. Thereupon submerge the substance in a vessel of tepid water, rend the covering membrane with the fingers, and then moving the mass to and fro in the water, say at the same time the words: *If you are capable of Baptism, I baptize thee*, etc. After that withdraw the mass from the water.

¹ Cf. p. 118, note.

² Cf. p. 119, note 1.

In Spanish

138 The Church desires, and even commands, priests to give certain necessary instructions to those who intend to be united in marriage. Here they are:

I. The principal ends of marriage are: a) to beget children for heaven; b) that married persons mutually give help to each other.

II. With regard to the first end it must be noted that some acts are permitted to married persons and others prohibited.

1. *It is permitted:* a) The conjugal act, that is, the union of bodies. It is noted that to perform this act the woman must place herself face upward and the man over her; and without reason this posture ought not be changed. b) Whatever is necessary for the completion of the conjugal act is lawful, for example mutual touches, etc.
2. *It is prohibited:* a) Under mortal sin, everything that can impede generation. Therefore one must not give ear to those who advise limiting the number of offspring. Trust in divine Providence, which, if it gives you children, will also give you means to support them. b) It is forbidden to you to excite grave sexual commotions in each other mutually, if you do not intend and are not able to perform the conjugal act.

III. The conjugal act is not only lawful for you, but even obligatory, when the spouse asks it seriously. In this case it is not lawful to refuse without a grave reason, for example in case of sickness.

IV. If the Lord blesses your marriage, the woman must avoid whatever could harm the fetus which she carries in her womb, such as great efforts, lifting great weights, violent emotions, for example of anger or sadness, the immoderate use of the bicycle, etc. During this time let the husband take account of the condition in which the woman is, and let both pray to the Lord for the creature that is to be born, so that it may be able to receive Baptism.

V. Finally I must make some observations to you concerning Baptism:

1. *Must the fruit of the woman's delivery always be baptized?*

Certainly, both in the case of miscarriage, that is, premature birth, and also when the child is born in ordinary conditions, even if he gives no sign of life or is still wrapped in the membranes.

2. *Who must baptize the child?* - a) In the normal case, that is, when the child is healthy, he must be baptized in the church. b) But in danger of death, he must be baptized by one of those present. The father and mother can do it only when there is no other person who knows how to do it or can do it decently, or in case of extreme urgency. In case of miscarriage, as a general rule, Baptism will have to be administered by the father or the mother.
3. *How must Baptism be administered?* If the child can be baptized on the head, let it be done on it in the ordinary form; that is, you will clean his head so that the water can touch it directly. Then take ordinary water, preferably a little warm if you have it at hand; blessed water is not necessary. With it bathe the child's head, saying at the same time: *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* - If it cannot be done on the head, baptize him on any other member, however small it may be, even if it were no more than a finger of the hand or of the foot; and afterward, when another more important member appears, such as the hand or the foot, rebaptize him on it, until you can do it on an important part of the body, such as the breast, the back, the shoulders, and finally the head; for only then is there certainty of the validity of Baptism, when it has been administered on the head. On the contrary, if after having baptized him on a finger you can do it on the head, cease doing it on the other members. Whenever for the first time you have not been able to baptize on the head, in the ablution of any other member you will use this

formula: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* If finally you can baptize him on the head, say: *If you are not baptized, I baptize you,* etc.¹

4. *How must Baptism be administered when the fetus does not yet have human form, or is still wrapped in the afterbirth membranes?*

In this case it belongs to the father or the mother to administer Baptism, and in this he or she must put the greatest attention, since it is a matter of the salvation of a soul, because an unbaptized child cannot enter heaven. Therefore, if after the conjugal act, even if no more than a few days had passed, the woman should expel a substance of uncertain nature, it must not simply be thrown away, because it could well be that in it there was a fetus. The fetus is enclosed in a membrane full of a whitish liquid. If therefore you find this membrane, place it on a cloth, and afterward pour a little water over it,² saying: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you,* etc. Then, always keeping the membrane submerged, break it a little obliquely, making the liquid come out; and then, while stirring the membrane a little in the water, you will say: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you,* etc. Afterward wash the membrane in the water.

¹ Cf. p. 118, note.

² Cf. p. 119, note 1.

In Portuguese

139 The Church desires, or rather commands, that its minister teach some necessary rules to persons who wish to contract marriage. Here they are:

I. The principal ends of marriage are: 1. the generation of children; 2. mutual assistance between husband and wife.

II. With the primary end of marriage in view, it must be noted that there are actions that are lawful for married persons, while others are unlawful.

1. *What are the lawful actions for married persons?* 1. The so-called use of marriage is lawful, which consists in the union of bodies. Let it be noted that for this act the woman must remain beneath the husband, lying on her back; without there being a motive, such a position cannot be changed. 2. Everything that is necessary or useful for the use of marriage is lawful, as for example touching each other mutually.

2. *What are the unlawful actions for married persons?* 1. Under grave sin everything that can impede generation is forbidden to them. Therefore, if someone gives them the counsel to limit the number of children, they cannot give ear to such counsel. Let them have confidence in divine Providence, which, by giving them children, also gives them the means to educate them. 2. It is forbidden to them to excite grave sensual commotions among themselves, outside the case in which they wish and are able to perform the conjugal act.

III. The conjugal act is not only permitted, but even obligatory, if one of the spouses asks it seriously. Therefore, unless there is a grave motive, as for example in case of sickness, this request cannot be rejected.

IV. When the Lord deigns to bless their marriage, let the wife prudently avoid everything that can cause harm to the conceived fetus, such as heavy works, carrying things that are too heavy, strong movements of body or spirit, for example much riding of a bicycle, becoming excessively angry or saddened, etc. Let the husband also take into consideration the state of the woman, especially taking care that she not be excessively afflicted. Finally, during the time of pregnancy let both ask God that the child be born alive and be able to be baptized.

V. Finally, as to the Baptism of the child, let the following be observed:

1. *Must the child always be baptized?* Always; even in the case of miscarriage, that is, when the fetus or child is expelled from the womb before the time; even if it does not yet have human form, nor gives a sign of life; even if the fetus is wrapped in the membranes, even then it must be baptized.

2. *Who must baptize the child?*

a) Ordinarily, when healthy, the child must be baptized in the church by a priest.

b) If it is in danger of life, any person present can baptize it. The father and mother of the child will not be able to baptize it except in the last case. This happens when there is no other person present, or when none of those present knows well the manner of baptizing, or when, except for the father or mother, there is no one who can do it decently. In case of necessity, the father or mother must baptize their own child. In case of miscarriage, Baptism will have to be administered most often by the parents themselves.

3. *How must such a child be baptized?*

a) If the child can be baptized on the head, let the ordinary manner be observed; that is, let the head be cleaned in such a way that there is certainty that the water touches it. Then let common water be taken - warm, if possible; it is not necessary that it be blessed - let the water be poured over the head of the child, saying at the same time: *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* (N.B. The same person who pours the water must pronounce the words.)

But if it is not possible to baptize the child immediately on the head, it must be baptized on any other member, however small it may be, even on a finger of the hand or of the foot; but the more important member must always be chosen.

If, however, another more important member comes to light, such as the hand or the foot, the child must be rebaptized on the hand or on the foot. Baptism must be repeated as many times as a more important member appears (as for example the breast, or the back, or the shoulders), until the child can be baptized on the head; for only then, when Baptism has been administered on the clean head, will there be certainty of its validity.

But if the child can be baptized on the head immediately after having been baptized on a finger of the hand or of the foot, the other members must be omitted and it must be baptized immediately on the head. Whenever it is impossible to administer Baptism immediately on the head, the following formula must be used during the ablution of each of the other members: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* If finally one can baptize on the head after it has been brought forth, it is to be said: *If you are not baptized, I baptize you,* etc.¹

b) How must one baptize when the fetus still does not have human form, or the embryo is inside the membrane? Great care must be taken, for in such circumstances it most often belongs to the father or mother to administer Baptism, and the eternal salvation of the child can depend on their manner of acting. For an unbaptized child cannot enter heaven. Therefore let much attention be given, so that it may be baptized, and this in the best possible way. Therefore, if after the conjugal act it happens that the woman expels some abortive substance, without it being known what it is, it must not be thrown away without more ado; rather, it must be examined carefully, for it may well be that the fetus is inside it. The fetus is found inside a vesicle full of a whitish liquid.

When the vesicle has been found, it must be placed in a dish or in a cup on the table, near a basin with water. Then let a little water be poured over the vesicle,² saying at the same time: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you*, etc. Next, let the vesicle be opened with the thumb and index fingers of both hands, keeping it a little inclined inside the water of the basin. When the whitish liquid has drained out, let the fetus be stirred a little inside the water, saying again at the same time: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you*, etc. Finally, let the fetus be taken out of the water.³

¹ Thus, practically. Theoretically, however, the more perfect manner is this: when one cannot baptize immediately on the head, one says the first time, when baptizing any member: *If you can be baptized, I baptize you*, etc. The other times: *If you are not baptized and can be baptized, I baptize you*, etc. But if one can finally baptize on the head, one says: *If you are not baptized, I*, etc. Cf. Roman Ritual, title II, chapter 1, n. 16; canon 746, §§ 2 and 3.

² Cf. p. 119, note 1.

³ Cf. Rath, *Institutiones de Sacramentis in genere necnon de Baptismo et de Confirmatione*, n. 419.

Colophon (Volume III)

Printing-house called "Les Presses Gruuthuuse," Bruges (Belgium).

Alphabetical Index to Volume III

A Act of generation: 4.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

I Immodest act: notion 70; morality 71; diverse acts 72–76.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

V Venereal act: 10.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

A Adultery: notion 35; morality 36; 105.

Aureole of virgins: 22.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

L Looking: 80.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

B Bestiality: notion 55; morality 56; inquiry concerning it in confession 56.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

S Songs: 76.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

C Chastity: notion and morality 14.

Castrated man: insofar as he is capable of the venereal act 13; his intercourse 34; as regards the use of marriage 87.

Clitoris: 3; its amputation 80.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

V Venereal commotion: what is to be said of one who is passive with regard to it 64; see: pleasure.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

C Concubinage: notion, penalties, toleration 34.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

I Intercourse: with a betrothed man or woman 37; unnatural, notion 57; morality 58; 107; inquiry concerning it 58; with a dead woman 59; with a demon 60.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

A Acts of spouses: mutual 101; solitary external 102; internal 103; 121.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

C Copulation: notion 5; onanistic 51; interruption 51; conjugal, lawfulness 81; end 82; place and position in it 83; obligation 96; 97; excusing causes 97–99; impediments, promise made to the other party 84; vow of chastity 85; impotence 86; 87; doubtfully valid marriage 88; harm to be averted 89–95; incomplete 114; deposition of semen outside the vagina 115.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

P Pleasure: venereal, sensible carnal, purely sensible 11; consent to sensible carnal pleasure 64; morose, notion 119; morality 120; concerning an act prohibited by positive law 121; concerning the manner in which the sin was committed, concerning knowledge and thought of a lustful act, concerning a dangerous object 121.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

D Desire: notion 122; morality 123.

Distillation: 10.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

E Eunuch: whether capable of the venereal act 13; his intercourse 34; as regards the use of marriage 87.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

F Fecundation: 6; artificial 106; less probable 117.

Fornication: notion 32; morality 33.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

J Joy: notion 122; morality 123; 124; concerning a good effect, concerning an evil act as cause of a good effect, concerning merely natural pollution 126.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

H Hypersexuality: 77.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

B Boasting: 124.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

I Impediments: those that obstruct the use of marriage 84–95.

Impotence: impediment to the use of marriage 86.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

P Prepubescent person: insofar as capable of the venereal act 12.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

I Immodesty: notion 70; morality 71.

Incest: notion 38; morality 39.

Instruction: sexual, insofar as it is to be recommended 127; by whom it is to be given 128; how it is to be given 129; specimen 130; matrimonial, necessity and matter, instructor and time of instructing 131; manner of instructing in Latin 132; in Dutch 133; in Italian 134; in French 135; in German 136; in English 137; in Spanish 138; in Portuguese 139.

Irritation in the genitals: 68.

Irrumation: 57; 58; 65; 107.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

L Lactation: use of marriage during the time of lactation 92.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

V Vaginal washings: 116.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

L Lust: notion 25; morality 27–29; effects 30; penalties 61; consummated natural lust, notion and species 31; consummated unnatural lust, notion, species, and relative gravity 48; non-consummated lust, notion 62; morality 63; in betrothed persons 64; indirectly voluntary lust, notion 65; obligation of forestalling venereal effects 66; acts gravely, moderately, and lightly influencing 67; disguised lust 68; remedies against lust 80.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

M Marriage: ends 82; doubtfully valid insofar as an impediment to the use of marriage 88.

Male member: 2.

Menses: 3; use of marriage during the time of menses 89.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

P Prostitution: notion, toleration 34.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

I Illness: use of marriage during the time of illness 93.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

C Conjugal onanism: notion 108; morality 109; what the wife of an onanistic husband can or must do 110; remedies 112; manner of treating onanists 113.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

O Organs: male 2; female 3.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

K Kisses: 75.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

O Ovaries: 3.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

P Pregnancy: 7; use of marriage during the time of pregnancy 90.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

B Birth: 8.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

P Painters: as regards immodest things 73.

Pollution: notion 49; morality 50; manner of treating those subject to pollution in confession 51; indirectly voluntary 67; merely natural 65; had in sleep 68; pollution of a married person 104.

Promise: impediment to the use of marriage 84.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

I Itching in the private parts: 68.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

P Pubescent person: insofar as capable of the venereal act 12.

Puberty: 4.

Pudicity: notion 69.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

G Girl: oppressed, to what she is bound 44; permitting herself to be touched 74.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

P Puerperium: 8; use of marriage during the time of puerperium 91.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

R Rape: notion 43; morality 46; penalties 47.

Remedies against lust: 80.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

C Carnal sacrilege: notion 40; morality 42; personal carnal sacrilege 42; local carnal sacrilege 42; real carnal sacrilege 42.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

S Semen: notion 2; expulsion 44; 116.

Semination: before or after copulation 117.

Speeches: 76; those hearing them 76.

Sexual perversion: 79.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

C Contrary sexuality: 78.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

D Diversity of sex: 1.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

S Sodomy improperly so called: see: unnatural intercourse.

Sodomy: notion 52; morality 53; penalties 54; inquiry concerning it in confession 54.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

B Betrothed person: incomplete venereal act in betrothed persons 64.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

S Stuprum: notion 43; morality 44; reservation 44; to what an oppressed girl is bound 44.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

T Touches: gravely evil 74.

Testicles: 2.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

U Uterus: 3.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

V Vagina: 3.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

O One who has undergone vasectomy: intercourse 34; as regards the use of marriage 87.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).

V Virginity: notion 16; morality 17–20; excellence 21; reward 22; loss 23; recovery 24.

Virgin: oppressed, to what she is bound 44.

Vow: impediment to the use of marriage 85; dispensation 85.

Vulva: 3.

The author's index, rendered with links to the paragraphs; † = reference corrected (see the edition note).