

lease therapy of Freudian inspiration, which relies on the inherent goodness of human nature without taking into account the reality of the wounds inflicted by original sin. Furthermore it is based on the assumption that the source of valuing things lies exclusively within the individual man. It is therefore anti-authoritarian in moral matters. However, the present reviewer feels that at least in one respect Catholic priests who are called upon to counsel can learn a valuable lesson from the Rogers technique. That is the lesson of patient *listening*. Too often we have a tendency to be sure that we have the answer and to be satisfied with blurting it out at a moment when the consultant is not emotionally prepared to accept it. Patient, hour-long listening is often absolutely necessary if one is to lead a person to see and accept what it is that God is requiring of him.

It is perhaps a weakness of this work that it is addressed to such a varied audience. One feels that parts of it are meant for the instruction of the Catholic clergy, others for the Catholic psychiatrist, psychologist, physician, counsellor or social worker, others for the non-Catholic professional man, others for the educated Catholic laity. Consequently, in reading it, one needs frequently to shift one's point of view in order to grasp the implications of what is said. Another weakness, which is probably inherent in psychiatry itself as an infant science, is the confusion engendered by the multiplicity of conflicting theories adduced to explain various mental disorders. The very presence of so many divergent theories warns us that psychiatry is a developing science with a long way to go in filling out a body of well-ascertained scientific truths about the nature and the remedies of mental disorders. The treatment of the moral problems which sometimes arise in psychiatric practice is forthright and competent, but the thorny problems involved in psycho-analytical abreaction (problems not sufficiently resolved by Father Snoek's recent article in *Theological Studies*) are left untouched. The final chapter on marriage problems seemed too sketchy to be of much help to the average priest.

Despite these limitations of minor import, the book, *Psychiatry and Catholicism*, seems to the present reviewer to be worthy of high recommendation. No Catholic psychiatrist, psychologist, physician, priest, seminarian, counsellor or social worker can afford to omit this work from his reading list. We are indebted to the authors for combining in one volume competence in scholastic philosophy, the findings of modern psychology and psychiatry, with adequate documentation both from European and American sources, and a common sense straightforwardness in the exposition of Catholic doctrine that is sure to win the confidence of the clerical reader.

JOHN C. FORD, S.J.

# The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVII, No. 5

NOVEMBER, 1952

## CONTENTS

A Sixth Century Sermon on Sin .....	Henry G. J. Beck	321
A New Title for Mary .....	Titus Cranny, S.A.	330
A New Historical Project: Editing the Papers of Archbishop John Carroll .....	Henry J. Browne	341
The Structure of Parochial Societies .....	Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.	351
The Syro-Phoenician Woman .....	Elmer A. McNamara	360
Father Journet's Concept of the Church .....	Joseph Clifford Fenton	370
 ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS		
Baptismal Difficulties .....		381
Betrothal Ceremony .....		382
Bell at Benediction .....		382
Anniversary Requiem .....		382
Seniority to be Observed at Communion Time .....		383
Flag in Sanctuary .....		383
Tabernacle Key .....		383
Reconsecration of Chalice .....		384
Dress for Mixed Marriage .....		384

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, \$5.00; Foreign, \$5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

OFFICE OF SAINT PETER LIBRARY, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

## FATHER JOURNET'S CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH

Ever since the end of the sixteenth century, theological writing on the basic concept of the Catholic Church has revolved around the last four paragraphs of the second chapter in St. Robert Bellarmine's *De ecclesia militante*. Most of the authors who have dealt with this particular section of sacred doctrine have tried to explain and to develop the teachings set forth in these paragraphs. Others, rather numerous during the course of the last half century, have challenged these teachings.

The four paragraphs with which we are concerned contain St. Robert's statement and justification of his definition of the true Church of Jesus Christ.

But we teach that there is only one Church, and not two, and that the one and true Church is the assembly (*coetum*) of men bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and by the communion of the same sacraments, under the rule of legitimate pastors, and especially of the one Vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pontiff. From this definition it is easy to infer which men belong to the Church and which ones do not belong to it. This definition has three parts, the profession of the true faith, the communion of the sacraments, and subjection to the Roman Pontiff, the legitimate pastor. By reason of the first part, all infidels, both those who never have been in the Church, such as Jews, Turks, and pagans, and those who have been in it, but have left, such as heretics and apostates, are excluded. By reason of the second part, catechumens and excommunicated persons are excluded, since the former have not as yet been admitted to the communion of the sacraments, while the latter have been expelled from it. By reason of the third, schismatics, who have the faith and the sacraments, but who are not subject to the legitimate pastor, and who consequently profess the faith and receive the sacraments outside [the Church], are excluded. All others are included, even though they be reprobates, hardened sinners, and impious men.

Now there is this difference between our teaching on this point and all the others [the four heretical notions of the Church previously listed in this chapter]. All the others hold that internal virtues are requisite in order that a man may be constituted in the Church, and therefore they consider the true Church as invisible. On the other hand, although we believe that all the virtues, faith, hope, charity, and the rest, are to be found in the Church, we do not think that any internal virtue

at all, but only the outward profession of faith and the sensibly manifest communion of the sacraments are required in order that a man may be judged absolutely to be a part of the true Church of which the Scriptures speak. For the Church is as visible and palpable an assembly of men as the assembly of the Roman people, or the kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice.

We should note that, according to Augustine, in his *Breviculus collationis*, where he is dealing with the conference of the third day, that the Church is a living body in which there is a soul and a body. The internal gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, charity, and the rest, constitute the soul. The external profession of the faith and the communication of the sacraments are the body. Hence it is that some are of the soul and of the body of the Church, and thus joined to Christ the Head both inwardly and outwardly. Such men are most perfectly of the Church, for they are like living members in a body. Still, even among these, some partake of this life in a greater, and others in a lesser, degree, while some have only the beginning of life and, as it were, sensation without movement, like those who have faith alone, without charity. Again, there are some who are of the soul and not of the body [of the Church], like catechumens or excommunicated persons, if they have faith and charity, as they may very well have. Finally, there are some who are of the body but not of the soul, as those who have no inward virtue, but who still profess the faith and receive the sacraments under the rule of the pastors by reason of some temporal hope or fear. These are like hairs or fingernails or evil liquids in the human body.

Therefore our definition takes in only this last way of being in the Church since this is required as a minimum in order that a man may be said to be a part of the visible Church. Now we must demonstrate in an orderly fashion that the unbaptized, heretics and apostates, excommunicated persons, and schismatics do not belong to the Church, and that those not predestined, the imperfect, sinners, even those whose offenses are manifest, and occult infidels do belong to the Church if they have the sacraments, the profession of faith, the subjection, and the rest.<sup>1</sup>

During the first half of our century there were some notable efforts to challenge St. Robert's teaching "that there is only one Church, and not two." Some rather fashionable writers in the field of sacred theology tried to prove the coexistence of an

<sup>1</sup> *De ecclesia militante*, chapter 2. The translation is my own, as are the various translations of passages from Fr. Journet's book cited in this article.

invisible Church along with the visible one. Others, while not explicitly denying the essential visibility of the true Church, held that the boundaries of this society are quite indistinct and thus, by implication, tried to rob the concept of visibility of much of its meaning. Still others were repelled by the forthrightness of St. Robert's teaching, and tried to show that some sort of true and sincere faith was actually necessary for membership in the true Church.

It is noteworthy that much of the opposition to St. Robert's teaching was discredited by the content of the encyclical *Mystici corporis*. According to this encyclical, "only those who have received the laver of regeneration and who profess the true faith, and who have neither unhappily separated themselves from the fabric of the Body or been cast out by legitimate authority by reason of most serious offenses are to be numbered as members of the Church."<sup>2</sup> Thus it presented the teaching of St. Robert as the doctrine of the Catholic Church, set forth officially by Christ's Vicar on earth.

Last year, however, there appeared in France what seems to be one of the most radical challenges to St. Robert's teaching in all modern theological literature. Fr. Charles Journet, professor in the major seminary at Fribourg in Switzerland, last year published one section of his extensive and erudite treatise *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*.<sup>3</sup> In this book the author takes issue with the basic procedures and the main contentions of the second chapter in St. Robert's *De ecclesia militante*. Fr. Journet objects to St. Robert's action in defining the true Church without including a mention of faith or charity in the definition. He also finds the Saint's statement that "the Church is as visible and palpable an assembly of men as the assembly of the Roman people, or the

<sup>2</sup> *AAS*, XXV, (1943), 202.

<sup>3</sup> *L'Église du Verbe Incarné, Essai de théologie spéculative. II Sa structure interne et son unité catholique*, by Charles Journet. The book is published by Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie. of Paris and is a part of the *Bibliothèque de la Revue Thomiste*. The first part is already written, according to the author, but at the time of this writing it has not yet been published. The projected third and fourth sections have not as yet been completed. The volume with which we are concerned runs to xlviii + 1393 pages.

kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice" quite unacceptable. Here is what Fr. Journet has to say on this subject.

St. Bellarmine seeks to define the Church without mentioning either charity or the supernatural virtue of faith. In the heat of the controversy, preoccupied with the task of opposing the Catholic truth of the visible Church to the Protestant error of the invisible Church, he forces himself to put in parentheses as much as possible whatever belongs to the realm of the mysteries within the Church: grace, the infused virtues, and the three Divine Persons, to leave only a husk. [He goes] to the point of forgetting momentarily what, being a Saint, he knew better than anyone else, the fact that, if the Church is visible, it is not so in the manner of a natural society or of the republic of Venice, it is [visible] as what it is, a supernatural society and the very Body of Christ.<sup>4</sup>

After giving a French translation of most of the section of St. Robert's book which this article carries in an English version, Fr. Journet makes this observation.

One may say that, in this unfortunate chapter *De definitione ecclesiae*, Bellarmine himself realizes that he is making a bad job of it (*se rend compte qu'il s'est mal engagé*). After all, that which he had defined at the very beginning as the only true Church, that is, the community in which the faith is professed in an exterior manner, the sacraments are received in an exterior manner, the government obeyed in an exterior manner; this is the very reality which he now says represents truly only the body of the Church. The interior gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, and charity, constitute the *soul* of the Church. Thus the soul and the body of the Church would be separable, in such a way that a man could be of the body of the Church without being of its soul, of its soul without belonging to the body, etc.<sup>5</sup>

In line with these views, Fr. Journet denies one of the central contentions in St. Robert's *De ecclesia militante*. Fr. Journet believes that "neither complete hypocrites nor occult heretics belong to the Church."<sup>6</sup>

The author of *L'Église du Verbe Incarné* has given evidence of extraordinary erudition in his book. Unfortunately, however, he has not shown himself a particularly discerning student of St. Robert Bellarmine. He seems completely to misunderstand the

<sup>4</sup> Journet, *op. cit.*, p. 1181.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1192. Cf. pp. 53 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1183.

type of definition St. Robert worked to elaborate in the second chapter of his *De ecclesia militante*. He certainly misjudges the use St. Robert made of the terms "soul" and "body," when he applied them to the Church in this particular chapter. And he certainly does the magnificent Doctor of the Church a serious injustice when he suggests that, in the heat of controversy, important truths about the Church of Jesus Christ were misstated or forgotten in the composition of the *De ecclesia militante*.

In the first place, any close examination of the text itself will show very clearly that St. Robert never intended to formulate any essential definition of the only true Church of Jesus Christ in the second chapter of his *De ecclesia militante*. Throughout the entire chapter, and, for that matter throughout the eight subsequent chapters, St. Robert is concerned only with conditions requisite for membership in the one true Church. His definition of the Church is a description of this society in terms of the minimum requirements for membership in it. It was never intended to be anything else.

St. Robert Bellarmine was engaged in controversy against opponents who agreed with him about the basic concept of the one true Church of Jesus Christ. All of the participants in this dispute were in perfect accord about the existence of a community or group of men within which alone salvific contact with Our Lord was to be found. The point at issue was the identity of this community. The Protestant writers had renewed, with some modifications of their own, the old heretical teaching that this community was not an organized society, and specifically that it was not the organized society over which the Bishop of Rome presides as the visible head. The Catholic writers were firm in their insistence that the true Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, the one kingdom of God on this earth, was that very organization. When these men declared that the true Church is visible, they meant that the kingdom of God on earth, the only assembly within which men have salvific contact with Christ, is a society, including in its membership both good and evil men, both the reprobate and the predestined. When, on the other hand, the Protestant writers defended the concept of an invisible Church, they meant that the assembly of the Saints was not an organized

social group at all, and that salvific contact with Our Lord could be achieved independently of any organization.

The Catholic truth, in other words, is the teaching that the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ on this earth is an organized society, and hence a community in which men possess membership by reason of certain definitely recognizable or visible factors. St. Robert, and Becanus after him,<sup>7</sup> were perfectly justified in appealing to the parallel of the political groups extant in their own times. By the favor of divine providence, the true and only Church of Jesus Christ on earth is as visible and manifest an organization as the republic of Venice or the kingdom of France ever were. St. Robert did not "forget" anything when he insisted upon this truth.

Furthermore, he was perfectly faithful to Our Lord's own teaching about His Church when he left charity and the supernatural virtue of faith out of the formula which he meant to express the minimum requisites for membership in that Church. One of the main themes in Our Lord's parables of the kingdom is the warning that on the last day the Church will be purified by the permanent expulsion of those members who have passed from this world without the supernatural virtues. The obvious implication of this warning is that here on earth men who are devoid at least of charity can retain their membership in His Mystical Body.

One of the central errors about the constitution of Our Lord's Church has always taken the form of a certain ecclesiastical Docetism. Just as the Docetists long ago were unwilling to admit that a real man, who really suffered and was really repudiated and crucified, could actually be the Son of God, so, in more recent times, there have always been individuals who were repelled by the thought that this organization, with its bad members intermingled with the good, is really the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. They have been too delicate to accept the fact that God wills us to find our salvific contact with Our Lord in an organization, any one of whose members or even superiors may not be living the life of divine grace at all. It was precisely against this tendency that St. Robert wrote his book, *De ecclesia militante*. Unfortu-

<sup>7</sup> Becanus copies St. Robert's expression in his *Manuale controversiarum huius temporis* (Würzburg, 1623), p. 38.

nately, it is this tendency which would designate his chapter on the definition of the Church as "cet infortuné chapitre."

When Fr. Journet objects against St. Robert's omission of the factors which, for him, constituted the "soul" of the Church from his definition in terms of membership, he betrays a serious misconception of St. Robert's procedure and habitual terminology. Fr. Journet, as a matter of fact, builds his central concept of the Church around the notions of "soul" and "body." He distinguishes sedulously between the uncreated Soul of the Church and its created soul. For him, as we shall see, the "souls" and the "body" go together to form the Church itself.

St. Robert, on the other hand, employed the terms in quite a different way. The first statement in the all-important paragraph in which he first employs this distinction in the *De ecclesia militante* is the declaration that "the Church is a living body, in which there is a soul and a body."<sup>8</sup> St. Robert attributed this teaching to St. Augustine, and Fr. Journet, incidentally, tells us that he has gone through the *Breviculus collationis*, the work of St. Augustine mentioned in this reference, without finding the text in question.<sup>9</sup>

Actually there is no passage which contains this explicit statement in the entire *Breviculus collationis* at all. Later in the *De ecclesia militante*, in the ninth chapter to be exact, St. Robert indicates the text to which he had reference. It is the paragraph in which St. Augustine speaks of the *homo interior* and the *homo exterior*, using an expression employed by St. Paul himself.<sup>10</sup> In this ninth chapter, St. Robert speaks of good Catholics as *quasi anima ecclesiae* and of bad ones as *quasi corpus*.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> St. Robert, *loc. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Journet, p. 566, n.

<sup>10</sup> The passage in the *Breviculus collationis* reads: "Dictum est etiam de homine exteriore et interiore, quae cum sint diversa, non tamen dici duos homines: quanto minus dici duas Ecclesias, cum iidem ipsi qui nunc boni tolerant permixtos malos et resurrecturi moriuntur, tunc nec mixtos malos habituri sint, nec omnino morituri." The expression "interiorem hominem" occurs in *Rom.* 7:22; and in *Eph.* 3:16. The term "homo exterior" is not found in the Vulgate.

<sup>11</sup> St. Robert's text here reads as follows. "Certe in breviculo collationum, collatione tertia, cum Donatistae calumniarentur Catholicos duas Ecclesias facere; unam quae solos bonos, aliam quae bonos cum malis contineret:

It is perfectly obvious, then, that St. Robert never took the terms "body" and "soul" of the Church as seriously as does Fr. Journet. In the same volume, the Saint designates the Church itself, the factors which earlier Catholic controversialists had called the outward or bodily bond of union within the Church, and bad Catholics, as a "body." He uses the term "soul" to indicate both the inward bond of union within the Church and good Catholics themselves. He obviously never intended to have the terms employed strictly, according to all exigencies of the hylemorphic theory. In his mind, the Church was certainly not an entity made up of this "body" animated and actuated by what he designated in his famous second chapter as the "soul."

Actually Fr. Journet's use of the terms "body" and "soul" with reference to the Catholic Church is such as to imply that the Church is not really a *coetus hominum*, an assembly or group of men at all. "It is easy," he tells us, "to define the body of the Church from the point of view of the Church's efficient, formal, or final cause. We shall say that it is the visible and outward bearing of men (*le comportement visible et extérieur des hommes*)—that is, their visible being, their visible activity, their visible working."<sup>12</sup> This is the reality which is moved by the motion of the Holy Ghost and of Our Lord Himself, informed by the outpouring of His capital grace, and raised to the very final cause of the economy of grace.

It is important to note that it is not the men themselves, but their conduct or activity which is said to be the "body" of the Catholic Church, the element which, together with the "soul" and vivified by that "soul," makes up the Church itself. Fr. Journet's further elucidations show that he takes this concept very seriously. He tells us "that there are sinners in the Church but that they do not bring their sin into it. The Church is not without sinners, but it is without sin, 'glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any

---

responderunt Catholici se nunquam duas Ecclesias somniasse, sed tantum distinguere partes vel tempora Ecclesiae; partes quidem quia aliter boni, aliter mali, ad Ecclesiam pertinent, boni enim sunt pars interior et quasi anima Ecclesiae, mali sunt pars exterior et quasi corpus, et dabant exemplum de homine interiore et exteriore, qui non sunt duo homines sed duae partes eiusdem hominis."

<sup>12</sup> Journet, *op. cit.*, p. 879.

such thing, but holy and without blemish.<sup>13</sup> Its boundaries run across our heart to divide the light there from the darkness."<sup>14</sup>

The language used by Fr. Journet in this connection is figurative in the extreme. In itself, and in its context, it is incompatible with the notion that the Church is properly and definitely a *coetus hominum*. And, if the ideas underlying this language be completely acceptable, then it would seem to follow that the old definition of the Church as the *congregatio* or *convocatio fidelium* could never have been more than approximately accurate. A congregation or society is a reunion of men and not simply a summation of their conduct.

Moreover, in his book, Fr. Journet tends to represent the Church more as an institution towards which good men tend automatically than as a society with a genuine and really urgent universal missionary commission. He seems to depict it primarily as a center towards which the supernatural life of grace in the world is meant to converge more or less of its own accord.

In the order of salvation, gathered close to Christ who favors it with His contact, it is the point of condensation of an immense cloudiness, the solid center which, moreover, attracts, sustains and draws into its wake more or less closely millions of men scattered like atoms throughout space and time.<sup>15</sup>

The missionary commission of the Catholic Church is certainly understressed in this concept, and in the one brought out in the following paragraph, which forms the conclusion to Fr. Journet's treatise on the necessity of the Church.

So the Church, the Church of Christ entrusted to Peter, is at the same time more pure and more extensive than we realize. It is more pure because it is without sin, though not without sinners, and the faults of its members never deface it. It is more extensive, because it gathers about itself everything that is saved in the world. It knows that, from the depths of space and of time, there are attached to it by desire, in an initial and hidden way, millions of men who are prevented by invincible ignorance from knowing it, but who have not refused, in the midst of the errors in which they live, the grace of living faith which, in the secret of their hearts, God who wills that

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Eph.*, 5:27.

<sup>14</sup> Journet, *op. cit.*, p. 1103.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1102.

all men should be saved and should come to the knowledge of the truth offers to them. [The Church] itself does not know them by name, but it feels their innumerable presence around itself and sometimes, amidst the silences of prayer, it hears in the night the confused sound of their walking.<sup>16</sup>

This concept of the Church, surrounded and, as it were cushioned, in this world by millions of its unknown and unknowing adherents may seem to be reassuring, but actually it has nothing like any adequate backing in the content of God's revelation about His Church. It is a dogma of the Catholic faith that the true Church is necessary for salvation. It is likewise perfectly certain, an article of Catholic doctrine, that a man may be attached to the Church in such a way as to be saved, and to obtain membership in the Church triumphant, without ever having been a member of the Church militant here on earth. Such has been the case with those whom the Church honors and venerates as martyrs because they gave their lives for the faith before they had the opportunity to receive the sacrament of baptism, without which membership in the Church militant of the New Testament is impossible. Such is the case with catechumens who die before they can be baptized, as the familiar teaching of St. Ambrose assures us.<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, it is certain likewise that a man may have true and vital faith even if he does not have explicit knowledge of the Catholic Church. The theologians who have worked on the truths which a man must believe explicitly as an absolute minimum if he is to be saved have never included the teaching about the Church itself as one of these truths. Hence we must hold that a man can be saved, and thus be attached to the Church militant in this world by desire, without having an explicit knowledge of this Church. There is such a thing as an effective implicit desire of the Church.

But it is one thing to assert this Catholic doctrine, and quite another to teach that the purity and the extension of the Church are increased by the attachment to the Church of millions who are unknown to the Church and unconscious of their attachment. The Catholic Church is not any larger by reason of people who want to enter it, even when their desire is quite explicit. A man who

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1114.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *De obitu Valentiniani*.

is attached to the Church in desire is precisely one who is not a member of it. And it is at best confusing to insist that a visible and visibly holy society is rendered more holy by reason of the virtues of men whom it does not recognize as members and who do not themselves acknowledge the society.

There is a tremendous amount of very fine teaching in *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*. Especially to be commended is the author's success in joining up the concept of Our Lord's capital grace with the notion of the Church itself. Nevertheless, despite its numerous excellent sections and its qualities of erudition, there is a definite danger that the volume may engender more confusion than light among its readers, particularly the younger ones.

The book is a systematization of and an advance in one line of ecclesiological teaching. Unfortunately this line is not the one laid down by St. Robert Bellarmine, the greatest of the Doctors of the Church in the field of ecclesiology. It is the one taken by writers like Adam and Karrer, and, in later days, Congar. It is honest in its declared opposition to the central tenets of St. Robert in his *De ecclesia militante*. At the same time, however, it adduces no evidence whatsoever which should influence students and teachers of sacred theology to forsake the doctrine of St. Robert on the visibility of the Catholic Church.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

*The Catholic University of America*  
Washington, D. C.

## Answers to Questions

### BAPTISMAL DIFFICULTIES

*Question:* a) Please direct the correct procedure in private Baptism. At our hospital, we often have the opportunity of baptizing infants privately. We use only the form of the Sacrament of Baptism. What of the use of Holy Chrism, the giving of the linen cloth, and the presenting of a lighted candle?

b) May a seminarian in our parish act as sponsor when his nephew is baptized?

c) Is one sponsor sufficient? If so, may the sponsor be of the opposite sex of the one being baptized?

*Answer:* a) In case of urgent necessity or danger of death, the essential ceremony of pouring the water and at the same time reciting the required formula is all that is done. All the usual prayers and ceremonies in this particular situation are omitted.

If our inquirer is referring to private baptism as taking place in a hospital, not under unusual circumstances because of danger of death, then the sacrament is administered with all ceremonies and the full ritual.

b) There are no regulations set forth by the code of canon law forbidding one in minor orders to act as a sponsor at baptism. It is well, however, to inform one's self about specific diocesan regulations.

For one in major orders express permission of his own Ordinary but not the Ordinary of the place is necessary to act as a sponsor when the sacrament of baptism is being conferred.

c) The Code states specifically that one and only one sponsor is required for the sacrament of baptism. Likewise, the sponsor need not be of the same sex as the person he stands for.