

QUESTION 66

The Sacrament of Baptism

Next we have to consider each of the sacraments in particular: first, baptism (*baptismus*) (questions 66-71); second, confirmation (*confirmatio*) (question 72); third, the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*) (questions 73-83); fourth, penance (*poenitentia*) (questions 84-90 and *Supplement*, questions 1-28); fifth, extreme unction (*extrema unctio*) (*Supplement*, questions 29-33); sixth, holy orders (*ordo*) (*Supplement*, questions 34-40); and, seventh, matrimony (*matrimonium*) (*Supplement*, questions 41-68).

Concerning the first topic, there are two sorts of consideration: first, concerning baptism itself (questions 66-69) and, second, concerning what leads up to baptism (*de praeparatione baptismi*) (questions 70-71).

On the first of these topics, four things have to be considered: first, the things that belong to the sacrament of baptism (question 66); second, the minister of this sacrament (question 67); third, the recipients of this sacrament (question 68); and, fourth, the effect of this sacrament (question 69).

On the first of these topics there are twelve questions: (1) Is baptism a washing? (2) When was baptism instituted? (3) Is water the proper matter of this sacrament? (4) Is simple water required? (5) Is this the appropriate form of this sacrament: “I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”? (6) Could an individual be baptized under this form: “I baptize you in the name of Christ”? (7) Is immersion necessary for baptism? (8) Is a triple immersion required? (9) Can baptism be repeated? (10) Is the rite that the Church uses in baptizing baptism appropriate? (11) What is the distinction among the baptism of water, the baptism of blood, and the baptism of the Spirit? (12) How do these three baptisms compare with one another?

Article 1

Is baptism the washing itself?

It seems that baptism is not the washing itself (*baptismus non sit ipsa ablutio*):

Objection 1: A bodily washing passes, whereas baptism remains. Therefore, baptism is not the washing itself, but is instead, as Damascene puts it in *De Fide Orthodoxa* 4, “the regeneration, the seal (*sigillum*), the safeguarding, and the illumination.”

Objection 2: Hugh of St. Victor says, “Baptism is water sanctified by the Word of God for washing away sins.” Yet water is not the washing itself, but instead the washing is a certain use of the water.

Objection 3: In *Super Ioannem* Augustine says, “A word is added to the element and it becomes a sacrament.” Therefore, baptism is the water itself and not the washing.

But contrary to this: Ecclesiasticus 34:30 says, “If someone takes a bath after touching the dead (*baptizatur a mortuo*) and then touches the dead again, what does his bath profit him?” Therefore, it seems that baptism is the washing, or bathing, itself.

I respond: In the sacrament of baptism there are three things to consider: (a) something that is a *sacrament only* (*sacramentum tantum*); (b) something that is a *reality and sacrament* (*res et sacramentum*); and (c) something that is a *reality only* (*res tantum*).

Now that which is a *sacrament only* is something visible which exists exteriorly and which is a sign of an interior effect—for this is what the concept of a sacrament involves. Therefore, some have claimed that the water itself is the sacrament. This seems consonant with the words of Hugo of St. Victor. For he himself, in his general definition of a sacrament, says that a sacrament is the material element, and in his definition of baptism he says that the baptism is the water.

However, this is not true. For since the sacraments of the New Law bring about a sort of

sanctification (*sanctificationem quandam operentur*), a sacrament is brought to completion when the sanctification is brought to completion. But the sanctification is not brought to completion in the water; instead, what is there [in the water] is a certain instrumental power to sanctify—not a permanent power, but a power that flows into the man, who is the subject of a real sanctification. And so the sacrament is brought to completion not in the water itself, but in the application of the water to the man, which is the washing. And this is why in *Sentences* 4, dist. 3 the Master says, “Baptism is the exterior washing of the body carried out with a prescribed form of words.”

On the other hand, what is a *reality and sacrament* (*res et sacramentum*) is the baptismal character, which is both (a) a reality signified by the exterior washing and (b) a sacramental sign of the interior justification. And this interior justification is the *reality only* (*res tantum*) of this sacrament, i.e., a reality that is signified and does not itself signify.

Reply to objection 1: That which is a *sacrament and reality* (*sacramentum et res*), viz., the character, and that which is a *reality only* (*res tantum*), viz., the interior sanctification, both remain; however, as was explained above (q. 63, a. 5), the character remains indelibly, whereas the sanctification remains but can be lost (*permanet sed amissibiliter*).

Therefore, Damascene defined baptism not with respect to what it does exteriorly, which is a *sacrament only* (*sacramentum tantum*), but with respect to what it does interiorly. Hence, he posited two things that belong to the character, viz., the *seal* (*sigillum*) and the *safeguarding* (*custodiam*), insofar as the character itself, which is called a seal in its own right, safeguards the soul in the good. Likewise, he posits two things that belong to the *last reality* (*ad ultimam rem*) of the sacrament, viz., (a) the *regeneration*, which pertains to the fact that through baptism a man begins a new life of justice, and (b) the *illumination*, which belongs specifically to the faith through which a man receives spiritual life—this according to Habacuc 2:4 (“The just man lives by faith”). Now baptism is a sort of profession of faith, and that is why it is called the sacrament of faith.

Likewise, in *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, chap. 2 Dionysius defines baptism (a) by the way it is ordered toward the other sacraments, when he says that it is “the principle that forms the habits of our soul for receiving the most holy words and sacraments,” and, again, (b) by its relation to heavenly glory, which is the universal end of all the sacraments, when he adds, “preparing the road that lifts us up to the repose of the heavenly kingdom,” and, again, (c) with respect to the beginning of the spiritual life, when he adds, “the conferring of our most sacred and divine regeneration.”

Reply to objection 2: As has been explained, Hugo of St. Victor’s opinion on this matter does not follow with necessity.

Still, baptism’s being said to be the water can be verified in the sense that the water is the material principle of baptism. And so this will be an instance of predication through a [material] cause.

Reply to objection 3: When the word is added to the element, the sacrament comes to be—not, to be sure, in the element itself, but in the man, to whom the element is applied through the exercise of the washing. And the very words that come to the element likewise signify this when it is said, “I baptize you, etc.”

Article 2

Was baptism instituted after Christ’s passion?

It seems that baptism was instituted after Christ’s passion (*baptismus fuerit institutus post Christi passionem*):

Objection 1: A cause precedes its effect. But Christ’s passion is operative in the sacraments of the

New Law. Therefore, Christ's passion precedes the institution of the sacraments of the New Law—and especially the institution of baptism, since in Romans 6:3 the Apostle says, “We who have been baptized in Christ Jesus have been baptized in His death, etc.”

Objection 2: The sacraments of the New Law have their efficacy from Christ's command. But Christ gave His disciples the command to baptize after His passion and resurrection, when in Matthew 28:19 He said, “Go and teach all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, etc.” Therefore, it seems that baptism was instituted after Christ's passion.

Objection 3: As was explained above (q. 65, a. 4), baptism is a sacrament that involves necessity, and so it seems that from the time that baptism was instituted, men were obligated to be baptized. But before Christ's passion men were not obligated to be baptized, since circumcision, in the place of which baptism came along, still retained its power. Therefore, it seems that baptism was not instituted before Christ's passion.

But contrary to this: In a homily on the Epiphany Augustine says, “From the time that Christ was immersed in the waters [of the Jordan], water washed away the sins of everyone.” But this happened before Christ's passion. Therefore, baptism was instituted before Christ's passion.

I respond: As was explained above (q.62, a. 1), by their institution the sacraments are such that they confer grace. Hence, it seems that a sacrament is instituted when it receives the power to produce that same effect. But baptism received this power when Christ was baptized.

However, the necessity of receiving this sacrament was made known to men after the passion and resurrection—both because (a) in Christ's passion the prefigurative sacraments were terminated and succeeded by baptism and the other sacraments of the New Law, and also because (b) through baptism a man is configured to Christ's passion and resurrection insofar as he dies to sin and begins a new life of justice. And so it was necessary for Christ to suffer and rise before the necessity of men's configuring themselves to Christ's death and resurrection was made known to them.

Reply to objection 1: Even before the passion Christ's baptism had efficacy from His passion insofar as that baptism prefigured the passion—yet in a way different from the way in which the sacraments of the Old Law prefigured His passion. For the latter were figures only, whereas Christ's baptism had its power to justify from Christ Himself, and it was likewise through His power that the passion itself was salvific.

Reply to objection 2: It was not fitting for men to be limited to multiple figures by Christ, who had come to replace the fulfilled figures with His reality. And so before His passion He did not place the baptism that had been instituted under a precept, but instead He wanted men to become accustomed to its use—and especially within the people of the Jews, among whom all the prefigurements had been practiced, as Augustine explains in *Contra Faustum*.

By contrast, after His passion and resurrection He imposed the necessity of baptism by His command, not only upon the Jews but also upon the gentiles, when He said, “Go and teach all the nations.”

Reply to objection 3: The sacraments are obligatory only when they are placed under a precept, and this, as has been explained, did not occur before the passion. For what our Lord had said to Nicodemus before the passion in John 3:5 (“Unless a man is born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he will not enter into the kingdom of God”) seems to be referring to the future rather than to the present moment.

Article 3

Is water the proper matter of baptism?

It seems that water is not the proper matter of baptism (*aqua non sit propria materia baptismi*):

Objection 1: According to Dionysius and Damascene, baptism has illuminative power. But illumination belongs to fire most of all. Therefore, baptism should be carried out with fire rather than with water—especially because when John the Baptist is announcing Christ’s baptism beforehand, he says, “He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire” (Matthew 3:11).

Objection 2: What is signified in baptism is the washing away of sins. But there are many things other than water that are used for washing, e.g., wine and oil and other things of this sort. Therefore, baptism can likewise be carried out with those things. Therefore, it is not the case that water is the proper matter of baptism.

Objection 3: As was said above (q. 63, a. 5), the sacraments of the Church flowed from the side of Christ hanging on the cross. But from His side there flowed not only water, but also blood. Therefore, it seems that baptism can also be carried out with blood. This also seems to fit in better with the effect of baptism, since Apocalypse 1:5 says, “He washed us from our sins in His own blood.”

Objection 4: As Augustine and Bede explain it, by the touch of his most pure flesh Christ conferred regenerative and purgative power on the waters. But not every instance of water is connected with the water of the Jordan, which is the water that Christ touched with his flesh. Therefore, it seems that baptism cannot be carried out with every instance of water. And so water is not as such the proper form of baptism.

Objection 5: If water in its own right (*secundum se*) were the proper matter of baptism, then it would not be necessary for anything else to be done to the water in order for a baptism to be carried out with it. But in a solemn baptism, the water with which it is fitting to celebrate baptism is exorcized and blessed. Therefore, it seems that water is not in its own right the proper matter of baptism.

But contrary to this: John 3:5 says, “Unless a man is born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he will not enter into the kingdom of God.”

I respond: By divine institution water is the proper matter of baptism—and fittingly so:

First of all, with respect to *the very nature of baptism*, which is a regeneration into the spiritual life—something that fits in especially with water. Hence, the seeds (*semina*) from which all living things, viz., plants and animals, are generated are likewise humid and involve water. Because of this some philosophers have claimed that water is a principle of all things.

Second, with respect to *the effects of baptism*, to which the properties of water belong. Water washes by its wetness, and because of this it is fitting for it to signify and to cause the washing away of sins. Again, by its coldness water tempers an excess of heat, and because of this it is fit to mitigate the excessive sensual desire stemming from the stimulant [to sin] (*fomes [peccati]*). Again, because of its transparency it is receptive of light, and hence it is fitting for baptism insofar as baptism is the sacrament of faith.

Third, because water *fittingly represents the mysteries of Christ*, by which we are justified. For as Chrysostom says in commenting on John 3:5 (“Unless a man is born again, etc.”), “When we submerge our heads in the water as in a sort of tomb, the old man is buried, and while submerged, he is hidden below, and from there the new man rises again.”

Fourth, because by reason of water’s general availability and abundance (*ratione suae communitatis et abundantiae*), it is a matter that befits the necessity of the sacrament, since it can be easily had anywhere.

Reply to objection 1: Illumination belongs to fire as an active force (*pertinet ad ignem active*).

But an individual who is baptized does not thereby become one who illuminates; instead, he is illuminated by faith, which “comes from hearing,” as Romans 10:17 says. And that is why water befits baptism more than fire does.

Now as for what is said, viz., “He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire,” the word ‘fire’ here can, as Jerome explains, be understood as the Holy Spirit, who, as Acts 2:3 reports, appeared over the disciples in tongues of fire.

An alternative reply is that, as Chrysostom explains in *Super Matthaicum*, ‘fire’ can be understood as distress (*tribulatio*), because distress purges sins and diminishes excessive sensual desire (*concupiscentiam diminuit*).

Another alternative reply is that, as Hilary points out in *Super Matthaicum*, “For those who have been baptized in the Holy Spirit, what remains is to be brought to perfection by the fire of judgment.”

Reply to objection 2: Wine and oil are not as commonly used for washing as water is. Again, they do not wash as completely, since from a washing with them there remains a sort of adulteration with respect to smell—which does not happen in the case of water. Again, they are not as generally available and abundant as water is.

Reply to objection 3: From the side of Christ flowed water to wash, but blood to redeem. And this is why the blood belongs to the sacrament of the Eucharist, whereas the water belongs to baptism. Yet the water has its ability to wash from the power of Christ’s blood.

Reply to objection 4: Christ’s power flowed to all water in general not by a continuity of place, but by a similarity of species. As Augustine puts it in a homily on the Epiphany, “The blessing that flowed from the savior’s baptism, like a spiritual river, filled the course of every stream and the channels of every spring.”

Reply to objection 5: The blessing that is applied to the water is not necessary for baptism, but instead involves the sort of solemnity through which the devotion of the faithful is stimulated and the cunning of the devil is kept from posing an obstacle to the effect of the baptism.

Article 4

Is plain water required for baptism?

It seems that plain water is not required for baptism (*ad baptismum non requiratur aqua simplex*):

Objection 1: The water that exists among us is not pure water; this is especially evident in the case of sea water, which, as is clear from the Philosopher in the *Meteorology*, has a lot of terrestrial matter mixed in with it. Therefore, it is not the case that plain and pure water (*aqua simplex et pura*) is required for baptism.

Objection 2: In a solemn celebration of baptism, chrism is poured into the water. But this seems to undermine the purity and plainness of the water. Therefore, pure and plain water is not required for baptism.

Objection 3: As has been explained (a. 3, ad 3), the water that flowed from the side of Christ on the cross signified baptism. But that water does not seem to have been pure water, because in a mixed body—such as Christ’s body was—the elements do not exist in their pure state (*non sint elementa in actu*). Therefore, it seems that pure or plain water is not required for baptism.

Objection 4: Lye (*lixivium*) does not seem to be pure water, since it has properties that are contrary to those of water, viz., heating and drying. Yet it seems that baptism can be carried out with lye, just as it can be carried out with the water of the baths, which passes through sulphurous fissures in the way that lye is filtered through ashes. Therefore it seems that plain water is not necessary for Baptism.

Objection 5: Rose water (*aqua rosacea*) is distilled from rose petals, just as alchemical waters are generated by distillation from various bodies. But, it seems, baptism can be carried out with such waters, just as it can likewise be carried out with rain water, which is generated by distillation from vapors. Therefore since waters of these types are not pure and plain waters, it seems that pure and plain water is not required for baptism.

But contrary to this: As has been explained (a. 4), the proper matter of baptism is water. But only plain water has the species of water. Therefore, pure and plain water is necessarily required for baptism.

I respond: There are two ways in which water can lose its purity and plainness: by *being mixed with another body*, and by *alteration*. And both of these can occur in two ways: *through art* and *through nature*.

Now art falls short of the operation of nature, since nature gives a substantial form, which art cannot do. Instead, all artificial forms are accidental—except, perhaps, when a proper agent is applied to its proper matter, e.g., fire to something combustible, in the way that certain animals are generated from some things by putrefaction.

Therefore, if a transmutation with respect to water is made through art, whether by mixing or by altering, the species of the water is not changed. Hence, a baptism can be carried out with water of this sort, unless the water is mixed by art with a body in such a small quantity that the composite is something other than water, in the way that mud is earth rather than water, and in the way that diluted wine is wine rather than water.

On the other hand, a transmutation worked by nature sometimes destroys the species of water, and this occurs when by a natural process water comes to be absorbed into the substance of some mixed body, in the way that water converted into the liquid of the grape is wine and no longer has the species of water. By contrast, sometimes a transmutation of water is worked by nature without the destruction of the species, and this happens both (a) through an *alteration*, as is clear in the case of water heated by the sun and also (b) by a mixing, as is clear in the case of the water in a river becoming murky by being mixed with earthy parts.

So, then, one should reply that in every instance of water, no matter how it has been changed, a baptism can be carried out with it as long as the species of water has not been destroyed. On the other hand, if the species of water has been destroyed, a baptism cannot be carried out with it.

Reply to objection 1: The transmutation made in sea water and in other waters that we have at hand is not so great that it destroys the species of water. And so baptism can be carried out with waters of this sort.

Reply to objection 2: Mixing in chrisam does not destroy the species of water. The same thing holds in the case of the water in which meat and other things of this sort have been boiled down—unless perhaps so much of the boiled bodies is dissolved in the water that the fluid contains more of the foreign substance than it does water. This can be discerned from the density. If, however, plain water can be strained from a liquid that has been made dense in this way, that water can be used for baptism, just as with water that is strained from mud, even though a baptism cannot be carried out with mud.

Reply to objection 3: The water that flowed from the side of Christ hanging on the cross was not a phlegmatic humor, as some have claimed. For baptism could not be carried out with such a fluid—just as it could not be carried out with the blood of an animal or with wine or with any liquid from a plant. Instead, the water that flowed from the side of Christ was pure water miraculously leaving a dead body—and likewise the blood—in order to prove the genuineness of our Lord's body against the error of the Manicheans, with the result that through water, which is one of the four elements, Christ's body would be shown to have been truly composed of the four elements, whereas through the blood it would be shown to have been composed of the four humors.

Reply to objection 4: Baptism can be carried out with lye and with the waters of sulphuric baths,

since waters of this sort are not incorporated by art or by nature into any mixed bodies, but instead only receive a certain alteration by passing through certain bodies.

Reply to objection 5: Rose water is a liquid distilled from rose petals and so baptism cannot be carried out with it. And, for the same reason, alchemical waters cannot be used, as neither can wine.

However, the same line of reasoning does not apply to rain water, which for the most part is generated by the condensation of vapors formed from water, but contains a small amount of liquid matter from mixed bodies. However, by the force of nature, which is stronger than art, this liquid matter is, by being elevated, resolved into real water, a result that art cannot produce. Consequently, rain water retains no properties of any mixed body—something that cannot be said of rose water or of alchemical waters.

Article 5

Is this an appropriate form for baptism: “I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”?

It seems that this is not an appropriate form for baptism: “I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (*haec non sit conveniens forma baptismi: ego te baptizo in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti*):

Objection 1: An act should be attributed more to the principal agent than to his minister. But as was explained above (q. 64, a. 1), in a sacrament the minister acts as an instrument, whereas the principal agent in baptism is Christ—this according to John 1:33 (“He upon whom you will see the Spirit descending and abiding upon Him, He it is who baptizes ...”). Therefore, it is inappropriate for the minister to say, “I baptize you” (*Ego te baptizo*)—especially because when he says, ‘*baptizo*’, the word ‘*ego*’ (‘I’) is already understood and so seems to be added superfluously.

Objection 2: It is unnecessary for an individual who exercises an act to make mention of the exercised act; for instance, an individual who is teaching does not have to say, “I am teaching you.” But our Lord handed down the command to baptize and the command to teach at one and the same time when He said, “Go and teach all nations, etc.” (Matthew 28:19) Therefore, it is unnecessary for the act of baptizing to be mentioned in the form of baptism.

Objection 3: An individual who is being baptized sometimes does not understand the words—for instance, if he is deaf or if he is a child. But speech is directed to such an individual in vain—this according to Ecclesiasticus 32:6 (“Where there is no hearing, do not pour out speech”). Therefore, it is inappropriate to say “I baptize you” explicitly in speech to an individual who is being baptized.

Objection 4: It happens that many individuals are being baptized by many individuals, in the way that the apostles baptized three thousand on one day and five thousand on another day (Acts 2:41 and 4:1). Therefore, the form of baptism should not be limited to the singular number, as when it is said “I baptize you,” but instead it can be said, “We baptize all of you.”

Objection 5: Baptism has its power from Christ’s passion. But baptism is sanctified by its form. Therefore, it seems that in the form of baptism mention should be made of Christ’s passion.

Objection 6: The name designates a property of the reality. But as was explained in the First Part (ST 1, q.32, a. 3), there are three personal properties of the divine persons. Therefore, one should not say, “... in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” but should instead say “... in the names of ...”

Objection 7: The person of the Father is signified not only by the name ‘Father’, but also by the names ‘Innascible’ (*Innascibilis*) and ‘Begetter’ (*Genitor*); again, the Son is signified by the names ‘Word’ (*Verbum*), ‘Image’ (*Imago*), and ‘Begotten’ (*Genitus*), and the Holy Spirit can be signified by the

names ‘Gift’ (*Donum*) and ‘Love’ (*Amor*) and by the name ‘Proceeder’ (*Procedens*). Therefore, it seems that baptism is brought to completion by these names as well.

But contrary to this: In Matthew 28:19 our Lord says, “Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”

I respond: Baptism is consecrated by its form—this according to Ephesians 5:26 (“Cleansing her with a bath of water in the word of life”), and in *De Unico Baptismo* Augustine says, “Baptism is consecrated by the words of the Gospels.” And so the cause of baptism had to be expressed in the form of baptism.

Now there are two causes of baptism: (a) the principal cause, from which it has its power, and this is the Holy Trinity; and (b) the instrumental cause, viz., the minister, who confers the sacrament exteriorly. And that is why both of them have to be made mention of in the form of baptism. The minister is touched upon when it is said, “I baptize you,” whereas the principal cause is touched upon when it is said, “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”

Hence, the appropriate form of baptism is this: “I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”

Reply to objection 1: The action is attributed to an instrument as acting immediately, whereas it is attributed to the principal agent as that in the power of which the instrument acts. And so in the form of baptism the minister is fittingly signified as exercising the act of baptizing when it is said, “I baptize you,” and our Lord Himself attributed the act of baptizing to the ministers when He said, “... baptizing them, etc.” (Matthew 28:19). On the other hand, the principal cause is signified as the one in whose power the sacrament is performed, when it is said, “... in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” For Christ does not baptize without the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Now the Greeks do not attribute the act of baptizing to the ministers, and this in order to avoid the error of those ancients who attributed the power of baptism to those who were baptizing, saying, “I am of Paul, and I am of Cephas” (1 Corinthians 1:12). And this is why they say, “Let the servant of Christ, N., be baptized in the name of the Father, etc.” And since the exercised act is expressed by the minister with an invocation of the Trinity, a genuine sacrament is brought to completion.

On the other hand, the fact that the word ‘*ego*’ (‘I’) is added in our [Latin] form is not part of the substance of the form, but is posited for a greater emphasis on the [minister’s] intention.

Reply to objection 2: Since the washing of a man with water can be done for many reasons, it must be determined by the words of a formula why it is being done. But this cannot be accomplished by its being said, “... in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” since we ought to do *everything* in this name, as Colossians 3:17 points out. And so if the act of baptizing is not made explicit, either in our [Latin] manner or in the manner of the Greeks, the sacrament is not brought to completion—this according to the decretal of Pope Alexander III, “If anyone immerses a child in water three times ‘in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit Amen’ and does not say, ‘I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit’, the child has not been baptized.”

Reply to objection 3: The words that are pronounced in the forms of the sacraments are pronounced not only for the sake of *signifying*, but also from the sake of *causing*, insofar as they have efficacy from that Word “through whom all things have been made” (John 1:3). And so it is fitting for those words to be directed not only to human beings, but also to insensible creatures, as when it is said, “I exorcize you, creature of salt.”

Reply to objection 4: It is impossible for many individuals together to baptize one individual, since the act is multiplied by the multiplication of agents if it is done completely by each of them. And so, if two individuals came together, one of whom was unable to speak and could not pronounce the words, and the other of whom lacked hands and could not carry out the act, then the two of them would

not be able to perform a baptism together, with the one speaking the words and the other carrying out the act.

However, it is possible, if necessity demands it, for many individuals to be baptized together, since none of them receives anything except one baptism. But then it will be necessary to say “I baptize all of you” (*ego baptizo vos*). And there will be no change in the form, since “all of you” is nothing other than “you and you and you ...”.

However, what ‘we’ (*nos*) means is not the same as ‘I and I’, but is instead ‘you and I’, and so the form is already changed. Similarly, the form would be changed if it were said, “I baptize myself” (*ego baptizo me*). And so no one can baptize himself. Indeed, it was for this reason that Christ wanted to be baptized by John, as is explained in *Extra, De Baptismo et eius effectu*, chap. *Debitum*.

Reply to objection 5: Even if Christ’s passion is a principal cause with respect to the minister, it is nonetheless an instrumental cause with respect to the Holy Trinity. And that is why the Trinity, rather than Christ’s passion, is commemorated.

Reply to objection 6: Even if there are three personal names of the three persons, there is nonetheless one name of the essence. But the divine power, which is what is operative in baptism, belongs to the essence. And that is why “in the name” is said and not “in the names.”

Reply to objection 7: Just as water is taken up for baptism because it is more commonly used for washing, so the names by which the persons [of the Trinity] are most commonly named in a given language are taken to signify the three persons in the form of baptism. And the sacrament is not brought to completion with other names.

Article 6

Can baptism be conferred in the name of Christ?

It seems that baptism can be conferred in the name of Christ (*in nomine Christi possit dari baptismus*):

Objection 1: Just as “there is one faith,” so, too, “there is one baptism,” as Ephesians 4:5 says. But Acts 8:12 says that men and women were baptized in “the name of Jesus Christ.” Therefore, baptism can now also be conferred in the name of Christ.

Objection 2: Ambrose says, “If you say ‘Christ’, you have designated the Father, by whom He was anointed, and He Himself who was anointed, the Son, and the Spirit, by whom He was anointed.” But baptism can be done in the name of the Trinity. Therefore, it can be done in the name of Christ.

Objection 3: Pope Nicholas, responding to questions put to him by the Bulgars, says, “Those who have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, or only in the name of Christ, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles—it is one and the same thing, as Saint Ambrose says—should not be re-baptized.” But they would be re-baptized if they did not receive the sacrament of baptism when they were baptized with that form. Therefore, baptism can be celebrated in the name of Christ under this form: “I baptize you in the name of Christ.”

But contrary to this: Pope Pelagius wrote to the bishop Gaudentius, “If any of those living in your eminence’s territory confess that they have been baptized only in the name of the Lord, you will baptize them without any hesitation in the name of the Holy Trinity when they come to the Catholic Faith.” Again, in *De Spiritu Sancto* Didymus says, “Even if there were someone of an alien mind who was to baptize in such a way as to skip one of the aforementioned names”—viz., the names of the three Persons—“he would baptize without bringing it to completion.”

I respond: As was explained above (q. 64, a. 3), the sacraments have their power from Christ’s

instituting them. And so if something is left out of those things that Christ instituted with respect to a given sacrament, then it lacks efficacy—except by a special dispensation from the one who did not bind His power to the sacraments. Now Christ established that the sacrament of baptism is to be conferred with an invocation of the Trinity. And so whatever falls short of a full invocation of the Trinity destroys the integrity of baptism.

This holds (a) despite the fact that one person is understood in the name of another person, in the way that the Son is understood in the name ‘Father’; and (b) despite the fact that an individual who names only one person can have accurate faith with respect to the three persons. For just as a matter that can be sensed is required for a sacrament, so, too, a form that can be sensed. Hence, an understanding of, or faith in, the Trinity is not sufficient for the completion of the sacrament unless the Trinity is expressed with words that can be sensed. Hence, even in Christ’s baptism, wherein we find the origin of the sanctification of our own baptism, the Trinity was present in things that could be sensed, viz., the Father in the voice, the Son in His human nature, and the Holy Spirit in the dove.

Reply to objection 1: By a special revelation of Christ’s the apostles in the primitive Church baptized in the name of Christ, so that the name of Christ, which had been found odious by both Jews and gentiles, might be rendered honorable by the fact at the invocation of Christ the Holy Spirit was given in baptism.

Reply to objection 2: Ambrose assigns a reason why such a dispensation could have been granted in the primitive Church, viz., because the whole Trinity is understood in the name of Christ; and so the form which Christ handed down in the Gospel was preserved at least in its intelligible integrity.

Reply to objection 3: Pope Nicholas confirms what he decrees by appealing to the two preceding objections. And so the reply to this objection is clear from the replies to the first two objections.

Article 7

Is immersion in water necessary for baptism?

It seems that immersion in water is necessary for baptism (*immersio in aqua sit de necessitate baptismi*):

Objection 1: As Ephesians 4:5 says, “One faith, one baptism ...” But among many the common manner of baptism is by immersion. Therefore, it seems that there cannot be baptism without immersion.

Objection 2: In Romans 6:3-4 the Apostle says, “We who have been baptized in Christ Jesus were baptized in His death; for we were buried with Him through baptism in death.” But this occurs through immersion, since in commenting on John 3:5 (“Unless you are born again of water and the Holy Spirit, etc.”) Chrysostom says, “When we submerge our heads in water, as in a sort of sepulcher, the old man is buried and is hidden below submerged, and then the new man rises again.” Therefore, it seems that immersion is necessary for baptism.

Objection 3: If baptism could be performed without the immersion of the whole body, it would follow that, by parity of reasoning, it suffices for water to be poured over any part of the body. But this seems inappropriate, because original sin, against which baptism is mainly conferred, is not in just one part of the body. Therefore, it seems that immersion is required for baptism and just splashing or pouring not sufficient (*non sufficiat sola aspersio*).

But contrary to this: Hebrews 10:22 says, “Let us draw near to Him with a true heart in fullness of faith, with our hearts having been sprinkled clean of an evil conscience and our body having been washed with clean water.”

I respond: Water is taken up in the sacrament of baptism to be used for a bodily washing through

which the interior washing away of sins is signified. But there can be a washing with water not only in manner of an immersion, but also in the manner of a splashing or of a pouring.

And so even though it is safer to baptize in the manner of an immersion, since this is the more common practice, baptism can be performed in the manner of a splashing or, again, in the manner of a pouring—this according to Ezechiel 36:25 (“I will pour clean water upon you”)—in the way that Saint Lawrence is said to have baptized. And this is mainly out of necessity—either (a) because of a large number of those to be baptized, as is clear from Acts 2:41 and 4:4, where we read that three thousand came to believe on one day and five thousand on another day, or (b) because sometimes an emergency can crop up due to a shortage of water, or (c) because of the feebleness of the minister, who cannot support the one who is to be baptized, or (d) because of the feebleness of the one who is to be baptized, who could be exposed to the danger of death by being immersed. And that is why one should reply that immersion is not necessary for baptism.

Reply to objection 1: Things that are incidental (*per accidens*) do not change the substance of a reality. Now bodily washing with water is an essential requirement (*per se requiritur*) for baptism, and this is why baptism is called a bath—this according to Ephesians 5:26 (“Cleansing her with a bath of water in the word of life”). But it is incidental to baptism that the washing is done in this or that manner. And so this sort of diversity does not destroy the unity of baptism.

Reply to objection 2: In immersion the figure of Christ’s burial is more explicitly represented, and so this manner of baptizing is more common and more laudable. But it is represented in some way in the other modes of baptizing, though not as explicitly. For no matter how the washing is done, the man’s body, or some part of it, is under water in the way that Christ’s body was placed under the earth.

Reply to objection 3: The principal part of the body, especially as regards its external members, is the head, in which all the senses, both interior and exterior, are vigorous. And so if it is not the case that the whole body can be moistened with water, and this because of a shortage of water or for some other reason, it is necessary to moisten the head, in which the principle of animal life is made manifest.

And even though it is through the members which are devoted to generation that original sin is passed on, it is nonetheless not the case that those members should be sprinkled instead of the head. For baptism does not remove the transmission of original sin to the offspring by the act of generation, but instead liberates the soul from the stain and guilt of the sin that it has incurred. And so the part of the body that should be mainly washed is the one in which the works of the soul are made manifest.

However, in the Old Law a remedy against original sin had been instituted in the member of generation, since the one through whom original sin would be taken away was going to be born of the seed of Abraham, whose faith, as Romans 4:11 explains, was what circumcision signified.

Article 8

Is a triple immersion necessary for baptism?

It seems that a triple immersion is necessary for baptism (*trina immersio sit de necessitate baptismi*):

Objection 1: In a sermon called *De Symbolo ad Baptizatos* Augustine says, “You were correctly immersed three times, because you received baptism in the name of the Trinity. You were correctly immersed three times, because you were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the third day. For the immersion, repeated three times, is a figure of our Lord’s the burial, through which you have been buried with Christ in baptism.” But both of these points seem to belong to baptism necessarily, viz., (a) the Trinity of persons being signified in baptism, and (b) there being a configuration

to Christ's burial. Therefore, it seems that a triple immersion is necessary for baptism.

Objection 2: The sacraments have their efficacy from Christ's command (*ex mandato Christi*). But a triple immersion comes from Christ's command; for Pope Pelagius wrote to the bishop Gaudentius, "The Gospel precept, handed down by our Lord God Himself, our savior Jesus Christ, admonishes us to confer holy Baptism on each individual in the name of the Trinity and, likewise, with a triple immersion." Therefore, just as baptizing in the name of the Trinity is necessary for baptism, so, too, baptizing by means of a triple immersion seems to be necessary for baptism.

Objection 3: If a triple immersion is not necessary for baptism, then an individual receives the sacrament after the first immersion. But if a second and third immersion are added, it seems that he would [also] be baptized at the second or third immersion—which is absurd. Therefore, one immersion is not sufficient for the sacrament of baptism; instead, a triple immersion seems to be necessary for it.

But contrary to this: Gregory writes to the bishop Leandrus, "It cannot be in any way reprehensible to baptize an infant with either a triple immersion or a single immersion. For it is the case both that the persons of Trinity can be signified in three immersions, and also that the singularity of the divine nature can be signified in one immersion."

I respond: As was previously explained (a. 7, ad 1), what is required in its own right (*per se*) for baptism is a *washing with water*, which is necessary for the sacrament, whereas the *mode* or *manner* of the washing is related incidentally to the sacrament. And so, as is clear from the passage just cited from Gregory, as regards baptism in its own right, it can be performed in either way, viz., by immersing once or by immersing three times, since the oneness of Christ's death and the oneness of the divine nature are signified by a single immersion, whereas a triple immersion signifies the triduum of Christ's burial and also the Trinity of persons.

However, for diverse reasons, in accord with the Church's discipline, sometimes the one mode has been mandated and sometimes the other mode. For instance, because at the beginning of the infant Church some individuals harbored mistaken ideas about the Trinity, thinking of Christ as a mere man and one who is to be called the Son of God and God only because of His merits, which consisted principally in His death, they baptized not in the name of the Trinity but in memory of the death of Christ and by a single immersion—a practice that was rejected in the primitive Church. Hence, in *Canones Apostolorum* we read, "If any priest or bishop uses just one immersion and not a triple immersion in an instance of administering baptism—a baptism that some claim to be conferred 'in the death of our Lord'—let him be deposed. For our Lord did not say to us, 'Baptize in my death', but instead said, 'Baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'."

By contrast, later on, the error developed of certain schismatics and heretics who were re-baptizing men, as Augustine reports about the Donatists in *Super Ioannem*. And so, in detestation of their error, it was decided at the Council of Toledo that only a single immersion should be done—in the place where we read: "In order to avoid the scandal of schism, or the practice of heretical teaching, let us hold to a simple immersion in baptism."

However, now that this sort of provocation has ceased, a triple immersion is commonly observed in baptism. And so anyone who baptized in a different way would commit a grave sin by not observing the Church's rite, as it were. Yet it would still be a baptism.

Reply to objection 1: The Trinity acts as the principal agent in baptism. Now assimilation to the agent reaches the effect by means of the form and not by means of the matter. And so the signifying of the Trinity is accomplished in baptism through the words of the form.

Nor is it necessary for the Trinity to be signified through the way in which the matter is used; instead, this is done for the sake of a greater explicitness. Again, similarly, a single immersion is a sufficient figure of Christ's death.

On the other hand, the triduum of His burial is not necessary for our salvation, since even if He had

been buried or dead for one day, it would have been sufficient to bring our redemption to completion; instead, as was explained above (q. 53, a. 2), the triduum is ordered toward making manifest the genuineness of His death.

And so it is clear that a triple immersion is not necessary for the sacrament, either on the part of the Trinity or on the part of Christ's passion.

Reply to objection 2: Pope Pelagius understands the triple immersion to come from Christ's mandate by way of a parallel, viz., in the fact that Christ commanded that individuals be baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. However, as has been explained, there is no parallel between the form of the sacrament and the way in which its matter is used.

Reply to objection 3: As was explained above (q. 64, a. 8), the intention is required for baptism. And so it is by the intention of the Church's minister, who intends to confer a single instance of baptism by a triple immersion, that the baptism becomes a single baptism. Hence, in *Super Epistolam ad Philippenses* Jerome says, "Even if he is baptized"—that is, immersed—"three times because of the mystery of the Trinity, it nonetheless counts as one baptism."

On the other hand, if the minister intended to confer one baptism with each of the immersions, repeating the words of the form for each immersion, then, by baptizing the individual more than once, he would be guilty of something that is a sin in its own right (*peccaret, quantum in se, pluries baptizans*).

Article 9

Can baptism be repeated?

It seems that baptism can be repeated (*baptismus possit iterari*):

Objection 1: Baptism seems to have been instituted to wash away sins. But sins are repeated. Therefore, *a fortiori*, baptism should be repeated, because Christ's mercy transcends man's sin.

Objection 2: John the Baptist was commended by Christ when He said of him, "Among those born of women there has not risen a greater than John the Baptist" (Matthew 11:11). But those baptized by John were baptized again, as Acts 19:1-7 reports when it says that Paul baptized those who had been baptized with John's baptism. Therefore, *a fortiori*, those who have been baptized by heretics or sinners should be baptized again.

Objection 3: At the Council of Nicea it was decided, "If any of the Paulianists or Cataphrygians flee to the Catholic Church for refuge, they are to be baptized." But it seems that the same argument applies to other heretics. Therefore, those baptized by heretics should be baptized again.

Objection 4: Baptism is necessary for salvation. But in the case of certain baptized individuals, there is sometimes a doubt about whether they have been baptized. Therefore, it seems that they should be baptized again.

Objection 5: As was explained above (q. 65, a. 3), the Eucharist is a more perfect sacrament than baptism is. But the sacrament of the Eucharist is repeated. Therefore, *a fortiori*, baptism can be repeated.

But contrary to this: Ephesians 4:5 says, "... one faith, one baptism."

I respond: Baptism cannot be repeated:

First of all, because baptism is a sort of spiritual regeneration, in the sense that someone dies to his old life and begins to live a new life. Hence, John 3:5 says, "Unless a man is born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." But there is just one generation for each individual. And that is why baptism cannot be repeated, just as carnal generation cannot be repeated. Hence, in commenting on John 3:4 ("Can a man enter his mother's womb again and be born?"), Augustine says, "So you have to understand being born of the Spirit in the same way that Nicodemus understood being

born in the flesh. In the same way that the womb cannot be repeated, so neither can baptism be repeated.”

Second, “we are baptized in Christ’s death” (Romans 6:3), and through this death we die to sin and rise to a newness of life. But Christ died only once. And that is why baptism should not be repeated, either. Because of this, Hebrews 6:6 says, against those wishing to be baptized again, “They are crucifying the Son of God again for themselves,” and a Gloss explains, “One death of Christ has consecrated one baptism.”

Third, because baptism imprints a character, which is indelible and which is given with a sort of consecration. Hence, just as other consecrations are not repeated in the Church, so neither is baptism. And this is what Augustine is pointing out in *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani* 2, viz., that “the military character is not repeated,” and that “the sacrament of Christ is no less permanent than this bodily mark; for we see that not even apostates lack baptism, and that when they return repentant, it is not redone.”

Fourth, because baptism is given mainly against original sin. And so just as original sin is not repeated, so neither is baptism repeated. For as Romans 5:18 says, “As from the offense of one man the result was unto condemnation to all men, so from the justice of the one the result is unto justification of life to all men.”

Reply to objection 1: As was explained above (a. 2, ad 1 and q. 63, a. 5), baptism operates in the power of Christ’s passion. And so just as subsequent sins do not remove the power of Christ’s passion, so neither do they remove baptism in such a way that it has to be repeated; instead, when [the sacrament of] penance intervenes, the sin that was impeding the effect of baptism is done away with.

Reply to objection 2: As Augustine explains in commenting on John 1:33 (“But I did not know Him”), “Notice that after John, baptism is conferred [again]; after a murderer, baptism is not conferred [again]. For John conferred his own baptism, whereas the murderer conferred the baptism of Christ, and the sacrament is so sacred that it is not polluted even if a murderer confers it.”

Reply to objection 3: The Paulianists and Cataphrygians did not baptize in the name of the Trinity. Hence, in writing to the bishop Quiricus, Gregory says, “Those heretics who are not baptized in the name of the Trinity, such as the Bonosians and Cataphrygians”—who thought the same thing as the Paulianists—“since the former believe that Christ is not God”—thinking Him to be a mere man—“whereas the latter”—that is, the Cataphrygians—“believe in a perverse way that the Holy Spirit is a mere man, viz., Montanus: All these heretics are baptized when they come into the holy Church, since what they received while in the state of error they did not receive in the name of the Trinity, and it was not baptism.”

By contrast, as it says in *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, “As for those baptized by heretics who baptize with a profession of the Holy Trinity, they are to be received as already baptized when they come to the Catholic Faith.”

Reply to objection 4: As the decretal of Alexander III says, “In the case of those concerning whom there is a doubt whether they have been baptized, they are to be baptized with the following opening words: ‘If you have been baptized, I am not baptizing you again, but if you have not been baptized, I baptize you, etc.’ That way, what is not known to have been done does not appear to be repeated.”

Reply to objection 5: Both of the sacraments, viz., baptism and the Eucharist, represent the death and passion of our Lord, but in different ways. For in baptism Christ’s death is commemorated insofar as a man dies with Christ in order to be reborn into a new life. By contrast, in the sacrament of the Eucharist Christ’s death is commemorated insofar as Christ Himself, having suffered, is offered to us as a paschal feast—this according to 1 Corinthians 5:7-8 (“Christ our passover has been sacrificed; therefore, let us have a feast”). And since a man is born just once but eats many times, baptism is given just once, whereas the Eucharist is given many times.

Article 10

Is the rite that the Church uses in baptizing appropriate?

It seems that the rite that the Church uses in baptizing is not appropriate (*non sit conveniens ritus quo Ecclesia utitur in baptizando*):

Objection 1: As Chrysostom says, “The waters of baptism would never have washed away the sins of believers if they had not been sanctified by the touch of our Lord’s body.” But this was done at our Lord’s baptism, which is celebrated within the feast of the Epiphany. Therefore, solemn baptism should be celebrated within the feast of the Epiphany rather than at the Easter Vigil or the Vigil of Pentecost.

Objection 2: The same sacrament does not seem to involve the use of diverse matters. But baptism involves washing with water. Therefore, it seems inappropriate for an individual who is being baptized to be anointed with holy oil twice, first on his breast and then between his shoulders, and with chrism on the top of his head.

Objection 3: “In Christ Jesus ... there is neither male nor female” (Galatians 3:23) ... “neither barbarian nor Scythian” (Colossians 3:11), or, for the same reason, any other differences of this sort. Much less, then, does a difference in clothing play any role in faith in Christ. Therefore, it is not fitting for those who have been baptized to be given a shining white garment.

Objection 4: Baptism can be celebrated without any such observances. Therefore, the things just mentioned seem to be superfluous, and so it is inappropriate for them to be placed by the Church within the rite of baptism.

But contrary to this: The Church is ruled by the Holy Spirit, who does not do anything haphazardly.

I respond: In the sacrament of baptism there is (a) something done which is necessary for the sacrament and (b) something that lends a certain solemnity to the sacrament (*quod ad quandam solemnitatem sacramenti pertinet*).

What is necessary for the sacrament is (a) the *form*, which signifies the principal cause of the sacrament, and (b) the *minister*, who is the instrumental cause, and (c) the *use of the matter*, viz., a washing with water, which signifies the principal effect of the sacrament.

By contrast, everything else that the Church observes in the rite of baptizing instead lends a certain solemnity to the sacrament. There are three reasons why these things are added to the sacrament:

First of all, in order to stimulate the devotion of the faithful, along with their reverence for the sacrament. For if there were just a washing with water without any solemnity, some might easily think of it as a sort of common washing.

Second, for the instruction of the faithful. For simple people who are not erudite in letters have to learn through signs that can be sensed, e.g., through pictures and other things of this sort. And, in this way, through what is done in the sacraments, they are either instructed or moved to inquire about the things that are signified by sensible signs of this sort. And so because, beyond the principal effect of the sacrament, one has to know certain other things about baptism, it was appropriate for those things to be represented by exterior signs.

Third, because through the prayers and blessings and other things of this sort, demonic powers (*vis daemonis*) are kept from obstructing the sacrament’s effect.

Reply to objection 1: As was explained above (q. 39, a. 2), within the Epiphany Christ was baptized with the baptism of John, whereas the faithful are baptized not with that baptism, but rather with the baptism of Christ, which has its efficacy both (a) from Christ’s passion—this according to Romans 6:3 (“We who have been baptized in Christ Jesus have been baptized in His death”)—and (b) from the Holy Spirit—this according to John 3:5 (“Unless a man is born again of water and the Holy

Spirit ...”).

And so solemn baptism is done in the Church both (a) at the Easter vigil, when a commemoration is made of our Lord’s burial and of His resurrection, because it was after the resurrection that our Lord gave the disciples the command about baptism, as we read in Matthew 28:19—and (b) on the vigil of Pentecost, when the solemnity of the Holy Spirit is beginning to be celebrated; and hence we read that on the very day of Pentecost, when the apostles had received the Holy Spirit, they baptized three thousand [souls] (Acts 2:41).

Reply to objection 2: The use of water is applied in baptism as belonging to the substance of the sacrament, but the use of oil or chrism is applied to lend a certain solemnity. For, in the first place, the one to be baptized is anointed with holy oil both on his breast and on his shoulders “like an athlete for God,” as Ambrose puts it in *De Sacramentis*, in the way that a wrestler used be anointed.

An alternative reply is that, as Pope Innocent III says in a decretal concerning sacred unction, “The one to be baptized is anointed on the breast in order to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, to cast off error and ignorance, and to accept the true faith, since ‘the just man lives by faith’. He is anointed between the shoulders in order to put on the grace of the Holy Spirit, to put off negligence and sluggishness, and to exercise good works—with the result that through the sacrament of faith there might be purity of thought in his breast and strength for labors on his shoulders.” And as Rabanus explains, after the baptism “he is immediately anointed on the head by the priest with holy chrism, accompanied by the prayer that he might become a participant in Christ’s kingdom and that he might be able to be named a Christian after Christ.” An alternative to this is that, as Ambrose explains, the oil is poured on his head in order that “‘the sense of a wise man might be in his head’ (Ecclesiastes 2:14), so that he is ready to give a reason for his faith to all who ask him.”

Reply to objection 3: That shining white garment is given to the one who has been baptized, not because he is not permitted to use other garments, but (a) as a sign of the glorious resurrection to which men are reborn through baptism and (b) to signify the purity of life that they ought to observe after baptism—this according to Romans 6:4 (“... in order that we might walk in a newness of life”).

Reply to objection 4: As has been explained above, even if the things that belong to the solemnity of the sacrament are not necessary for the sacrament, they are nonetheless not superfluous, since they contribute to the well-being of the sacrament (*sunt ad bene esse sacramenti*).

Article 11

Are the three baptisms appropriately described as baptism of water, baptism of blood, and baptism of wind, i.e., baptism of the Holy Spirit?

It seems that the three baptisms are not appropriately described as baptism of water, baptism of blood, and baptism of wind, i.e., baptism of the Holy Spirit (*inconvenienter describantur tria baptismata, scilicet aquae, sanguinis et flaminis, scilicet spiritus sancti*):

Objection 1: In Ephesians 4:5 the Apostle says, “One faith, one baptism.” But there is only one faith. Therefore, there should not be three baptisms.

Objection 2: As was explained above (q. 65, a. 1), baptism is one of the sacraments. But it is baptism of water alone that is a sacrament. Therefore, one should not posit two other baptisms.

Objection 3: In *De Fide Orthodoxa* 4 Damascene determines several other kinds of baptisms. Therefore, it is not the case that just three baptisms should be posited.

But contrary to this: A Gloss on Hebrews 6:2 (“... of the doctrine of baptisms”) says, “Because there is baptism of water, baptism of repentance, and baptism of blood.”

I respond: As was explained above (a. 2, ad 1 and a. 9, ad 1 and q. 62, a. 5), baptism of water has its efficacy from (a) Christ's passion, to which an individual is configured by baptism and, further, (b) from the Holy Spirit as from a first cause.

Now even though the effect depends on the first cause, the cause nonetheless exceeds the effect and does not depend on the effect. And so, an individual can, apart from baptism of water (*praeter baptismum aquae*), receive the effect of that sacrament *from the passion of Christ* insofar as he is conformed to that passion by suffering for the sake of Christ. Hence, Apocalypse 7:14 says, "These are they who have come out of the great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Again, for the same reason, an individual receives the effect of baptism *from the power of the Holy Spirit* not only without the baptism of water, but also without the baptism of blood, viz., insofar as his heart is moved by the Holy Spirit to believe in God and to love Him and to repent of his sins. Hence, it is also called the baptism of repentance. And of this sort of baptism Isaiah 4:4 says, "... if the Lord washes away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and washes away the blood of Jerusalem from its midst, by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of ardor."

So, then, both of the other baptisms are called 'baptism' insofar as they take the place of baptism. Hence, in *De Unico Baptismo Parvulorum* 4 Augustine says, "Saint Cyprian puts forward no lightweight argument for the claim that suffering sometimes takes the place of baptism, based on the case of that thief to whom, though unbaptized, it was said, 'Today you shall be with me in paradise'. Having pondered this argument time and again, I find that it is not only *suffering for the name of Christ* that can supply what one has failed to obtain from baptism, but that this can also be supplied by *faith and the conversion of one's heart*, if it turns out that, because of extenuating circumstances, it is not possible to arrange for the celebration of the sacrament of baptism (*si forte ad celebrandum mysterium baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest*)."

Reply to objection 1: The other two baptisms are included in the baptism of water, which has its efficacy both from the Christ's passion and from the Holy Spirit. And so the unity of baptism is not thereby destroyed.

Reply to objection 2: As was explained above (q. 60, a. 1), a sacrament has the nature of a sign. By contrast the other two baptisms agree with baptism of water not, to be sure, with respect to the nature of a *sign*, but instead with respect to the *effect* of baptism. And that is why they are not sacraments.

Reply to objection 3: Damascene posits certain *figurative* baptisms—for instance, the flood, which was a sign of our baptism as regards the salvation of the faithful in the Church, just as "at that time a few souls were saved" in the ark, as 1 Peter 3:20 puts it. He also posits the crossing of the Red Sea, which signifies our baptism as regards the liberation from servitude to sin; hence, in 1 Corinthians 10:2 the Apostle says that "all were baptized ... in the cloud and in the sea." Again, he posits the different types of washing which were carried out in the Old Law and which prefigured our baptism as regards the washing away of sins. Again, he posits the baptism of John, which prepared the way for our baptism.

Article 12

Is the baptism of blood the most excellent of the three baptisms?

It seems that the baptism of blood is not the most excellent of the three baptisms (*baptismus sanguinis non sit potissimus inter tria baptismata*):

Objection 1: The baptism of water imprints a character, which the baptism of blood does not do. Therefore, the baptism of blood is not better than the baptism of water.

Objection 2: The baptism of blood is of no avail without the baptism of wind, which exists through charity; for 1 Corinthians 13:3 says, “If I deliver my body to be burned but do not have charity, it profits me nothing.” But the baptism of wind avails without the baptism blood, since it is not only martyrs who are saved. Therefore, baptism of blood is not the most excellent.

Objection 3: Just as the baptism of water has its efficacy from Christ’s passion, which, according to what was said above (a. 11), the baptism of blood corresponds to, so Christ’s passion has its efficacy from the Holy Spirit—this according to Hebrews 9:14 (“The blood of Christ, who through the Holy Spirit offered Himself for us, cleansed our consciences from dead works, etc.”). Therefore, the baptism of wind is more excellent than the baptism of blood. Therefore, the baptism of blood is not the most excellent.

But contrary to this: In *Ad Fortunatum* Augustine, speaking about the comparison among the baptisms, says, “The one who is being baptized professes his faith in the presence of a priest, the martyr in the presence of a persecutor. The former is sprinkled with water after he has professed, the latter with blood. The former receives the Holy Spirit by the imposition of the bishop’s hands; the latter is made a temple of the Holy Spirit.”

I respond: As has been explained (a. 11), the shedding of blood for the sake of Christ, along with the interior operation of the Holy Spirit, are called baptisms insofar as they cause the effect of the baptism of water. And, as has been said, the baptism of water has its efficacy from Christ’s and from the Holy Spirit.

These two causes are, to be sure, operative in each of the three baptisms, but they operate in the most excellent way in the baptism of blood. For Christ’s passion operates in the baptism of water through a certain figurative representation and in the baptism of wind or of penance through a certain affection, but it operates in the baptism of blood through an imitation of the work itself. Similarly, the power of the Holy Spirit operates in the baptism of water through a certain latent power and in the baptism of repentance through a movement of the heart, but it operates in the baptism of blood through the most excellent fervor of love and affection—this according to John 15:13 (“Greater love than this no one has than to lay down his life for his friends”).

Reply to objection 1: The character is a *reality and sacrament (res et sacramentum)*. But we are not claiming that the baptism of blood has preeminence as regards the nature of a sacrament; instead, we are claiming that it has preeminence as regards the effect of the sacrament.

Reply to objection 2: The shedding of blood does not have the nature of baptism if it exists without love. From this it is clear that the baptism of blood includes the baptism of wind, but not vice versa. Hence, the baptism of blood is thereby proved to be more perfect.

Reply to objection 3: As has been explained, the baptism of blood has its preeminence not only as regards Christ’s passion, but also as regards the Holy Spirit.