

QUESTION 69

The Effects of Baptism

Next we have to consider effects of baptism. And on this topic there are ten questions: (1) Are all sins taken away through baptism? (2) Is a man freed from all punishment through baptism? (3) Does baptism take away the punishments of this life? (4) Are grace and the virtues conferred on a man through baptism? (5) Which effects of the virtues are conferred through baptism? (6) Do even young children receive grace and the virtues through baptism? (7) Are the gates of the kingdom of heaven opened through baptism to those who are baptized? (8) Does baptism have an equal effect in all the baptized? (9) Does deception (*fictio*) impede the effect of baptism? (10) Does baptism attain its effect when the deception ends?

Article 1

Are all sins removed through baptism?

It seems not to be the case that all sins are removed through baptism (*per baptismum non tollantur omnia peccata*):

Objection 1: Baptism is a sort of spiritual regeneration that is counterposed to carnal generation. But through carnal generation a man contracts only *original* sin. Therefore, through baptism only *original* sin is removed.

Objection 2: Repentance is a sufficient cause of the remission of *actual* sins. But repentance is required *before* baptism in adults—this according to Acts 2:38 (“Repent and be baptized every one of you”). Therefore, baptism does nothing with respect to the remission of *actual* sins.

Objection 3: There are different medicines for different diseases, since, as Jerome says, “What cures the heel does not cure the eye.” But *original* sin, which is removed through baptism, is a different genus of sin from *actual* sin. Therefore, it is not the case that all sins are remitted through baptism.

But contrary to this: Ezekiel 36:25 says, “I will pour clean water upon you, and you shall be cleansed from all your impurity.”

I respond: As the Apostle says in Romans 6:3, “All of us who have been baptized in Christ Jesus have been baptized in His death.” And afterwards (6:11) he concludes, “Thus do you consider yourselves also as dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus our Lord.” From this it is clear that through baptism a man dies to the oldness of sin and begins to live with the newness of grace. But every sin belongs to one’s former oldness (*ad pristinam vetustatem*). Hence, it follows that every sin is removed through baptism.

Reply to objection 1: As the Apostle explains in Romans 5:15-16, the sin of Adam cannot be as great as the gift of Christ which is received in baptism: “For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift (*gratia*) following many trespasses brings justification.” Hence, in *De Baptismo Parvulorum* Augustine likewise says, “When the flesh is generated, it contracts only original sin, but when the Spirit regenerates, there is a remission not only of original sin but also of voluntary sins.”

Reply to objection 2: No remission of any sin can be effected except through the power of Christ’s passion; hence, in Hebrews 9:22 the Apostle says, “Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness.” Hence, the movement of the human will would not be sufficient for the forgiveness of sin unless faith in the passion of Christ, along with the intention of participating in His passion, were present—either by receiving baptism or by submitting oneself to the keys of the Church. And so when a repentant adult comes forth for baptism, he attains the remission of all his sins by his intention to receive baptism, but he attains it more perfectly by actually receiving baptism.

Reply to objection 3: This argument goes through for the case of particular medicines. But baptism operates in the power of Christ's passion, which is a universal medicine for all sins, and through baptism all sins are taken away.

Article 2

Is a man liberated through baptism from every debt of punishment for sin?

It seems that a man is not liberated through baptism from every debt of punishment for sin (*per baptismum non liberetur homo ab omni reatu peccati*):

Objection 1: In Romans 13:1 the Apostle says, "What is from God is well-ordered." But sin is well-ordered only through punishment, as Augustine explains. Therefore, the debt of punishment for previous sins is not removed through baptism.

Objection 2: The effects of a sacrament bear some similarity to the sacrament itself, since, as was explained above (q. 62, a. 1, ad 1), the sacraments of the New Law effect what they are a figure of. But the baptismal washing bears a similarity to the washing away of a stain, whereas it seems to bear no similarity to taking away the debt of punishment. Therefore, it is not the case that the debt of punishment is taken away through baptism.

Objection 3: When the debt of punishment is taken away, the individual no longer remains deserving of punishment, and so it would be unjust for him to be punished. Therefore, if the debt of punishment were removed through baptism, then, after his baptism, it would be unjust to hang a robber who had previously committed homicide. And so through baptism the rigor of human discipline would be destroyed—which seems absurd. Therefore, it is not the case that the debt of punishment is removed through baptism.

But contrary to this: In commenting on Romans 11:29 ("The gifts and the call of God are without punishment (*sine poenitentia*)"), Ambrose says, "In baptism the grace of God remits everything free of charge."

I respond: As was explained above (q. 49, a. 3, ad 2 and q. 68, aa. 1 and 4-5), through baptism an individual is incorporated into the passion and death of Christ—this according to Romans 6:8 ("If we have died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with Christ"). From this it is clear that Christ's passion is shared with every baptized individual as a remedy, as if he himself had suffered and died. But as was stated above (q. 48, aa. 2 and 4, q. 49, a. 3, and q. 68, a. 5), Christ's passion is sufficient satisfaction for all the sins of every human being. And the one who is baptized is set free from the debt of every punishment owed to him for his sins, as if he himself had made sufficient satisfaction for all of his own sins.

Reply to objection 1: Because the punishment involved in Christ's passion is shared with the baptized individual insofar as he has become a member of Christ, as if he himself had endured that punishment, it follows that his sins remain well-ordered through the punishment involved in Christ's passion.

Reply to objection 2: Water not only washes, but also refreshes. And so its refreshment signifies the taking away of the debt of punishment, just as its washing signifies the cleansing from sin.

Reply to objection 3: In the case of punishments that are imposed by a human tribunal, one pays attention not only to what punishment a man deserves vis-a-vis God, but also to what debt he has vis-a-vis the men who have been injured and scandalized by his sin. And so even though a murderer is liberated through baptism from his debt of punishment vis-a-vis God, he nonetheless remains in debt vis-a-vis human beings, who are justly edified by his punishment, just as they have been scandalized by

his sin. Yet the ruler could justly be lenient as regards the punishment for such cases.

Article 3

Should the punishments of the present life be taken away through baptism?

It seems that the punishments of the present life should be taken away through baptism (*per baptismum debeant auferri poenalitates praesentis vitae*):

Objection 1: As the Apostle says in Romans 5:15, “The gift of Christ is more powerful than the sin of Adam.” But as the Apostle explains in the same place (5:12), through the sin of Adam “death has entered into the world” and, as a result, all the other punishments of the present life as well. Therefore, *a fortiori*, through the gift of Christ, which is received in baptism, a man should be liberated from the punishments of the present life.

Objection 2: As was explained above (a. 1), baptism takes away original sin and actual sin. But it takes away actual sin in such a way that it liberates us from every debt of punishment that follows upon actual sin. Therefore, it likewise liberates us from the punishments of the present life, which constitute the punishment for original sin.

Objection 3: If a cause is removed, its effect is removed. But the cause of these punishments is original sin, which is removed through baptism. Therefore, punishments of the sort in question should not remain.

But contrary to this: A Gloss on Romans 6:6 (“... that the body of sin might be destroyed”) says, “Through baptism it is brought about that the old man is crucified and that the body of sin is destroyed—not in such a way that concupiscence, sprinkled through and innate in the living flesh itself, is suddenly consumed and ceases to exist, but in such a way that what was in him when he was born might not hurt him when he is dead.” Therefore, by parity of reasoning, neither are the other punishments removed through baptism.

I respond: Baptism has the power to take away the punishments of the present life; however, it does not take them away *during* the present life, but instead by its power they are taken away from those who are righteous *at the resurrection*, “when this mortal body puts on immortality,” as 1 Corinthians 15:54 puts it. And this makes good sense:

First, because, as was explained above (a. 2 and q. 68, a. 5), through baptism a man is incorporated into Christ and becomes of a member of Him. And so it is appropriate that what has been done in the head should be done in an incorporated member. But from the beginning of His conception Christ was full of grace and of truth, even though He had a passible body that through its passion and death was raised up to a life of glory. Hence, in Romans 8:11 the Apostle says, “He who has raised Jesus Christ from the dead will likewise bring to life our mortal bodies because of His Spirit who dwells in us.” And later on in the same place (8:17) : “... heirs indeed of God and joint heirs with Christ, provided, however, that we suffer with Him in order that we might also be glorified with Him.”

Second, it is appropriate for spiritual exercise, in order that a man might receive his crown of victory after having struggled against excessive sensual desires and other sorts of passibility. Hence, a Gloss on Romans 6:6 (“... in order that the body of sin might be destroyed”) says, “[That is,] if after baptism a man lives in the flesh, has excessive sensual desire with which he struggles, and conquers it with God’s help.” As a prefigurement of this, Judges 3:1-2 says, “These are the nations the Lord left [in the promised land], in order that by them He might instruct Israel ... that afterwards their children might learn to fight with their enemies and to be trained in doing battle.”

Third, it was appropriate lest men should approach baptism for the sake of being impassible in the

present life and not for the sake of attaining the glory of eternal life. Hence, in 1 Corinthians 15:19 the Apostle says, “If it is only for this life that we hope in Christ, then we are of all men the most to be pitied.”

Reply to objection 1: As a Gloss on Romans 6:6 (“... that we might no longer be slaves to sin”) says, “Just as a man who, having captured a frightful enemy, does not immediately slay him, but allows him to live for a short time in shame and suffering, so did Christ at first curb our punishment, but in the future He will destroy it.”

Reply to objection 2: As a Gloss on the same verse says, “There are two sorts of punishment for sin, the punishment of hell and temporal punishment. Christ entirely abolished the punishment of hell, with the result that those who are baptized and truly repent are not affected by it. As of yet, however, He has not altogether abolished temporal punishment, since, for instance, hunger, thirst, and death still remain. He did, however, throw down its reign and dominion”—in the sense that man should no longer fear this sort of punishment—“and in the end He will altogether do away with it on the last day.”

Reply to objection 3: As was explained in the Second Part (*ST* 1-2, q. 81, a. 1 and q. 82, a. 1, ad 2), original sin proceeds in such a way that in the first place the person infects the nature, whereas afterwards the nature infects the person.

By contrast, Christ, in the reverse order, first repairs what belongs to the person and then will afterwards simultaneously repair in everyone what belongs to the nature. And so through baptism He immediately removes from a man the fault of original sin, along with the punishment of being without the vision of God. On the other hand, the punishments of the present life, such as death, hunger, thirst and other things of this sort, have to do with the nature, by the principles of which they are caused insofar as the nature is devoid of original justice or righteousness. And so these defects [that belong to the present life] are removed only in the ultimate restoration of the nature that takes place through the glorious resurrection.

Article 4

Are grace and the virtues conferred on a man through baptism?

It seems that grace and the virtues are not conferred on a man through baptism (*per baptismum non confirmantur homini gratia et virtutes*):

Objection 1: As was explained above (a. 2 and q. 62, a. 1, ad 1), the sacraments of the New Law effect what they are figures of. But what is signified by the washing of baptism is the cleansing of the soul from sin and not the soul’s being informed by grace and the virtues. Therefore, it seems that grace and the virtues are not conferred on a man through baptism.

Objection 2: An individual does not need to receive again what he has already acquired. But some individuals come forth for baptism already having grace and the virtues; for instance, in Acts 10:1-2 we read, “There was a man in Caesarea, Cornelius by name, a centurion of the cohort called ‘Italian’, who was devout and God-fearing.” Yet he was only later baptized by Peter. Therefore, it is not the case that grace and the virtues are conferred through baptism.

Objection 3: A virtue is a habit, the definition of which includes that it is a quality which is difficult to change and through which one acts easily and with delight. But after baptism there remains in men a proneness toward evil by which virtue is destroyed, and one has difficulty with respect to the good that is the act of virtue. Therefore, it is not the case that a man receives grace and the virtues through baptism.

But contrary to this: In Titus 3:5-6 the Apostle says, “He saved us through the bath of

regeneration”—that is, through baptism—“and renewal by the Holy Spirit, whom He has abundantly poured out on us”—“that is,” as a Gloss on this passage explains, “for the remission of sins and the abundance of the virtues.”

I respond: As Augustine says in *De Baptismo Parvulorum*, “Baptism is powerful enough for the baptized to be incorporated into Christ as His members.” But grace and the fullness of virtue flow from Christ the head into all His members—this according to John 1:16 (“From His fullness we have all received”). Hence, it is clear that through baptism an individual receives grace and the virtues.

Reply to objection 1: Just as, through its washing, the water of baptism signifies the cleansing from sin, and, through its refreshing nature (*per suum refrigerium*), it signifies liberation from punishment, so through its natural clearness it signifies the splendor of grace and the virtues.

Reply to objection 2: As has been explained (a. 1, ad 2 and q. 68, a. 2), an individual attains the remission of his sins before baptism insofar as he has baptism by his desire, either explicitly or implicitly, and yet when he receives baptism in reality the remission becomes more full as regards the liberation from all punishment. So, too, before baptism Cornelius and other similar individuals receive grace and the virtues through their faith in Christ and their desire, implicit or explicit, for baptism, whereas afterwards they receive in baptism a greater abundance of grace and the virtues. Hence, a Gloss on Psalm 22:2 (“He has brought me up on the water of refreshment”) says, “He has brought us up by an increase of virtue and of good behavior in baptism.”

Reply to objection 3: Difficulty with respect to the good and a proneness to evil are found in the baptized not because they lack the habit of the virtues, but because they have excessive sensual desire (*propter concupiscentiam*), which is not removed in baptism. Yet just as excessive sensual desire is diminished through baptism in such a way that it does not dominate, so, too, difficulty with respect to the good and proneness to evil are both diminished in such a way that the man is not overpowered by them.

Article 5

Is it appropriate to attribute to baptism, as its effects, certain acts of the virtues such as incorporation into Christ, illumination, and fruitfulness?

It seems that it is not appropriate to attribute to baptism, as its effects, certain acts of the virtues such as incorporation into Christ, illumination, and fruitfulness (*inconvenienter attribuantur Baptismo pro effectibus quidam actus virtutum, scilicet, incorporatio ad Christum, illuminatio, fecunditas**):

Objection 1: Baptism is not given to an adult unless he is [already] faith-filled (*non datur adulto nisi fidei*)—this according to Mark 16:16 (“He who believes and is baptized shall be saved”). But it is through faith that a man is incorporated into Christ—this according to Ephesians 3:17 (“... and to have Christ dwelling through faith in your hearts”). Therefore, to be incorporated into Christ is not an effect of baptism.

Objection 2: Illumination is effected by teaching (*illumination fit per doctrinam*)—this according to Ephesians 3:8-9 (“To me, the least of all, was given this grace to illuminate everyone, etc.”). But teaching by means of the catechism precedes baptism. Therefore, it is not an effect of baptism.

Objection 3: Fruitfulness involves actively generating. But through baptism an individual is himself generated again. Therefore, fruitfulness is not an effect of baptism.

But contrary to this: In *De Baptismo Parvulorum* Augustine says, “Baptism is powerful enough for the baptized to be incorporated into Christ as His members.” Again, in *De Ecclesia Hierarchia*, chap. 2, Dionysius attributes “illumination” to baptism. And a Gloss on Psalm 22:2 (“He has brought me up on the water of refreshment”) says, “The soul of sinners, sterile with dryness, is made fruitful through

baptism.”

I respond: Through baptism an individual is generated again into the spiritual life, which is proper to Christ’s faithful. As the Apostle puts it in Galatians 2:20, “And the life that I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God.” But this life is none other than the life of the members united to the head, from whom they receive their understanding and their movement (*sensum et motum suscipiunt*). And so it has to be the case that through baptism an individual is incorporated into Christ as a member of Him.

Now just as understanding and movement flow from a *natural* head into its members, so from the *spiritual* head, which is Christ, what flows into His members are *spiritual understanding*, which consists in the cognition of truth, and *spiritual movement*, which comes through the prompting of grace (*per gratiae instinctum*). Hence, John 1:14-16 says, “We saw Him full of grace and of truth ... and of His fullness we have all received.” And so it follows that the baptized are (a) illuminated by Christ with respect to the cognition of truth and (b) made fruitful by Him with the fruitfulness of good works through the infusion of grace.

Reply to objection 1: Adults who have a prior belief in Christ are *mentally* incorporated into Him. But afterwards, when they have been baptized they are in a certain sense incorporated into Him *corporeally*, viz., through a visible sacrament, in the absence of which they could not have been incorporated either *in intention* or *mentally*.

Reply to objection 2: A teacher (*doctor*) illuminates [his students] *exteriorly* through his ministry by catechizing them, but God illuminates the baptized *interiorly*, preparing their hearts to receive the teaching of truth—this according to John 6:45 (“It is written in the prophets, ‘They shall be taught by God (*erunt omnes docibiles Dei*)’”).

Reply to objection 3: What is posited as an effect of baptism is the fruitfulness by which an individual produces good works [in general] and not the fruitfulness by which an individual generates others in Christ in the sense that the Apostle is speaking of in 1 Corinthians 4:15 (“In Christ Jesus I gave birth to you through the gospel”).

Article 6

Do young children receive grace and the virtues in baptism?

It seems that young children do not receive grace and the virtues in baptism (*pueri in baptismo non consequantur gratiam et virtutes*):

Objection 1: Grace and the virtues are not had without faith and charity. But as Augustine explains, “Faith consists in an act of will on the part of the believers (*consistit in voluntate credentium*),” and, similarly, charity consists in an act of will on the part of the lovers. But children do not have use of their will, and so they do not have faith and charity. Therefore, in baptism children do not receive grace and the virtues.

Objection 2: In commenting on John 14:12 (“... and he will do greater works than these”), Augustine explains that in order for a wicked man to become righteous, “Christ operates in him, but not without him.” But since a child does not have the use of free choice, he does not cooperate with Christ in his own justification—indeed, sometimes he resists as much as possible. Therefore, he is not justified by grace and the virtues.

Objection 3: Romans 4:5 says, “To an individual who does not work but believes in Him who justifies the wicked, his faith is credited to him as righteousness.” But a child is not “an individual who believes in Him who justifies the wicked.” Therefore, he receives neither justifying grace nor the virtues.

Objection 4: What is done with a carnal intention does not seem to have a spiritual effect. But sometimes children are brought forward to baptism with a carnal intention, viz., that they might be healed in their body. Therefore, they do not receive the spiritual effect of grace or the virtues.

But contrary to this: In *Enchiridion* Augustine says, “When young children are baptized, they die to that sin which they contracted in birth, and so what is said may thereby also be applied to them: ‘We were buried together with Him by baptism unto death...’—and he adds—‘... so that just as Christ is raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in a newness of life.’”

I respond: Some ancients claimed that, in baptism, young children are not given *grace and the virtues*, but that the *character* is imprinted on them, and that by the power of the character they receive grace and the virtues when they have come of age. But this is clearly false, and for two reasons:

First of all, because children, just like adults, are made members of Christ in baptism. Hence, they have to receive an inflow of grace and of virtue from the head.

Second, because on this view children who die after baptism will not reach eternal life, since, as Romans 6:23 says, “The grace of God is life eternal.” And so, as regards salvation, their having been baptized would have turned out to be of no profit at all.

Now the cause of this error was that they failed to acknowledge the distinction a *habit* and an *act*. And so, recognizing that children are incapable of the acts of the virtues, they thought that after baptism children do not in any way have the virtues. But this lack of the power to operate occurs in children not because they lack the relevant habits, but because of a bodily impediment—in the same way that even though individuals who are sleeping might have the *habits* of the virtues, they are nonetheless prevented by sleep from carrying out the *acts* of the virtues.

Reply to objection 1: Faith and charity are seated in the will of men, but in such away that the habits of these and the other virtues require not only (a) the power of the will, which does exist in children, but also (b) an act of will, which does not exist in children. And it is along these lines that, in *De Baptismo Parvulorum*, Augustine says, “Even if it is not yet the faith which consists in an act of the will that makes a child one of the faithful, it is already the sacrament of faith itself”—that is, that which causes the habit of faith—“that makes him to be one of the faithful.”

Reply to objection 2: As Augustine says in *De Caritate*, “No one is born again of water and the Holy Spirit except willingly”—something that should be understood to apply not to children, but to adults. And, similarly, the claim that a man “is not justified by Christ without him” should be understood to apply to adults.

On the other hand, the fact that by their own powers children about to be baptized put up resistance as much as they can “is not imputed to them, since to the extent that they do not know what they are doing, they seem not to be doing it,” as Augustine puts it in *De Praesentia Dei ad Dardanum*.

Reply to objection 3: As Augustine explains, “In the case of young children, Mother Church allows the feet of others to come forward, the heart of others to believe, the tongue of others to speak.” And so the children believe not through their own act, but through the faith of the Church, which is shared with them. And by virtue of this faith, grace and the virtues are conferred on them.

Reply to objection 4: A carnal intention on the part of those who bring young children to baptism does no harm to them, just as the sin of one individual does no harm to another unless the latter consents. Hence, in *Epistola ad Bonifacium* Augustine says, “Do not worry that some bring their young children to receive baptism not in the hope that their children might be born again to eternal life by means of spiritual grace, but because they intend that by this remedy their children might preserve or recover their bodily health. For it is not the case that because the children are not brought forward with the intention that they should be regenerated, they are thereby not regenerated.”

Article 7

Is the opening of the gates to the heavenly kingdom an effect of baptism?

It seems that the opening of the gates to the heavenly kingdom is not an effect of baptism (*effectus baptismi non sit apertio ianuae regni caelestis*):

Objection 1: That which is open does not need to be opened. But the gates of the heavenly kingdom were opened by the passion of Christ; hence, Apocalypse 4:1 says, “After this I saw a great door standing open in heaven.” Therefore, the opening of the gates of the heavenly kingdom is not an effect of baptism.

Objection 2: Baptism has its effect at all times from the time at which it was instituted. But as is shown in John 3:22-26, some were baptized with Christ’s baptism before His passion, and if they had died at that time, entry into the heavenly kingdom would not have been open to them, since no one entered into that kingdom before Christ—this according to Micah 2:13 (“He went up, opening the way before them”). Therefore the opening of the gates of the heavenly kingdom is not an effect of baptism.

Objection 3: As was explained above (a. 3), the baptized are still liable to death and to the other punishments of the present life. But as is clear from the case of those who are in purgatory, entry into the heavenly kingdom is not open to anyone as long as he is liable to punishment. Therefore, it is not the case that the opening of the gates of heaven is an effect of baptism.

But contrary to this: A Gloss of Bede’s on Luke 3:21 (“... heaven was opened”) says, “Here the power of baptism is shown. When an individual comes forth from it, the gates of heaven are opened to him.”

I respond: To open the gates of heaven is to remove an impediment by which an individual is prevented from entering the heavenly kingdom. But this impediment is sin and the debt of punishment. But it was shown above (aa. 1-2) that through baptism every sin, and likewise every debt of punishment, is removed. Hence, it follows that the opening of the gates of the heavenly kingdom is an effect of baptism.

Reply to objection 1: Baptism opens the gates of the heavenly kingdom to the one who is baptized to the extent that it incorporates him into the passion of Christ by applying the power of the passion to a man.

Reply to objection 2: When the passion of Christ had been completed only in the faith of the believers and not yet in reality, baptism caused the opening of the gates in a proportionate way—not, to be sure, in reality, but in hope. For the baptized who were then dead looked forward with a sure hope to their entrance into the heavenly kingdom.

Reply to objection 3: One who is baptized is liable to death and to the punishments of the present life not because of a personal debt of punishment, but because of the status of the nature. And so he is not for this reason prevented from entering the heavenly kingdom when his soul is separated from his body in death, since that which the nature owes has, as it were, already been paid.

Article 8

Does baptism have an equal effect in everyone?

It seems that baptism does not have an equal effect in everyone (*baptismus non habeat in omnibus aequalem effectum*):

Objection 1: The effect of baptism is the removal of sin. But it removes more sins in some

individuals than in others. For in young children it removes only *original* sin, whereas in adults it also removes *actual* sins, more in some cases and fewer in others. Therefore, baptism does not have an equal effect in everyone.

Objection 2: Grace and the virtues are conferred on a man through baptism. But after baptism some individuals seem to have more grace and more perfect virtue than others who have been baptized. Therefore, baptism does not have an equal effect in everyone.

Objection 3: Nature is brought to completion through grace in the way that matter is brought to completion by form. But form is received in matter according to the matter's capacity. Therefore, since in some of the baptized, even young children, there is more natural capacity than in others, it seems that certain individuals receive more grace than others.

Objection 4: In baptism some individuals receive not only spiritual health but bodily health as well; this is clear in the case of Constantine, who was cleansed of leprosy in his baptism. But not all individuals with bodily infirmities receive bodily health in baptism. Therefore, baptism does not have an equal effect in everyone.

But contrary to this: Ephesians 4:5 says, "One faith, one baptism." But a uniform cause has a uniform effect. Therefore, baptism has an equal effect in everyone.

I respond: Baptism has two sorts of effect, one in its own right (*per se*) and one incidental (*per accidens*).

Now a *per se* effect of baptism is an effect for which baptism was instituted, viz., to generate men into the spiritual life. Hence, since all young children are related equally to baptism—for they are baptized not with their own act of faith but with the faith of the Church—they all receive an equal effect in baptism. By contrast, adults, who approach baptism with their own proper act of faith, are not all related equally to baptism; for some of them approach baptism with more devotion and some with less devotion. And so some individuals receive more and some receive less of the grace of newness, in the way that those who come closer to the same fire receive more heat from it, even though, as far as the fire in its own right is concerned, it pours out its heat equally upon everyone.

On the other hand, a *per accidens* effect of baptism is an effect that baptism is not ordered toward; instead, the divine power works this sort of effect miraculously. As a Gloss on Romans 6:6 ("... in order that we might no longer be slaves to sin") puts it, "What is not made available in baptism, except by an ineffable miracle on the part of our Creator, is that the law of sin (*lex peccati*) that exists in our members should be absolutely destroyed." Such effects are not received equally by all of the baptized, even if they come forward with equal devotion; instead, effects of this sort are dispensed according to the order of divine providence.

Reply to objection 1: The very least baptismal grace is sufficient to erase all sins. Hence, it is not because of a greater efficacy on the part of baptism that it remits more sins in some individuals and fewer sins in other individuals. Instead, this is because of the condition of the subjects, since in each of them baptism remits whatever sins it finds.

Reply to objection 2: There are two possible ways in which greater or lesser grace can occur in the baptized:

In one way, as has been explained, due to the fact that one individual receives greater grace than another because his devotion is greater.

In the other way, because even if they receive equal grace, they do not make equal use of that grace; instead, one of them progresses more zealously in grace, whereas the other falls short in God's grace due to his negligence.

Reply to objection 3: Diverse capacities in men do not stem from a diversity with respect to their minds, which are renewed through baptism, since all men, being of the same species, agree in form; instead, diverse capacities stem from diverse bodily dispositions.

However, it is otherwise in the case of angels, who differ in species from one another. And so angels, but not men, are given diverse gifts of grace according to their diverse capacities of their natures (*secundum capacitatem naturalium*).

Reply to objection 4: Baptism has bodily health not as a *per se* effect, but instead as a miraculous [*per accidens*] effect worked in accord with God's providence.

Article 9

Does deception impede the effect of baptism?

It seems that deception does not impede the effect of baptism (*fictio non impedit effectum baptismi*):

Objection 1: In Galatians 3:27 the Apostle says, "All of us who have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ." But all who receive the baptism of Christ are baptized in Christ. Therefore, they all put on Christ—something that is an effect of baptism. And deception does not impede the effect of baptism.

Objection 2: What is operating in baptism is the divine power, which can change a man's will to that which is good. But the effect of an agent cause cannot be impeded by something that can be taken away by that cause. Therefore, deception cannot impede the effect of baptism.

Objection 3: Grace, to which sin is opposed, is an effect of baptism. But there are many other sins more grievous than deception, and none of them is said to impede the effect of baptism. Therefore, neither does deception impede the effect of baptism.

But contrary to this: Wisdom 1:5 says, "The holy spirit of discipline will flee from the deceitful." But the effect of baptism is from the Holy Spirit. Therefore, deception impedes the effect of baptism.

I respond: As Damascene says, "God does not force a man to become righteous (*non cogit hominem ad iustitiam*). And so for an individual to be justified through baptism, it is required that the man's will embrace both baptism and baptism's effect.

Now an individual is being called 'deceptive' here by the fact that his act of will stands in contradiction either to baptism or to its effect. For according to Augustine, there are four ways in which someone is called 'deceptive' here: (a) he is not a believer, even though baptism is the sacrament of faith; (b) by the fact that he disdains the sacrament itself; (c) by the fact that he celebrates the sacrament in some alternative way, not observing the Church's rite; and (d) by the fact that he is approaching the sacrament without devotion.

Hence, it is clear that deception impedes the effect of baptism.

Reply to objection 1: There are two possible senses of what it is to be baptized in Christ:

In one way, *in Christ*, i.e., in conformity with Christ. And in this sense any individuals who are baptized in Christ while conformed to Him through faith and charity put on Christ through *grace*.

In the other sense, individuals are said to be baptized in Christ insofar as they receive the sacrament of Christ. And in this sense everyone puts on Christ through the configuration of the *character*, but not through a conformity of *grace*.

Reply to objection 2: When God changes a man's act of will from evil to good, the man does not come forward as a deceiver. But God does not always do this. Nor is the sacrament ordered toward an individual's becoming a non-deceiver from having been a deceiver. Instead, it is ordered toward an individual who comes forward as a non-deceiver being justified.

Reply to objection 3: An individual is called a deceiver by the fact that he presents himself as one who wills something that he does not in fact will. If an individual comes forward for baptism, by that very fact he presents himself as having correct faith in Christ, as venerating the sacrament, and as willing

to withdraw from sin. Hence, if there is *any* sin that a man wants to adhere to, then if he comes forward for baptism, he is coming forward as a deceiver, i.e., he is coming forward without devotion. (However, this should be understood to apply to mortal sin, which is contrary to grace, and not to venial sin.) Hence, deception here in a certain sense includes every sin.

Article 10

If the deception ends, does the baptism attain its effect?

It seems not to be the case that baptism attains its effect if the deception ends (*fictio recedente, baptismus suum effectum non consequatur*):

Objection 1: A work of the dead (*opus mortuum*), which is without charity, cannot ever be vivified. But an individual who approaches baptism as a deceiver receives the sacrament without charity. Therefore, the baptism can never be vivified in such a way that it confers grace.

Objection 2: The deception seems to be stronger than the baptism, since it impedes the baptism's effect. But what is stronger is not removed by what is weaker. Therefore, the sin of deception cannot be removed through a baptism impeded by deception. And such a baptism will not attain its effect, which is the remission of all sins.

Objection 3: It can happen that an individual comes forward deceptively for baptism and after the baptism commits many sins. But these sins are not removed through the baptism, since baptism removes past sins and not future sins. Therefore, such a baptism will never attain its effect, which is the remission of all sins.

But contrary to this: As Augustine says in *De Baptismo*, "Baptism begins to contribute to salvation at the moment when (*tunc cum*) the deception ceases by means of a truthful confession—a deception which, while the heart persisted in malice and sacrilege, did not allow the washing away of the sins to be accomplished."

I respond: As has been explained above (q. 66, a. 9), baptism is a sort of spiritual regeneration. But when something is regenerated, it receives, along with the form, the effect of the form, unless there is some impediment. And when the impediment is removed, the form of the generated thing brings its effect to completion—just as, when a heavy body is generated, it immediately moves downward, unless there is something preventing this, and when that thing is removed, the body immediately begins to move downward. Similarly, when an individual is baptized, he receives the *character*, a sort of form, and it attains its proper effect, which is the grace that remits all sins. But sometimes there is an impediment because of deception. Hence, it must be the case that when the impediment is removed through repentance, the baptism immediately attains its effect.

Reply to objection 1: The sacrament of baptism is a work of God and not of man. And so it is not a dead work in a deceiver who is baptized without charity.

Reply to objection 2: The deception is removed not through baptism, but through repentance. And once the deception is removed, the baptism takes away every sin, along with the debt of punishment for every sin, that precedes the baptism, as well as every sin and debt of punishment that exists simultaneously with the baptism. Hence, in *De Baptismo* Augustine says, "Yesterday is forgiven, and whatever is left over—even at the very last hour and moment before the baptism and during the baptism—is forgiven. From that time on, however, the debt of punishment exists continuously." And so the baptism and the repentance come together to attain the effect of the baptism, but the baptism acts as a *per se* cause (*sicut causa per se agens*), whereas the repentance acts as *per accidens* cause (*sicut causa per accidens*), i.e., as a cause that removes an obstacle.

Reply to objection 3: The effect of baptism is to remove present and past sins, and not future sins. And so, after the deception ceases, subsequent sins are removed through the sacrament of penance and not through baptism. Hence, unlike the sins that precede baptism, these subsequent sins are not remitted with respect to the entire debt of punishment.