Investigation into the Apocryphal Books

Authored by
JOHANN HENRICO HEIDEGGER, D.D., S.T.D.
With the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in pursuit of theological examination,
To be defended with vigor
By
JOHANNES NÖZLINUS and CONRADUS SULZBERGERUS,
Candidates for the Sacred Ministry.
June, Hours L.Q.S.
Geneva
Printed by David Gessner, 1675.

Investigation into the Apocryphal Books

I. The Roman Church equates the Apocryphal Books (such as the Codices Tobit, Judith, 3 Esdras, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Baruch, and the additions to Esther and Daniel) with the canonical ones, to the extent of anathematizing those who think otherwise. However, the catholic Church, following the divine command in Jeremiah 15:19 to distinguish between the precious and the worthless, does not deny that some of these books, especially Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, are very good and useful, and even preferable for ecclesiastical writings. Yet, it strongly denies that they are divine, canonical, and infallible, to the extent that they can serve as apodictic evidence in matters of faith.

II. Firstly, divine and canonical books were written by prophets, that is, by those whose authority in teaching the Church was indubitable and acknowledged. Consequently, canonical writings are explicitly identified as prophetic in the Scriptures (Luke 24:27, Romans 1:2, 2 Peter 1:19-21). The Apocryphal books, however, were not written by prophets.

III. An anonymous critic tries to refute this argument by questioning which prophet wrote the Book of Judges or Ruth, arguing that if the authorship of some canonical books is unknown, it doesn’t mean their authors were not prophets. However, the testimony of Christ and the apostles, who called the Old Testament writers prophets, and their writings prophetic, refutes this claim. Prophetic authority lies in the divine authorship and the content, not the human scribe’s name.

IV. Furthermore, the Apocryphal books were written at a time when the prophetic gift had already ceased in the Church, specifically after Malachi, the last prophet of the Old Testament. This is evidenced by ancient Jewish tradition, which states that the Holy Spirit departed from Israel after the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

V. The anonymous critic cites some early church fathers who considered certain authors of the Apocryphal books to be prophets. Yet, these human testimonies do not equate to divine testimony. Moreover, the fathers often spoke in a popular, non-technical manner, calling books sacred, divine, or canonical in a broad sense, not in the precise sense of being divine and canonical.

VI. Secondly, most Apocryphal books were written in Greek, a language unknown to the Jewish people at that time. God never addressed His Church in an unfamiliar language. Though some parts of the Old Testament are in Aramaic, it was well understood by the people at that time. The Greek translation by the Seventy was intended for Jews living in dispersion, not for those in the land of Canaan.

VII. Thirdly, the Apocryphal books were never included in the Jewish canon. The Church of the Old Testament was entrusted with the oracles of God (Romans 3:2), and what it did not receive as divine cannot be divine now. The books were written during the period of the second temple, a time devoid of prophetic inspiration, as confirmed by ancient Jewish and Christian testimony.

VIII. The anonymous critic wrongly invokes the testimony of Isidore and Augustine, who referred to a broader ecclesiastical canon, not to the strictly divine and canonical books.

IX. The suggestion that the Apocryphal books were written during a later Jewish council, which added them to the canon, is unsupported by any reliable witness.

X. The Apocryphal books do not meet the criteria of divine books, as they lack the intrinsic power to demonstrate their divine authority to the conscience of the faithful, unlike the canonical books of the Old Testament.

XI. The claim that preferring the Jewish canon makes us Jews or unfaithful Christians is unjust. We, along with Christ and the apostles, acknowledge only the canonical scriptures of the Old Testament, which contain the full counsel of God.

XII. Finally, the Apocryphal books contain many things that are dubious and fabulous, inconsistent with truth and piety, proving they are not divine. For example, the Book of Tobit has inconsistencies and statements that cannot be reconciled with divine truth.

XIII. In the Latin book of Tobit, chapter III.7, IV.21, IX.2, Sara and Gabelus are placed in different towns, yet both in the city of Rages in Media. In chapter V.4, 7, 16, 17, the angel lies about his lineage. He claims to be staying with Gabriel, a brother (V.7), and when questioned by the elder Tobias about his tribe and family (V.16-17), he responds according to the Greek text that he descends from Azariah and Ananiah, great brothers of Tobias, or according to the Vulgate version, that he is Azariah, son of the great Ananiah. This pretense of the angel misleads the elder Tobias, who acknowledges him as coming from a good and honest lineage. This deception cannot be justified: either the companion of the younger Tobias was the angel Raphael and thus not Azariah, or he was Azariah and therefore not the angel Raphael.

XIV. In the Book of Judith, the miraculous deliverance of the illustrious people of God is described, which cannot be referred to the times preceding the captivity or to the times following it. Not to the times preceding, because in chapter 5:21-22, the captivity of the people and their return are mentioned. Not to the immediately following times, which seems to be indicated in chapter 4:2. For how can this be admitted when Holofernes, the general of Nebuchadnezzar's army, is completely ignorant of the state of the Israelite people? For he inquires anxiously in chapter 5:2, like a man transported to another world, "Who are these people, what cities do they inhabit, what is their strength, who was their king," etc. And in chapter 16:30, after the death of Holofernes, while Judith was still alive and after her death, it is said that for a long time there was no terror to frighten the Israelites. But Holofernes is said to have been sent by Nebuchadnezzar in the 15th year of his reign. However, in the 19th year of his reign, the same Nebuchadnezzar burned the city.

XV. In the Book of Baruch, it is strange that he wrote in Babylon in the fifth year, at the time when Jerusalem was burned, to the priests, so that they might offer sacrifices in the house of God, as read in chapter 1:2, 2:6-7. However, from Jeremiah 43:6, it is clear that Baruch stayed with Jeremiah in Jerusalem and went with him to Egypt.

XVI. In the Book of Ecclesiasticus (Sirach), we find errors such as in chapter 24:14 about created wisdom, chapter 46:20 about the false Samuel, and chapter 48:10 about Elijah. Moreover, the author explicitly renounces the canonical authority in the prologue of the book, where he distinctly separates his writings from the Law and the Prophets, that is, from the truly canonical ones, acknowledges his own weakness, and excuses his difficulty in translating from Hebrew.

XVII. In the First Book of Maccabees chapter 1:6-7, Alexander the son of Philip, while still alive but near death, is said to have divided his kingdom among his illustrious servants who were brought up with him. This contradicts Daniel 8:22 and 11:4, where the division of the kingdom is established after the destruction of the king and the kingdom, as well as the era of Antiochus 157, from the beginning of Seleucus, not from the death of Alexander, as mentioned in 1 Maccabees 8:7-8 and 1 Maccabees 12:7. Additionally, in 1 Maccabees 8:7-8, 16 about the Romans, things are said that do not agree with reality, and neither does what is said in chapter 10 about Alexander, the son of Antiochus the Illustrious, and in chapter 12:7 about Darius, king of the Spartans (who cannot be Arius since Sparta was under tyranny).

XVIII. In the Second Book of Maccabees, especially, one finds glaring falsehoods, such as in chapter 1:10 about the letter of Judas, who died in 152, chapter 1:13-16 about the murder of Antiochus, contrary to Daniel 8:25 and 1 Maccabees 6:4 (where the first book does not agree with the second), chapter 1:18-22 about the fire from water and Nehemiah the temple builder, contrary to the truth of Ezra 1, chapter 2:4 about Jeremiah hiding the tabernacle, ark, and altar of incense, and chapter 8 about the false prophecy of Jeremiah concerning their discovery, contrary to Jeremiah 3:16 and 4 Esdras 10:22. Chapter 10:5 about the two-year pollution of the temple, which contradicts 1 Maccabees 1:54 and 4:52 as well as Josephus. Chapter 12:1 about

the death of Rhazis, whose narrative is both incredible and less pious in its praise. Moreover, the author of this book confesses that he has condensed the books of Jason of Cyrene and has swallowed the difficult labor of writing, and even doubts whether he has achieved the desired result, which does not argue for the author's credibility.

XIX. In the Book of Wisdom, there are things that reveal the author's vanity. The author pretends in chapters 7-9 to be Solomon, the king of Israel, when in fact he previously alluded to the Olympic games of the Greeks in chapter 4, whose institution was two centuries after Solomon.

XX. We have chosen to present these few examples. Neither does the Anonymous appeal to Bellarmine here, nor does he impose upon us the necessity of responding, even accusing us of fraud if we refuse to comply. This is the impudence of a madman. But it is better to refute both the crime alleged and vigorously turn it back on the Adversary himself. For Bellarmine's elaborate efforts to disguise and gloss over those errors are exposed by their vanity and have been thoroughly discussed by our theologians. Among many others, I cite two, namely, the Censure of Apocryphal Books by the illustrious John Rainolds, English theologian and professor at Oxford University, and the disputations of the illustrious senior Spanheim. Let the boaster, if he dares, confront them and thereby defend his prostrate Bellarmine. But he will desist, I am sure, and even the most learned and sharp-witted will succumb to the burden.

XXI. Fifth, Christ and the Apostles never included the Apocryphal books in the Canon, never cited or praised them, never referred the faithful to them, and finally defined the Divine books only as the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, among which the Apocrypha are not included. Let us be allowed to follow the holy footsteps of Christ and the Apostles, to whom alone we have vowed allegiance.

XXII. The notable sophistry of the Adversary is to divide what is united. For we do not base our argument solely on citation, nor do we reject from the Canon those books not cited by Christ and the Apostles, but those which are neither cited nor can be classified among those declared by Christ and the Apostles.

XXIII. Certainly, every canonical book of the Old Testament has some trace of the promised Messiah, indeed the outstanding duty of the Prophets was to testify about the Messiah, as stated in John 5:39, Acts 3:22, and 10:43, and indeed the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy as stated in Revelation 19:10. No book (whole books, not individual parts) will be found that does not either repeat an oracle about Christ, describe a type, or extend a part of His genealogy. But in the Apocryphal books, there is profound silence about the Messiah.

XXIV. The adversary would never have dared to deny that the Divine books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles were cited by the Apostles, unless he were a stranger to the Scriptures. Let him read the eleventh chapter of Paul's letter to the Hebrews, and recognize that some things cited there are from those books.

XXV. He is also mistaken and deceives when he claims that the passages in Romans 11:34 and Matthew 27:54 are cited from the Apocrypha, the former from Wisdom 9:13 and the latter from Wisdom 11:23-25. It is not so. For as to the former, it is manifestly cited from Isaiah 40:13. For the exact words are found in the Greek version of that passage. But the words in the Book of Wisdom are notably different. The latter passage is not cited from Wisdom 11:23-25, where there is no mention of Christ, nor do the words match, but from Psalm 22:1, as is very clearly repeated. The Adversary thus infelicitously demonstrates himself as an unacquainted guest in both the canonical and apocryphal scriptures.

XXVI. Sixth, the testimonies of the early Churches, both Greek and Latin, support us. And since the elegant man, more skilled in speaking like a dog to the ignorant rabble than in eloquence, accuses the author of the Preface, vindicating the consensus of the primitive Church to us, and objects to the entire Church of our times with deceit, hypocrisy, and other frauds, let us present a few testimonies beyond exception. Let the following testimonies from the Greek Church serve.

XXVII. In the second century after Christ flourished Melito of Sardis, an equal of Saint Polycarp. He undertook a journey to the East and brought back no other canon of the Old Testament books than ours, as his epistle to Onesimus, approved by Eusebius in *Ecclesiastical History* 4.26, shows. He made no other distinction, except that he counted Esther among the books of Ezra, and the Proverbs under the name of Wisdom. In the third century, Origen, in the preface to the Psalms, reported by Eusebius in *Ecclesiastical History* 6.25, recounting the number of sacred books, says: "It should not be ignored that there are twenty-two books of the Old Testament according to the Hebrews, which is the same number as the letters of their alphabet." In the fourth century, Athanasius in

his *Synopsis* and in his *Festal Letter* 39, and Gregory Nazianzen in his Iambic verse, proclaim the same canon. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* 4.36 adds: "Read the twenty-two canonical books of the Old Testament." Basil in his fourth book against Eunomius, chapter 3, speaks similarly. He acknowledges Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees as apocryphal. Even the seventy translators, and the Greek authors of the New Testament, followed the same canon. For the citations in the New Testament, which are acknowledged to be taken from the Greek version, are only from books counted as canonical by the Hebrews.

XXVIII. Nor are the testimonies of the Latin Fathers less favorable to us. Tertullian in his book *Against the Jews* says: "The books of the Old Testament are two and twenty." This canon is also supported by Jerome in his *Prologus Galeatus*, where he says: "So that we may know what books are to be received, it is fitting to number them according to the Hebrew tradition, which are twenty-two, and these are divided into three classes: Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa." Rufinus in his commentary on the Apostles' Creed, in Eusebius' fourth book *On the Scriptures*, and Augustine in his book *On Christian Doctrine* (Book 2, Chapter 8) all report the same canon. They all unanimously agree, as if to prevent any possibility of error, that only these twenty-two books should be received as canonical.

XXIX. We will end here with testimonies from the early Fathers of both Churches, even though more might be cited. It is clear from the above that the early Churches recognized only these books as canonical and divine. They omitted the apocryphal books, which are today canonized by the Roman Church.

XXX. Concerning Innocent I, Gelasius, and the Carthaginian Council, often cited by those who misuse their testimonies, let Cardinal Cajetan of the Roman Church speak for us. At the end of his commentary on the historical books of the Old Testament, he says: "Do not be disturbed, new reader, if you find these Apocryphal books counted among the Canonical ones, whether in sacred councils or among sacred doctors. The words of the councils and the doctors must be interpreted according to Jerome's rule. According to his letter to Chromatius and Heliodorus, these books (and if there are others like them in the Canon of the Bible) are not canonical, that is, they are not regular for establishing those things that pertain to faith. They can, however, be called canonical, that is, regular, for the edification of the faithful, as they are accepted and authorized in the Bible's canon. With this distinction, you can discern the words of Augustine and the writings in the Provincial Council of Carthage. This distinction, which conforms to the words of St. Augustine previously cited, must necessarily be accepted if we do not want to oppose the Fathers of the Council of Carthage and St. Augustine with the whole ancient Greek and Latin Synagogue."

XXXI. The testimony of the Nicene Synod regarding the Book of Judith is cited by the adversary, certainly to no avail. Jerome's words in the preface to the Book of Judith read: "Among the Hebrews, the Book of Judith is read among the Apocrypha; its authority is considered less adequate for confirming those things that come into contention. However, because the Nicene Synod is read to have counted this book among the sacred scriptures, I yielded to your request, or rather your demand, and gave this one little effort to the task despite my other engagements, etc." The authority of St. Jerome is of great weight to us in this argument, for he certainly knew what he was pronouncing. However, was Jerome present at that Council? He wasn't even born at that time. It could be said that one eyewitness is worth more than ten hearsay witnesses. If Eusebius, Cecilian, or Athanasius, who were present at the Synod, had affirmed this about the Synod, it would be more credible. It could also be said that Jerome is a single witness, and as jurists say, a single ear-witness is not sufficient. As Cicero says, even Cato himself could not be believed if he were alone. Nonetheless, to me, Jerome is as credible as a thousand witnesses. Did St. Jerome then say that the Nicene Council counted the Book of Judith among the sacred scriptures? An anonymous writer attributes this statement to him. Jerome says that this book is read as counted among the sacred scriptures. We believe what Jerome wrote. Does it follow then that the Synod counted it so? By no means. There is a significant difference between these two statements. Jerome did not believe what he wrote as read. For in his preface to Eusebius's Chronicle, he teaches that the Church most diligently embraced the doctrines of the Nicene Council. Yet elsewhere, in his preface to Solomon, he writes: "The Church indeed reads these books of Judith, Maccabees, Wisdom, etc., but does not receive them." Therefore, according to Jerome himself, the Synod did not count the Book of Judith among the sacred scriptures because the Church, which he says most diligently embraced the doctrines of the Nicene Council, did not receive the Book of Judith. Hence, William Lindanus, a man of great authority

among the Pontificials, proves that nothing was defined on this matter in the Nicene Council by the authority of the Laodicean Council confirmed by the Sixth Council of Constantinople.

XXXII. Finally, the author of the preface, not without serious cause, cited the clear support of St. Jerome in the Prologue of Galeatus. For in his preface to the Books of Kings, which he called the Galeate Prologue, he states that anything outside these is to be considered Apocryphal, and he lists the same books of Moses, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, which we include in the canon. He explicitly rejects the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees. He repeats and expands on this list in his letter to Paulinus. In his preface to Solomon's books, he again distinctly segregates the Apocrypha. This opinion of Jerome must indeed hold great authority in the Latin Church, as they effectively made it their own by appending the Galeate Prologue to the Latin Bibles.

XXXIII. What does the anonymous writer say to this? He admits that these things are true, but claims that Jerome changed his opinion after seeing the Nicene Council, which counted the Book of Judith among the sacred scriptures. What a shameful statement! Why would the writer thank God for Jerome's error, as judged by Jerome himself? Is this person delighted by human error? Furthermore, why does he dare to accuse Jerome of such ignorance and rashness? If, when writing the Galeate Prologue, he had before him the complete Acts of the Nicene Synod where Apocryphal books were equated with canonical ones, what rashness would it have been to ignore such significant Synod definitions and write the Prologue with great confidence, excluding the Apocrypha from the list of canonical books? If Jerome had indeed been so audacious, would the Church have tolerated it and appended the Prologue to the Bibles, contradicting the Sacred Oecumenical Council? Neither Jerome nor the Church ever bound themselves to such folly. As we have seen, the Nicene Synod did not include the Apocrypha.

XXXIV. But the writer still objects with the Florentine and Tridentine Synods, adding that if Jerome had seen those councils, he would have immediately submitted to their authority with a devout mind. I seriously doubt, for grave reasons, whether Jerome, if he had lived in the time of the Tridentine Council, deprived of the antiquity that now protects him among his adversaries, would have been treated any more gently than our heroes Zwingli and Luther. Would his writings have escaped the dreadful anathemas of Trent? As for the Florentine Council, it was not only non-ecumenical but also the work of Eugene's deceit, contrary to the Council of Basel, from which he was cited, declared contumacious, and solemnly deposed. Its decrees and actions contain no canon on the Apocrypha, as the editions of Lawrence Surius, Peter Crabbe, and Dominic Nicolini of Venice demonstrate. The charge of forgery against Caranza, the epitomizer, has been clearly established by the learned Rainoldus in his Censure of the Apocryphal Books, Part 1, Chapter 4. Certainly, if the Florentine Synod had defined that canon, neither Archbishop Antoninus of Florence, who attended the council, would have dared to lower the authority of the Apocrypha as he did in his work (Part 1, Title 13, Chapter 6), nor would the Tridentine Fathers have allowed themselves to question their authority, as the history of their fiercest dissensions during the council testifies.

XXXV. Thus, all reasoning and authority for the Apocrypha ultimately rests on the Tridentine Council. In its Fourth Session, on April 8, 1546, seventy Spanish bishops, not even in full agreement, pronounced with unprecedented audacity on such a significant matter, and shamelessly attributed divinity to books written by human authority. Just as they added Saints as mediators alongside Christ, the sole head of the Church, and other sacrifices alongside the unique sacrifice, so they did not hesitate to equate human Apocryphal books, of whatever kind, with the divine scriptures. This was not sufficient for them. They also stripped all dignity from the true canon, as they subjected it to the Pope's lust and authority, resolving all faith in the Pope as the ultimate deity of the Papists.

XXXVI. The anonymous writer's conclusion swells with empty boastfulness, threats, and curses. He threatens an examination of our newly revised vernacular version. I would rather he stop lurking in the shadows like a night owl and reveal himself openly. This man, who has published several such writings anonymously and even pretended to be a Swabian, is known for nothing but impudence and senile chatter. If anyone desires to examine our version, considered excellent by all truly learned scholars, they must be well-versed in the original languages. But the anonymous writer lacks this aid, for it is evident that the Hebrew language is barbarous to him, or rather he is a barbarian in that language, scarcely able to read Greek and only slightly better at Latin. If he considers himself well-fed, prepared, and equipped with all aids, he has ample field for displaying his learning, particularly with the current Vulgate version, which, filled with errors, demands a critic's sharp pen. We must earnestly pray to God that He may restrain the audacity of these enemies of truth, illuminate and sanctify their minds with His unmistakable word, and bring our beloved homeland back to the unity of faith and preserve it in peace. Amen.

DISPUTATION CONCERNING THE AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE,

Which Under the Presidency of
The Reverend and Most Illustrious Man,
DR. JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY,
and Most Celebrated Professor in the Renowned Academy of Zurich, his Patron forever to be revered and honored,
is Publicly Presented
by
MATTHIAS BISATZIUS, OF ENGADINE-RHETUS, Author and Respondent.
ON THE DAY OF JUNE ___, 1682.
ZURICH,
From the Schaufelberger Print Shop, 1682.

To the Most Reverend, Most Illustrious and Most Learned Men,

Mr. JOHN JAMES VEDROSIO, Most Faithful Head of the Church of Chur, and Most Deserving Dean of the Rhaetian Synod.
Mr. SATURNINUS ZAFFIO, Likewise Most Vigilant Herald of the Church of Chur, Most Illustrious Assessor.
Mr. OTTO GRASSO, Most Skillful Pastor of the Church of Sils, Most Learned Assessor.
And also to the Most Distinguished Man, conspicuous for his great experience and practice in many affairs,
Mr. JOHN JAMES WAGNER, of Zurich, Most Experienced Doctor of Medicine, his specially revered and esteemed Host and Patron.
This Theological Exercise of His Study, in a Most Humbly Observant Sign of Gratitude, Duty, Honor, and Pledge of Further Goodwill,
by the Author Matthias Bisatzius.

I. When we are about to discuss the Authority of Holy Scripture, or the Written Word of God, it should be considered that by the Authority of Scripture is understood either its intrinsic Dignity, which it has from its Author, which is always equal, whether or not the esteem of men is added to it; or the external Judgment or Estimation of men concerning it; which they then rightly form, when they revere and scrutinize with due reverence and diligence both the Majesty of the Author and His revealed will.
But this judgment of men varies greatly. Hence so many errors, both open and concealed, have crept into the Church. And indeed the supporters of open errors, both by defect, as the Jews, Manicheans, Ebionites, etc., eliminating various truly canonical books; and by excess, as the Gentiles, who hold the Sibylline leaves; the Muhammadans, who hold the Koran; the Papists, who offer both the Apocryphal books and the Decretals of the Popes as Divine Scriptures, have sinned.

II. Moreover, by concealing, when they think that the Sacred Writers have sometimes seriously stumbled, as the Socinians do; the Papists, suspending the Authority of Holy Scripture in an ignominious way from the Authority of the Church, defend their cause only by sophistry. But since it is of great importance that the most august Authority of Holy Scripture should stand firm and unshaken; for, as Augustine testifies, "If the authority of the Scriptures is shaken, then our Christian faith itself will totter," we confess that in treating the proposed question, we have to deal with the Papists. But since the Council of Trent passed over this question in silence, the opinion of the Papists must be gathered from their other writings. And it is not our purpose to enumerate the opinions of individual Papists on this matter: we choose to touch upon one or two. And indeed, Stapleton, in Book IX, Chapter 1, writes: "We should hold the Scriptures in all the reverence they deserve in themselves: but they would not be held in such high honor by us, unless the testimony of the Church were added. For that (he says) considers the reverence due to Scripture in itself; this, the same reverence as it relates to us."

Eckius, in his Enchiridion on the Authority of the Church, answer 2 to the Objection, says: "The Church is older than the Scriptures, and Scripture is not authentic except by the authority of the Church." And in the margin he says, this argument is the Achilles for Catholics. Nor does Bellarmine in his Controversy on Councils say anything different. Moreover, by the Church, to

which even the authority of establishing the canon belongs, they understand not only that which existed in the time of the Apostles, but the succeeding one, and even the present Church. Indeed, sometimes they understand by the Church, the Pastors; sometimes, the Councils; sometimes, the Roman Pontiff.

III. But we judge and confess as follows: "We believe and profess that the Canonical Scriptures of the holy Prophets and Apostles of both Testaments are the true Word of God itself, and have sufficient authority from themselves, not from men." These are the words of the Helvetic Confession, Chapter 1. The meaning is this: The authority of the Sacred Books, by which it came about that they were included in the canon, is from their own nature: that is, by this very fact, that they are inspired by God, they are also Canonical, whether or not the Church decrees and acknowledges it. If it decrees and acknowledges that they are to be held as Canonical, then it does not confer authority upon them by doing so, but performs its duty by ministerially discerning the true from the false. But if it does not decree it, then it seriously errs, when it delays including in the canon a book which it knows to be truly divine. And in fact, they would have sinned, who did not acknowledge the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, etc., as Canonical, no matter that no decree of the Church had intervened.

IV. Therefore, we do not deny that it pertains to the Church to approve, acknowledge, receive, and promulgate the Scriptures; but we deny that we principally believe the Scriptures because of this testimony alone. But we shall constantly affirm that the testimony of the Spirit is far more illustrious and more certain than the testimony of the Church, without which the commendation of the Church would be of no weight at all with us. But by the name Church, we understand not the Pastors, Councils, or Pope, but the whole multitude of the faithful, taught by the Holy Spirit, that these books are canonical. Hence arises such a question as this:

Whence do we know that the Holy Scripture which we have is divine? Hence that trite saying of old, and even today: "Whence do you know that Scripture is divine? Whence do you know that the Gospel of Matthew is by Matthew?" The Papists respond: From the testimony of the Church alone: hence others add that if the testimony of the Church is set aside, Holy Scripture would be of no more value than the feathers of geese or the fables of Aesop.

V. We respond that the reason for this impious sect is this alone: that they may forge new dogmas at will, avoid examination of forged ones, and have some pretext for maintaining their psycho-tyranny. But this view is rejected, first, as impious; because by this dogma they arrogate to themselves the right of censorship over God Himself, and make not only our faith, but also the very voice of God, dependent upon themselves, so that in this matter the purple-robed Fathers of the Roman Curia truly imitate the ancient pride of the Roman Senate, among whom, as Tertullian testifies, "divinity was weighed by human judgment." Second, as absurd; because while the Pontiff thinks that the authority of Scripture depends on the Church, soon the Church subject to him, and his clergy, feigns to represent the Church; and thus he impiously subjects God to himself. Third, as self-contradictory: for when the Papists are asked whence the Church has such a right as to confer authority on the Word of God, they quickly respond: Because it was said to Peter, Matthew 16:18, "And upon this rock," etc. And so they betray their own

cause, so that they are compelled, even against their will, to confess that the authority of Scripture does not depend on the testimony of the Church.

VI. Therefore, to the former question we respond: This authority of the Divine Word becomes known to us by both the Divine Testimony, which in turn is either the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit or the external testimony of Scripture itself; and the Human Testimony. And we shall produce arguments in this order. First, some arguments for the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit, persuading us of the truth of Scripture. Second, some from the character of Holy Scripture itself, most strongly inculcating its own authority. Third, finally, we shall briefly discuss the authority of the Church itself concerning Scripture.

VII. Our first argument is this: If the testimony of the Holy Spirit is not supreme, then it will follow that there is some authority superior to the authority of the Holy Spirit. But the latter is blasphemous and absurd. Therefore, also the former. The Papists grant that the Testimony of God is superior to all authority; therefore, also to the authority of the Church. And so, when the Holy Spirit has led a certain believer into all truth, then such a one believes Scripture because of the supreme and principal testimony, which is that of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer; that is, he believes that the doctrine of the Spirit is the remaining truth, attesting to it in himself (1 John 5:6), and exciting faith in him through the Word (Romans 10:17), not because of the less principal, and therefore contingent, testimony of the Church.

VIII. To this argument. The Papists argue as follows: This testimony of the Spirit ought not to be private but public; so that it is not only from God, but also evidently from God: moreover, this is necessary, lest seductive spirits insinuate themselves under the title of the divine Spirit.

II. Many resist the Holy Spirit, like the Jews in Acts 7, whom Christ wished to gather together Matthew 12:37. Thus Paul exhorts, that they do not extinguish the Spirit. 1 Thessalonians 5:19.

III. The testimony of the Holy Spirit is given for the utility of the Church, 1 Corinthians 12:7. But this internal testimony does not contribute to the utility of others, because it is said to avail for confirming each of the believers, not others.

IV. Granted this internal testimony of the Holy Spirit, it follows that there is one private Spirit and another public one; indeed, the public one is simply superfluous.

IX. But we respond to the First Exception that it is First inept, because since we are speaking about the testimony of the Spirit, which pertains to infused faith, the public objection is raised in vain. For if faith is supernaturally created in the soul, then it is necessary that there be an internal power of the Spirit creating that faith. But if indeed it is internal, then it is private, not public. Therefore, since faith is immediately created by the Holy Spirit, for what reason then is the testimony of the Church, which they say is a means to induce faith, put forward? Since to happen immediately and through some means are contradictory.

Secondly, it is useless; For if the testimony of the Spirit is granted to be one public, the other private: still it is evident that the testimony from which faith is infused is private, not public. And since the divinity of Scripture is persuaded to us by the internal testimony of the Spirit, it follows that there are at least two testimonies of the Spirit - one indeed private, by which it happens that we all believe with certainty; the other public or ministerial and therefore inferior. Whence not only will it not be the sole, but not even the highest testimony of the Church. Thirdly, by public testimony they understand either the extraordinary, such as in the time of the Apostles; or the ordinary, which is only in Scripture, and nowhere else besides it. If the former, then revelations must be expected daily with the Anabaptists. If the latter, then both to us and to Scripture must be granted that it proves itself, and indeed by supreme authority.

X. To the Second Exception, we respond first: Faith is always the work of the Holy Spirit, which even the Papists concede. But to believe the Scriptures is a part of faith; Therefore, no one has this unless it is infused by the Spirit, and consequently we are first persuaded by the testimony of the Spirit. Secondly, it is the Fallacy of Ignorance of the Issue. Our argument deals with the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit persuading hearts to faith; but the cited passages deal partly with the external ministry; partly with conviction and refutation rendering an apology. And although Stephen, while evangelizing, was acted upon by the Holy Spirit, yet his hearers were destitute of it. Nor were these, as those in Acts 1 when Peter was pardoning, pierced in heart. Otherwise, without doubt, they would have exclaimed with those in Luke 24: "Did not our heart burn within us, while he spoke on the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?" Thirdly, we retort: If the Holy Spirit, exciting faith in us, will not be able to persuade us of the authority of Scripture, what will become of the Church, whose authority can only be proved from Scripture, but this from no one except the Holy Spirit? Thus the Arians denied the consubstantiality, although the whole Church affirmed it.

XI. To the Third, we respond by denying the Minor. The reason for the denial is that whoever is persuaded of the divinity of the Scriptures also invites others to believe, both by example and by exhortations. Nor is it valid what they say, that this internal testimony does not become known to others; Because although it cannot be employed to convince others, yet it becomes known not only to those in whom it resides, but also to others, although differently to those and these. Those in whom it resides are certain of its presence, since the spirit of a man knows what is in him, 1 Cor. 2:11. But those, as the disciples of Christ mutually recognize one another. Whence, never do others judge of others that they are truly believers; from this also it is certain that that internal testimony becomes known. But that is only from the motion of the Holy Spirit, by which each one of the sons of God is impelled to embrace the other sons of God with brotherly love. Whence also charity toward God and neighbor is said to be infused, because it is infused into the hearts of the faithful by the Holy Spirit.

XII. To the Fourth, we respond by denying the Consequence. For the Spirit of God is one and the same, both generally for the whole Church and singularly for each member, announcing the word of Christ to us both outwardly and inwardly, John 16:14. Nor is the public testimony more superfluous than the Doctrine by which we are commonly instructed in the Church; because of

the Doctrine by which we are singularly instructed by the Holy Spirit unto salvation, John 6:45, 1 John 2:20.

XIII. Our Second Argument: The faith by which we believe Scripture is infused faith; Therefore it is from the Holy Spirit. The Consequence is conceded by the Papists. The Antecedent is proved from Matthew 16: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood did not reveal these things to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Whence it is clear that Peter did not believe that Christ is the Son of God, except by infused faith, that is, by the Holy Spirit. Indeed, Paul in 1 Corinthians 12 denies that anyone can say "Lord Jesus" except by the Holy Spirit, and in Acts 16 it is said that Lydia's heart was opened by God, so that she attended to the things spoken by Paul.

XIV. They object: I. Granting that we believe by infused faith and by the gift of God: but besides this, the testimony of the Church is also required as a means inducing faith. II. No heretic can thus be convinced, relying on the testimony of the Holy Spirit. We respond to I. First, what then, if the testimony of the Church is required? These two things suffice for us to know: that this testimony is not sole, and that it is the office of the Holy Spirit to give us perspicuity concerning the Scriptures. Secondly, they contradict themselves; since they have so often affirmed that we believe principally on account of the testimony of the Church, now they concede that it is only an inductive instrument. We respond to II. First, I concede that they cannot be convinced, if indeed they are not first instructed concerning the authority of Scripture from the Holy Spirit. Second, it is falsely assumed that those who are destitute of the testimony of the Spirit can rely on it.

XV. But since Scripture is a light to our feet, it ought also to shine by its own light; since Scripture does not put forward a more obscure sense of its own truth than white or black things of their color, or sweet and bitter things of their taste.

XVI. Besides these excellent arguments, Scripture further defends its independent authority with most vigorous proofs. And indeed.

XVII. The testimony of Scripture is more certain than the testimony of the living voice of Pastors and Teachers. Therefore Scripture does not derive its authority for us from the Church. The Reason for the Consequence: Because the Papists in this controversy contend that by the name "Church" is understood not the very multitude of the faithful, but the assembly of Bishops and Teachers. The Antecedent is proved from John 5:36, where Christ, having said that he has a testimony greater than that of John, recounts his works, the testimony of the Father, and finally the Scriptures themselves, which he commands to be searched as testifying about himself. But John the Baptist was among the pastors of the Church; so that no one thereafter dared to arrogantly claim such authority for himself, much less a greater one.

XVIII. Objection by Stapleton: I. The question is not asked whether the testimony of Scripture or of the Church is greater, or more noble or more certain, in respect to the things which must be believed; but whether the Church can bear witness concerning Scripture itself? We respond first: It is the Fallacy of Ignorance of the Issue, for two things are asked in the state of the

controversy; Whether the testimony of the Church alone establishes the authority of Scripture for us? and next, if not alone, whether at least as primary? Both of which points were previously brought forward by the Papists, against which this is argued. But we never denied that the Church has its own parts in commending Scripture. Second, it is inept to speak of a "more noble testimony" in respect to the things which must be believed. Since Christ compares the testimonies, not with the things to be believed, but with each other.

Objection 2: Only the testimony of his own works and of the Father is said to be greater than the testimony of John. We respond: For what reason then does he add, "Search the Scriptures, and it is they that testify about me?"

XIX. I. Scripture was once received before the judgment of the Church. Therefore its authority for us did not depend on the judgment of the Church. The Antecedent is proved by the example of the Law promulgated by God, which was recited and accepted by the people in such a way that the votes of all or of certain select persons were not required. Deuteronomy 31:25. Thus without any preceding judgment of the Church, the former Epistle to the Corinthians, full of admonition and reproof, was received. Furthermore, they themselves confess that the Church does not make Scripture authentic, but only declares it so. Therefore, what is authentic in itself must necessarily also be authentic for us. For that cannot be called authentic which seems so to no one. For that has authority which suffices for itself, which commends itself, sustains itself, proves itself, and has faith and authority from itself, which is contrary to that which is unbelieving and unauthorized, uncertain and lacking authority.

XX. Nor is that common evasion valid in this controversy: That they were indeed authentic in themselves, but not for us. The reason: because no authority of those books can be conceived except for us: for this whole authority consists in this, that it be the rule of faith, whence it is designated by the name "canon"; But that faith cannot be understood except as our faith, wherefore if not for us, then it will have no authority at all. And if it has no authority for us except from the authority of the Church, then it will plainly have no authority except from the same authority. That distinction is also futile. For the first part of it shows the mode by which Scripture is the Word of God: the second not the mode, but the person for whom. Indeed, if we weigh the matter with fair scales of mind, these propositions do not seem to differ except verbally: "From the judgment of the Church depends the reverence owed to Scripture"; And: "From the judgment of the Church depends which books are to be received into the canon": since the Holy Scripture to which divine reverence is owed is found only in the canonical books; the Papists maintain the latter, and we the former.

XXI. Finally I ask, what and where is such a judgment of the Church? Certainly not in the writings of the Fathers, which are equally uncertain; nor is it more known that these are the books of Augustine than those of Paul. Nor in the living voice of the Church; then because leaving behind the venerable antiquity, we would impiously take refuge in the present Church alone: and finally because the same can be asked concerning the authority of the Church, how does such authority become known to us? Which if they wish to establish by the authority of the Scriptures, they betray their own ignorance by their own judgment, like a shrew. Nor do we

attribute such a right of judging to the Councils; since they, with authority not human but divine (which exists nowhere except Scripture, unless we profess enthusiasm), ought to be assembled; it is established and clearly manifest that the authority of Scripture was established before the Councils were celebrated.

XXII. That in whose absence an effect can be produced, is not the cause of that effect per se. But the effect, namely assent given to the Scriptures, can be produced in the absence (ignorance) of the authority of the Church. Therefore, the authority of the Church is not the cause per se of this assent The Major premise needs no proof, since there is an essential connection between a cause per se and its effect. Nor does the Minor premise present any difficulties; since it can happen that Scripture exerts its efficacy in someone who otherwise held it in no authority. Among others, the Christian convert from Judaism, Christian Gerson, testifies to this by his own example, writing about himself somewhere: "In the presence of my two relatives Lazarus and Simeon, I read through the entire New Testament code, not without blasphemies. In the meantime, my heart (N.B.) was struck; and when I noticed that the Evangelists and Apostles, and Christ himself, so often appealed to the Testament, and repeatedly cited passages from it one after another, I was illuminated so as to read it again, secretly indeed with no one aware, not even my wife, and to compare the cited passages with the very text of the Testament. Which when I did, such a great light shone upon me, that on that account I owe eternal thanks to God." It is clear from this that the assent which a man gives to Scripture is not from the authority of the Church, since that can be unknown, indeed utterly rejected; but from God himself or divine grace, as from the principal cause, operating insensibly intrinsically, and bearing witness in the minds of men concerning the authority and truth of Holy Scripture.

XXIII. It is indeed an excellent principle, if under the august name of the Church lurks no other than the Roman Pontiff alone! If under the sheep's skin there lurks nothing but a wolf; and under the ram's horns, a Dragon!

Who, I ask, of sound mind will persuade himself that men, whom Gilbert Genebrard, a client of the Roman court (book 4 of his Chronography), confesses to be rather apostate than apostolic: and whom Baronius himself (what a great patron of the papists?), in his Annals for the year 879 no. 4, the year 899 no. 2, and the year 900 no. 1, does not blush to proclaim as most disgraceful in life, most depraved in morals, and even most filthy etc. - that these men are infallible in judging the doctrines of the faith? And can confer such great authority on the truly divine Scriptures?

DISSERTATION ON SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY

Which, by the Propitious Grace of the Holy Spirit,

HENRY HEIDEGGER, D.D. and Professor of Sacred Theology, and at this time Head of the School, proposes to be publicly debated.

With JOHN CASPAR BRUNNER, of Venerable Memory, as Respondent,

And WILLIAM HOFFMEISTER, Student of Sacred Theology, as Co-Respondent.

The day after the Synod of the French Church. The Time and Place are Announced.

ZURICH
Printed by David Gessner, 1671

I. Those most weighty and perpetually memorable words of the Teacher of the Gentiles to his true son Timothy, which are found in 1 Timothy 6:20-21, are: "O Timothy, guard the deposit, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of what is falsely called knowledge, which some professing have strayed concerning the faith." By these words he at the same time commends the faithful keeping of the deposit, that is, of the written word, which God has deposited with the Church as a certain treasure, which it should neither corrupt nor allow to be corrupted in any way by others; and at the same time he detests both the vain babblings, that is, vain, empty and futile words, utterly inept and unable to teach and demonstrate the sense of the Holy Spirit, and enervating and emptying the genuine sense of Scripture, which he calls profane, because evidently they do not have the authority of the words of God or the rule of piety; and the oppositions of what is falsely called knowledge, that is, not just that knowledge with the pride of which the Gnostics, that most wicked class of heretics so-called from their boasted gnosis, formerly permitted themselves anything, concerning whom Chrysostom interpreted these words, and after him Hugo Grotius; but especially human reasonings and conjectures, which although they do not have manifest truth innate either from the light of conscience or of revelation, are nevertheless rashly opposed to the doctrine which is according to godliness. And those who would follow such profane vain babblings of what is falsely called knowledge, the Apostle pronounces did not strike the mark of faith and the goal set forth for sound doctrine, but went astray concerning the faith.

II. It is indeed established beyond the realm of doubt that even in the Apostle's time there existed men marked by this stigma, who would both pollute the purity of the heavenly doctrine with futile words, and openly defend the oppositions of what is falsely called knowledge, that is, their own opinions, suspicions, fancies, and consequently stray unhappily concerning the faith.

Indeed, the same Apostle complains in Philippians 1:16 that some were preaching Christ insincerely. And in chapter 3:18 he accuses with tears some as walking as enemies of the cross of Christ. Indeed, even Apollos in Acts 18:26 needed to have the way of God expounded to him more accurately. Yet nothing prevents this Apostolic injunction from being accommodated also to those who would bind themselves to the same fault in the course of time, whom therefore the Apostle portrayed beforehand in those first strayers. To be referred here, accordingly, are as many as, after the Apostles' decease, turned aside from the pattern of sound words and the

doctrine once delivered, to the fictions and trifles of their own mind, both in words and in things, and who still turn aside today. Nor let anyone of sound mind dare to impute to me the mark of rashness, if I assert that the Apostle is pointing his finger also at Scholastic Theology, the Helen of the Pontificians. But that I may make this more manifest, I have determined to discuss Scholastic Theology briefly, especially at this time when a certain individual, having published a thick volume, has thought it necessary to engage me in combat anew, armed not so much with the decisive words of the Divine Word as with the preposterous weapons of that Theology, or rather that Bastard Sophistry, his meretricious minx. Which undertaking of his ought indeed to seem singular and unheard of. For the remaining adversaries who have wielded the pen against us have hitherto been almost ashamed of Scholastic Theology, whose mysteries they do not employ except among their own. But against ours they use continual and lengthy declamations, they pour out insults, they breathe forth flames. But this one, happier than they it seems, has permitted himself more liberty against me than the rest against others. For he both turns the horns of Scholastic Theology against me, and by no means refrained from declamations, insults, and numberless frauds. Therefore, since I will show in a few words how venomous and worthless are the weapons he employs, I will seem to have made no little progress beforehand against him with good and wise men.

III. Scholastic Theology takes its name from the Scholastics, and they from the School. But schools, says Festus, were so called not from leisure or idleness (from the Greek schole), but because in those places men devoted themselves to liberal studies, other things being set aside. And in the earliest times, indeed, the word of God was accustomed to be taught both privately and publicly by pastors and teachers, so that even the churches themselves and the homes of individual believers were in a certain way schools of piety.

Gradually, however, the duties of Bishops and Doctors also began to be distinguished, the Bishops indeed giving themselves this task, that they might either correct the morals of men with their censorial rod, or devote themselves to collecting and amassing the wealth of the Church. Thus, the duty of teaching began to be separated from the Bishops, as from a more eminent dignity, and delegated to others. Finally, however, when the Bishops neglected and almost renounced the care of feeding Christ's flock, and were buried in sloth, idleness, and ignorance, and errors were now prevailing, the mendicant Monks invaded the vacant and almost neglected duty of teaching, who strove to defend and propagate the received erroneous opinions, and smothered the doctrine of the Heavenly Gospel with their disputations and ψευδοκρισίαις.

Therefore, they were called Scholastics, because they held that doctrine which was publicly taught in the Schools, by the scholastic method and phraseology, obscure, most difficult, and entirely different from that which was in use among the people. And truly that Theology may be accommodated to what Julius Pollux writes: "The Scholastic manner of speaking is rough and fastidious, although its followers derive no small pleasure from it, so that what Chrysippus declares concerning the Scholastic life, that it differs in nothing from the voluptuous life, may be most deservedly applied to it.

IV. We confess, indeed, that around the year of the Lord 150, a celebrated school was instituted in Alexandria, in which the mysteries of the Christian faith were taught. According to Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, Book VI, 6, Pantaenus presided over it, to whom Clement the Presbyter of Alexandria succeeded, who wrote the two books of the Paedagogus; to Clement succeeded Origen Adamantius; to Origen, Dionysius, and thus others in order. But those of whom we are speaking were of an entirely different kind. For they do not follow the same doctrine or method of teaching as those men. Wherefore also their origins are of a much more remote antiquity. For their beginnings fall in the eleventh century, the time, namely, of Lanfranc of Pavia, who was the antagonist of Berengar. For whereas before the age of Lanfranc, the doctrine according to the written word of God, handed down first by the African theologians Eugippius, Fulgentius, and Primasius, afterwards by Isidore the Bishop of Seville, Maximus of Turin, Prosper the Gaul, Bede, and his disciples Alcuin, Claudius, Rabanus Maurus and others, as well as by entire Councils, such as that of Arausio and the Sixth of Constantinople, had prevailed, and been propagated by perpetual succession, even among the most learned and excellent men; it began to be gradually departed from the opinion of Augustine, both in other points and especially in the article concerning the Eucharist, various errors now increasing in the Church of God, and the mystery of iniquity and apostasy making great progress through the Roman Pontiffs, and giving birth to the monstrous error of transubstantiation, the fruitful mother of very many errors. But when Berengarius, the Archdeacon of Angers in Gaul, endeavored to oppose this inflicted wound upon the sounder doctrine, who labored with all his might to uphold the ancient and declining opinion of Augustine, Lanfranc the Italian, who taught theology at Pavia, opposed him, being assisted by Guitmundus the Archbishop, and other Italian men, who openly pronounced in his favor against Berengarius in the Council of Vercelli. From that time, a doctrine similar to that of Lanfranc, useless and contentious questions agitated beyond the word of God, thorny philosophy gradually introduced upon the stage of the Church, theological opinions and definitions accommodated to the rites already in use and the received dogmas and decrees of the Pontiffs, and finally, rules concerning these matters, as if they were authoritative opinions and divine oracles, were delivered and sent forth among the people.

V. But the synchronism of the birth of Canon Law at about the same time as Scholastic Theology first made its appearance, is truly remarkable. The occasion was of this kind. Henry V being at the helm of the Roman Empire in Italy, Irnerius, a man of the greatest dignity and reputation, governed those parts which were there subject to the Roman Empire. He caused the Roman Law, which Italy had used before the coming of the Lombards, and which had almost fallen into disuse, to be again brought forward and restored, using for this purpose the imperial authority of Lothair the Saxon. It is said, moreover, that he himself taught at Rome and Bologna, and was the first of the Italians to add glosses to the texts. This happened about the year of the Lord 1020. After Irnerius came his disciples John Bulgarus, Azo of Placentia, and others. The singular study of the Roman laws was therefore in full vigor throughout Germany and Italy. But because this strengthened the majesty of the Emperors, it seemed to threaten no small danger to the recent and not yet sufficiently confirmed tyranny of the Pontiffs. To avert which, the minions of the Pope endeavored to exalt the authority of the ecclesiastical canons, as well as of the papal decrees, by which the Roman laws of the Emperors were not a little derogated. In emulation of Irnerius, about the year of Christ 1140, Gratian, a native of Chiusi and by

profession a Benedictine monk, who was then also residing at Bologna, came forth, and collected the Canons of Councils and the Decrees of Pontiffs into one volume, which he published under the title of Decree. This work, because it was most acceptable to the Pontiffs, was afterwards from time to time amplified and enriched with new laws by Gregory IX, Boniface VIII, Clement V, and others. As therefore Scholastic Theology was opposed to the word of God and to the sounder theology derived from it, which Augustine and the other Holy Fathers held; so, about the same period, the Pontifical or Canon Law was set in opposition to the Laws and Decrees of the Emperors. Both tended to the same point, namely, to depress the Kingdom of Christ, and to establish the kingdom, or rather the tyrannical sovereignty, of the Roman Pontiffs. The former was placed in direct contradiction to the Divine, the latter to the supereminent human law. Both the theology of the Scholastics and that of the Canonists were, to use the words of Raynold against Hart, those two pillars of Samson, by which, as formerly the house of the Hugonots was overthrown. To this point tends the tradition, maintained by some, though contradicted by others, who however, in order to reconcile the history, assert that they were either illegitimate brothers born of a nun, or spiritual brothers, that Peter Lombard, who first reduced Scholastic Theology to order, Gratian, who did the same for Canon Law, and Comestor, who patched together an Ecclesiastical History of both Testaments, stuffed with the most false and insipid glosses of that age, were brothers. Concerning which, see Genebrard, Baronius, Nauclerus, and others.

VI. It will also be worth the trouble to distinguish the different ages of Scholastic Theology, which learned men of old, such as Lambertus Danaeus, Hospinianus, and others, have divided into three: the ancient, the middle, and the new; just as the Academics of old, whom the Scholastics closely resemble, being a class of men disputing ambiguously on all subjects, distinguished the ages of their sect. Some date the ancient age from Lanfranc, others, more correctly, from Lombard, as being the first who committed it to writing, and extend it to the times of Albertus Magnus, that is, to the year of Christ 1220. The leader, therefore, of this age was Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, who, in imitation and emulation of Damascenus, reduced Theology into a new method, and comprised the foundations of the Roman religion in the four books of the Sentences, which afterwards became the basis of all Scholastic doctrine. Whence this leader (whom, however, the mischievous Jesuit Genebrard accuses even of plagiarism from his own party, on the ground that he purloined his sentences from one William, an Abbot called Bondinus, of whom, nevertheless, Trithemius makes no mention), was afterwards usually called in the Schools the Master of Sentences (a title which comes very near to that of Daniel's abomination that maketh desolate, if it be not the same): and he acquired such authority, that it was not safe for any one even to open his mouth against him. Of which we have an instance in the case of Joachim, Abbot of the Cistercian Monastery of Flora, who, after the year 1190, having ventured to censure the opinion of Lombard, was immediately condemned by Innocent III in the Lateran Council, and stigmatized. Nor was there any other reason why the Eternal Gospel of Cyrillus, a Carmelite monk, forged from the ancient error of Origen, of which even Satan himself ought to have been ashamed, was approved by many monks, than because it pandered to this strumpet of the Scholastics. What shall I say, that at the end of the fourth book of the Sentences we find the blasphemous words, that the things contained in the books of Lombard were related and dictated by Him who sitteth upon the lofty throne, that is, by God

Himself; as if, forsooth, one thing were dictated by the head, and another by the feet of God, or as if the true and eternal Jehovah were like the fabulous Jove, who is feigned to have produced Minerva from his head, and Hercules from his feet and thighs; or, finally, as if that book had proceeded and been dictated by God Himself, in the same manner as the Canonical books. But there flourished in this age Rupertus, Leo Tuscus, Peter the Scholar, William of Auxerre, Peter of Clugni, Bernard of Compostella, Hugo of Bologna, Vincent the Gaul, Alexander of Hales, who first commented on the four books of Lombard, Gualter of Poictiers, and others. And this age equalled the ancient Fathers to the Prophets and Apostles, and their adulterated, mutilated, and distorted opinions to the genuine testimonies of the Divine Scriptures: it employed human philosophy and human reasons very sparingly (for even the name of Aristotle is not once repeated in Lombard), it was more modest and cautious than others in defining, and did not use that intricate and horrid barbarism of expression in which the moderns delight. It is also most worthy of remark, that Chronologists note that in the times of the rise of this doctrine there happened a horrible eclipse and a terrible earthquake, both prognostics of the change of doctrine; with which eclipse and earthquake many compare the sixth seal of the Apocalypse.

VII. The middle age had for its leader and champion Albert the Great, Bishop of Ratisbon, who flourished about the year of the Lord 1220, at which time also the Sorbonne, the college and seat of the Scholastic Theologians, was built at Paris. It lasted till Durandus of St. Pourcain, who taught in the year 1320, and therefore comprised a period of one hundred and ten years. Its writers were Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Tarentasia, William Bishop of Paris, Richard of Middleton, Durandus, John Scotus, commonly called Duns, the perpetual antagonist of Thomas Aquinas, Nicholas de Lyra, Augustinus of Ancona, Bonaventura, William Occam. Entire sects also prevailed in that age, namely, those of the Realists, the Albertists, the Thomists, the Scotists. Moreover, this age introduced Aristotelian philosophy, and especially Metaphysics, which had before been brought to the threshold of Theology, into the very sanctuary of Christ, and assigned to it the principal place. For what Augustine was to Lombard, Paul to Augustine, Aristotle was to that age, namely, a God, or, as the Rabbins say, "Moses our Master, upon whom be peace." For you will frequently find in the writers of that period the name of Aristotle, or, the Philosopher, placed first, and that too in such a manner, that while his writings are said to depend upon demonstration, the doctrine of the Word of God is represented as resting only on opinion or belief; as Occam, among others, in his Centilogium, most frequently says and replies, just as if the reasonings of Aristotle ought indeed to be considered apodictic, but those of Scripture merely dialectic. And thus, while they treated the Scripture of God in a cursory manner, they regarded the writings of Aristotle as their proper Text-book. That age also indulged itself not a little in curiosity and vanity, and departed somewhat further from the modesty of its predecessors.

VIII. The last and most corrupt and filthy of all, which commenced after Durandus of St. Pourcain in the year 1320, took its rise from Hervaeus Natalis, a Carmelite, and lasted till the times of Gabriel Biel of Spires, or rather of the blessed Reformation. In that interval flourished John Bacon, Henry of Urimaria, Capreolus, Peter D'Ailly, Bernardine of Sienna, Gabriel Biel, Holcot, and others, whose names, glimmering amid their own darkness, scarcely deserve to be mentioned. From their workshops, however, and those of their predecessors, (that I may use the

words of Graser De Venaticne Artium, p. 122,) proceeded those most illuminated, most stinking, most profound, most irrefragable, most universal, most acute, and most resolute Doctors and Masters, our true Masters and Masters-to-be, Bachelors formed and to be formed; Lights of the world besides, and all that crowned and tonsured troop of locusts, &c. The learned man alludes to their sesquipedalian titles. For it is well known that Thomas is commonly called the Angelic Doctor, Bonaventura the Seraphic, Alexander of Hales the Irrefragable, Scotus the Subtle, Henry of Ghent the Solemn, ægidius of Rome the Most Profound, Francis Mayronis the Illuminated, John Bacon the Resolute, &c. This last and most recent age indeed retained the same principles derived from the philosophy of Aristotle. But in prying into all the most abstruse mysteries, however inscrutable, in the profligate audacity of determining, pronouncing, and dogmatizing on points which had hitherto been freely doubted, in their destructive attacks upon everything certain, and in establishing uncertainty, and finally in the monstrous and Scythian barbarism of their terms, phrases, and distinctions, it far exceeded all the preceding ages. Hence it came to pass, that superstition openly invaded the ceremonies of the Church, idolatry its worship, falsehood its doctrines, and tyranny its government, the true light was put out by these night-rovers, and the Word of God suppressed, and its sacred seed strangled, as it were, in the very blade, by the tattered and thorny commentaries and interpretations of those Seraphic Doctors. The candid Melancthon testifies to the truth of this, by affirming that in his days Aristotle's Ethics were publicly read on Sundays in various places, instead of the Gospel for the Day, introduced into the Churches in the age of Charlemagne by P. Guarenfridus in the eighth century, and that he himself heard them at Tubingen. Nay, at Zurich in this very city, and elsewhere, sermons were commonly preached from Thomas Aquinas and Scotus. And it was openly avowed by many, that although the Sacred Scriptures were destroyed, the way of salvation might be sufficiently discovered from the writings of Plato, Aristotle, and others of the same kind. The Protestant States of the Empire also relate something horrible in their vernacular work on the Causes of their refusing the Council of Trent, namely, that twenty years before, students of theology had openly and grievously complained, that during the whole time they had attended the lectures on Theology, that is, for five or six years (for such was the prescribed course of that study), they had never heard the name of Jesus Christ or the Gospel mentioned by their Professors, who rang perpetual changes on the names of Lombard, Albert the Great, Scotus, Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, &c., to the total omission of the names of Christ and the Apostles. Nay, at Basle, according to Hellon in his Epistle to Zwingle written in 1520, and inserted by the celebrated Hottinger in the 8th vol, of his History of the Church, p. 381, 382, &c., a certain monk of the Minorite Order did not blush openly to blaspheme from the pulpit, by declaring that "Scotus had done more service to the Christian religion than Paul; that whatever had anywhere been learnedly written, was derived and stolen from Scotus, except that the vainglorious had intermixed Greek and Hebrew words to render things more obscure." But at length Divine Providence raised up heroes for the Church who boldly demolished this idol of Scholastic Theology.

demolished it. "Thus they completely knocked out the bottom of the cask," as a certain learned man rightly applauded. Without whom, to use the words of Isaiah, "unless the Lord had left us a few remnants, we would now assuredly have no Church at all." Certainly the Roman Church, which still relies on the support of this traditional Theology, defended by various individuals,

namely Cajetan, Dominic à Soto, Ferrarien, Bannez, Medina, Valentia, Corduba, Molina, Vasquez, Suarez, Ledesma, Ægidius de Conink and others, who labored upon it after the Reformation, has from that time become so depraved and corrupt, that while we seek the Church within the Church, we are compelled to behold, not without grief and tears, only the ashes of the Church.

VI. But it will be worth the trouble to distinguish the different ages of Scholastic Theology, which learned men of old, such as Lambertus Danaeus, Hospinianus, and others, have divided into three: the ancient, the middle, and the new; just as the Academics of old, whom the Scholastics closely resemble, being a class of men disputing ambiguously on all subjects, distinguished the ages of their sect. Some date the ancient age from Lanfranc, others, more correctly, from Lombard, as being the first who committed it to writing, and extend it to the times of Albertus Magnus, that is, to the year of Christ 1220. The leader, therefore, of this age was Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, who, in imitation and emulation of Damascenus, reduced Theology into a new method, and comprised the foundations of the Roman religion in the four books of the Sentences, which afterwards became the basis of all Scholastic doctrine. Whence this leader (whom, however, the mischievous Jesuit Genebrard accuses even of plagiarism from his own party, on the ground that he purloined his sentences from one William, an Abbot called Bondinus, of whom, nevertheless, Trithemius makes no mention), was afterwards usually called in the Schools the Master of Sentences (a title which comes very near to that of Daniel's abomination that maketh desolate, if it be not the same): and he acquired such authority, that it was not safe for any one even to open his mouth against him. Of which we have an instance in the case of Joachim, Abbot of the Cistercian Monastery of Flora, who, after the year 1190, having ventured to censure the opinion of Lombard, was immediately condemned by Innocent III in the Lateran Council, and stigmatized. Nor was there any other reason why the Eternal Gospel of Cyrillus, a Carmelite monk, forged from the ancient error of Origen, of which even Satan himself ought to have been ashamed, was approved by many monks, than because it pandered to this strumpet of the Scholastics. What shall I say, that at the end of the fourth book of the Sentences we find the blasphemous words, that the things contained in the books of Lombard were related and dictated by Him who sitteth upon the lofty throne, that is, by God Himself; as if, forsooth, one thing were dictated by the head, and another by the feet of God, or as if the true and eternal Jehovah were like the fabulous Jove, who is feigned to have produced Minerva from his head, and Hercules from his feet and thighs; or, finally, as if that book had proceeded and been dictated by God Himself, in the same manner as the Canonical books. But there flourished in this age Rupertus, Leo Tuscus, Peter the Scholar, William of Auxerre, Peter of Clugni, Bernard of Compostella, Hugo of Bologna, Vincent the Gaul, Alexander of Hales, who first commented on the four books of Lombard, Gualter of Poictiers, and others. And this age equalled the ancient Fathers to the Prophets and Apostles, and their adulterated, mutilated, and distorted opinions to the genuine testimonies of the Divine Scriptures: it employed human philosophy and human reasons very sparingly (for even the name of Aristotle is not once repeated in Lombard), it was more modest and cautious than others in defining, and did not use that intricate and horrid barbarism of expression in which the moderns delight. It is also most worthy of remark, that Chronologists note that in the times of the rise of this doctrine there

happened a horrible eclipse and a terrible earthquake, both prognostics of the change of doctrine; with which eclipse and earthquake many compare the sixth seal of the Apocalypse.

VII. The middle age had for its leader and champion Albert the Great, Bishop of Ratisbon, who flourished about the year of the Lord 1220, at which time also the Sorbonne, the college and seat of the Scholastic Theologians, was built at Paris. It lasted till Durandus of St. Pourcain, who taught in the year 1320, and therefore comprised a period of one hundred and ten years. Its writers were Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Tarentasia, William Bishop of Paris, Richard of Middleton, Durandus, John Scotus, commonly called Duns, the perpetual antagonist of Thomas Aquinas, Nicholas de Lyra, Augustinus of Ancona, Bonaventura, William Occam. Entire sects also prevailed in that age, namely, those of the Realists, the Albertists, the Thomists, the Scotists. Moreover, this age introduced Aristotelian philosophy, and especially Metaphysics, which had before been brought to the threshold of Theology, into the very sanctuary of Christ, and assigned to it the principal place. For what Augustine was to Lombard, Paul to Augustine, Aristotle was to that age, namely, a God, or, as the Rabbins say, "Moses our Master, upon whom be peace." For you will frequently find in the writers of that period the name of Aristotle, or, the Philosopher, placed first, and that too in such a manner, that while his writings are said to depend upon demonstration, the doctrine of the Word of God is represented as resting only on opinion or belief; as Occam, among others, in his Centilogium, most frequently says and replies, just as if the reasonings of Aristotle ought indeed to be considered apodictic, but those of Scripture merely dialectic. And thus, while they treated the Scripture of God in a cursory manner, they regarded the writings of Aristotle as their proper Text-book. That age also indulged itself not a little in curiosity and vanity, and departed somewhat further from the modesty of its predecessors.

VIII. The last and most corrupt and filthy of all, which commenced after Durandus of St. Pourcain in the year 1320, took its rise from Hervaeus Natalis, a Carmelite, and lasted till the times of Gabriel Biel of Spires, or rather of the blessed Reformation. In that interval flourished John Bacon, Henry of Urimaria, Capreolus, Peter D'Ailly, Bernardine of Sienna, Gabriel Biel, Holcot, and others, whose names, glimmering amid their own darkness, scarcely deserve to be mentioned. From their workshops, however, and those of their predecessors, (that I may use the words of Graser De Venaticne Artium, p. 122,) proceeded those most illuminated, most stinking, most profound, most irrefragable, most universal, most acute, and most resolute Doctors and Masters, our true Masters and Masters-to-be, Bachelors formed and to be formed; Lights of the world besides, and all that crowned and tonsured troop of locusts, &c. This last and most recent age indeed retained the same principles derived from the philosophy of Aristotle. But in prying into all the most abstruse mysteries, however inscrutable, in the profligate audacity of determining, pronouncing, and dogmatizing on points which had hitherto been freely doubted, in their destructive attacks upon everything certain, and in establishing uncertainty, and finally in the monstrous and Scythian barbarism of their terms, phrases, and distinctions, it far exceeded all the preceding ages. Hence it came to pass, that superstition openly invaded the ceremonies of the Church, idolatry its worship, falsehood its doctrines, and tyranny its government, the true light was put out by these night-rovers, and the Word of God suppressed, and its sacred seed strangled, as it were, in the very blade, by the tattered and thorny commentaries and

interpretations of those Seraphic Doctors. The candid Melancthon testifies to the truth of this, by affirming that in his days Aristotle's Ethics were publicly read on Sundays in various places, instead of the Gospel for the Day, introduced into the Churches in the age of Charlemagne by P. Guarenfridus in the eighth century, and that he himself heard them at Tubingen. Nay, at Zurich in this very city, and elsewhere, sermons were commonly preached from Thomas Aquinas and Scotus. And it was openly avowed by many, that although the Sacred Scriptures were destroyed, the way of salvation might be sufficiently discovered from the writings of Plato, Aristotle, and others of the same kind. The Protestant States of the Empire also relate something horrible in their vernacular work on the Causes of their refusing the Council of Trent, namely, that twenty years before, students of theology had openly and grievously complained, that during the whole time they had attended the lectures on Theology, that is, for five or six years (for such was the prescribed course of that study), they had never heard the name of Jesus Christ or the Gospel mentioned by their Professors, who rang perpetual changes on the names of Lombard, Albert the Great, Scotus, Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, &c., to the total omission of the names of Christ and the Apostles. Nay, at Basle, according to Hellon in his Epistle to Zwingle written in 1520, and inserted by the celebrated Hottinger in the 8th vol, of his History of the Church, p. 381, 382, &c., a certain monk of the Minorite Order did not blush openly to blaspheme from the pulpit, by declaring that "Scotus had done more service to the Christian religion than Paul; that whatever had anywhere been learnedly written, was derived and stolen from Scotus, except that the vainglorious had intermixed Greek and Hebrew words to render things more obscure." But at length Divine Providence raised up heroes for the Church who boldly demolished this idol of Scholastic Theology.

IX. Now if anyone desires the causes of the Theology thus corrupted by the Scholastics, various ones may be assigned. For, first, it is certain that the reading and meditation of Scripture, even among those who wished to appear learned, had almost fallen into desuetude. This is known from more than one document. For the Doctors themselves, even those who had lived more than fifty years, confessed that they had never read the Sacred Scriptures, but had only cited them from Jerome or the Canon Law, as may be seen in Robert Stephens's Apology to the Parisians. And Carlstadt confessed that he had begun to read the Scriptures only seven whole years after he had become a Doctor of Theology, who, however, as was inserted in the records of the University of Wittenberg in 1510, was considered most competent when he received the insignia of the Doctorate. Erasmus of Rotterdam, in his work On the True Method of Theology, p. 25, testifies that he formerly saw not a few at Paris who, if anything was to be quoted from Paul, seemed to themselves to be transported into quite another world. See more examples of this gross negligence in the celebrated Hottinger, book 1, p. 17, 18, &c. Whence at length the profane and almost triumphant opinion prevailed, that the salvation of the Church did not at all depend upon the Holy Scriptures. The impious saying of John Faber, Vicar of Constance, which he uttered in his disputation with Zwingle at Zurich, is well known: "We might live together in friendship and peace, even if there were no Gospel." (Zwingle's Works, vol. 1, p. 622.) Secondly, the utter ignorance of the sacred languages, Hebrew and Greek, in which the Scripture is written, and consequently also of sacred phraseology, contributed not a little. Pellicanus, Loc. Comm. p. 524, is a witness that the scholastic authors retained the Latin edition alone for four hundred entire years, and had no acquaintance with the Greek and Hebrew

languages. Claudius Espencaeus also, whom Genebrard honors with the encomium that "he was most averse to the furies of heretics," confesses, in his Commentary on 1 Tim. ch. 3, that such ignorance and barbarism of the original languages prevailed among the clergy, that "to know Greek was sufficient to be suspected among the Latins, and to know Hebrew was almost heretical." Even to our Zwingle a knowledge of Hebrew, and to Collin of Greek, was almost imputed as a crime. Thirdly, the neglect of the liberal arts and of sober philosophy also paved the way for this barbarism. The celebrated maxim of John Dullard was: "The better grammarian, the worse theologian you will be." They derived their grammar from Alexander, Hugutio, Mammotractus, Catholicon, Gemma Gemmarum, and similar blotches of a former age. They circumscribed philosophy and the kindred arts within the summary of the logic of Peter of Spain. I say nothing of the Tartareti, Perversores, Copulati of Montacutius, the Exercitia Taurina et Canina, and all the works of Holcot, Bicot, and Tricot. Questions were dictated on certain parts of Aristotle's Logic, Physics, Metaphysics, and Ethics, the farrago of which goes by the name of the Philosophical Course. Armed with these languages and arts, they were fully prepared to enter the sanctuary of Lombard. Fourthly, the practice and exercise of piety and of the ecclesiastical ministry had entirely grown obsolete. For the Doctors, being purely speculative and umbratile men, had little or no care for these things. Fifthly, the doctrine of the cross, derived from the Word of God, could scarcely be so treated by the Theologians as not frequently to clash with the triple tiara of the Papal head, and with the contrary views and practice of the Church. To avoid this Charybdis, therefore, it was determined to treat their scholastic subjects in a scholastic and Aristotelian manner. Thus there was no danger impending from the inquisitors of heretical pravity. Sixthly, it contributed much that the Peripatetic Philosophy, neglected for some centuries, being revived and cultivated by the Mohammedan Arabs, invaded the Christian world. Thus, being mixed with Theology, it gradually produced this offspring. These and similar causes gave birth to, nourished, and brought to maturity the aspect of this Theology.

X. But now let us turn to a somewhat more accurate examination of this Theology. And first, we will say a few words concerning the prince of the Scholastics, our Master Lombard. For when we shall have shown that he, who was better and more correct than all who followed him, ought to have no authority in the Church, prudent men will easily judge in what estimation the more inferior writers ought to be held. But first, his own disciples not only did not animadvert upon, but even censured the most grievous errors in Lombard. Hence in the margin frequently occurs such a black theta as this: "Here the Master of Sentences is not held," which manifestly derogates from his authority and credit. Not to say that Pope Alexander III, Joachim the Abbot of Flora, John of Cornwall, openly accused him of heresy, and that a syllabus exists of opinions which the Schools of Paris and Oxford in part condemned in him. Secondly, his Theology rests upon the testimonies of the Fathers, and those too for the most part adduced with bad faith and interpolated. He professes, indeed, in his Prologue, that he has compiled his volume with much labor and toil from the testimonies of the truth eternally established. Would that he had performed this! For on inspection it is evident that the sayings of the Fathers form the staple of both columns, and that the testimonies of Scripture are treated in a secondary place and made subsidiary. Hence he immediately subjoins: "To comprise the opinions of the Fathers in a brief volume." And in book 1, dist. 25, 12, on a most difficult question, he says: "It must be shown from the authorities of the Saints, lest we should seem to advance anything on our own

conjectures." Hence also, in his Life, Trithemius, Abbot of Spanheim, says "that he compiled, with sagacious study, from the sayings of the Holy Fathers, a commendable work." He would still more easily deserve pardon if he had cited in good faith the opinions of the Fathers, and especially of Augustine, whom he constantly appeals to. But now he has been convicted of falsifying testimony, both by others and especially by Lambertus Danaeus, who has formally undertaken this task, in his Review of the First Book of the Sentences, where he produces and demonstrates to the eye almost innumerable passages that are added, curtailed, omitted, changed, and distorted into a foreign sense. But if, by the Roman Laws, he who alters a private testament is liable to the charge of forgery and the Cornelian Law, what is to be thought of him who alters the public written monuments of Scripture and of the ancient Fathers of the Church, by erasing, punctuating, and mutilating them? Thirdly, this author is pernicious in this respect, that he converts the salutary mysteries, dictated by the Holy Spirit for the edification of consciences, and especially that august one concerning the Holy Trinity, into Thirdly, this author is pernicious in this respect, that he converts the salutary mysteries, dictated by the Holy Spirit for the edification of consciences, and especially that august one concerning the Holy Trinity, into idle speculation and vain curiosity. For when the end of those things which are revealed in the Scriptures is, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and that he may follow after charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned; he, therefore, who departs from this end, and instead of giving peace to consciences, offers perturbation; instead of charity, sows strifes and contentions; instead of the light of faith, substitutes intricate and inexplicable questions; and instead of the true use of the knowledge of God, brings in curious investigations; does he not, as a pernicious writer and maker of lies, deserve to be simply rejected and condemned? Now let the Distinctions be inspected, and especially those in which he has speculated on the Holy Trinity from human reasonings, from Dist. 2 to Dist. 34. To this point applies the judgment of John Aventin concerning Lombard: "At that period," says he, "Peter Lombard was created Pontiff at Paris. He wrote four books of Theological Conclusions; but, as I have heard more than a thousand times from Jacob Faber and Judocus Clichtoveus, my preceptors, he disturbed the pure fountain of most holy philosophy with the impure streams of opinions and unfounded notions." Which the experience of facts also, unless one is quite blind, sufficiently and more than sufficiently teaches. Fourthly, many frivolous, inept, and ludicrous things occur in these Sentences. I will say nothing of the inelegance of the Latin language, the faults of style, solecisms, and barbarisms. What is more, he sometimes discusses vocal difficulties, that is, concerning syllables and words, not real ones, as Occam his commentator observes: that he sometimes also deduces a true conclusion from false premises, as the same Occam frequently remarks: and finally, that he sometimes adduces inept proofs of the most important theological dogmas, which Thomas Aquinas himself says derogates from the Christian faith, and tends to turn it into ridicule. I am silent as to the fact that he everywhere asserts false and erroneous dogmas, and either entirely omits or corrupts and adulterates those which are true and salutary, and especially that which is the summit and key-stone of our consolation, concerning the justification of a sinful man by faith, and the converting into our own vigor and blood of the promises of the Gospel.

XI. Let us now briefly touch upon the principal errors of Scholastic Theology in general, from which it will appear that the Scholastics have deviated not a little from the true and theological mode of disputation in theological discussions. And the first and principal error is, that, having almost set aside the Scripture, or at least having cited it negligently in giving their judgment, the better and sounder of them indeed deduce their conclusions from the testimonies of the Fathers, but the rest from philosophical, and therefore both from heterogeneous principles. Accordingly, when questions are proposed, they do not so much appeal to the passages of Scripture and the Apostles, as to the Philosophers, logical axioms, and Topical Maxims: and if they do sometimes adduce the ancient Doctors also, they confound their authority with the authority of Scripture. But we by no means reject either the testimonies of the Fathers or sound and sober Philosophy, which rests not merely on the authority of Aristotle or of worse teachers, but on right and pure reason, provided they are conformed to the rule of the Divine Word: but we admit and commend them on this condition, that they be regarded not as the principle and rule of proof, but only as testimonies of consent, and subservient merely to explanation: while the Scripture alone, being the voice and Testament of the Father, holds, reigns, and rules our faith. For the Word of God alone can make men wise, and is sufficient for every use, 2 Tim. 3:15, 16. It is the canon of faith and manners, Gal. 6: in opposition to which, and contrary to which, not even an angel dares to preach anything under the penalty of anathema, Gal. 1:8. Neither, therefore, ought our faith to be built on the foundation of men, such as even the most ancient Doctors of the Church were, nor on human reason, which perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: but on the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, Eph. 2:20. Analytics itself, therefore, teaches that we should dispute concerning Theology from theological principles, and warns us not to wander beyond the limits of that science about which we propose to discourse. And since Theology is placed on the most sublime summit of all sciences, it is certainly most unjust and unworthy that it should be subjected to philosophical principles, and be degraded from its majesty into such narrow limits. I say nothing of the fact that they here employ a spurious Philosophy, and one most unworthy of Christian men, which is consumed in idle and most futile speculations, questions of terms and monsters, and treats of nothing that can be of use, and which is therefore expressly condemned by Paul, Col. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:20; and that they generally distort the testimonies of the ancient Fathers in the worst manner to serve their testimony.

XII. Another error of Scholastic Theology is, that it disputes on the most important theological subjects in opposite ways, and topically from probable arguments. But since, according to the testimony of the Apostle, faith is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," Heb. 11:1, and requires the certainty of truth, Rom. 14:5, and since Scripture forbids us to be "children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive," Eph. 4:14, it is evident that this method of disputation is by no means adapted to Theology. Topical disputations on both sides are indeed left for colloquial and rhetorical exercises. But Analytical treatises, such as Theological ones ought especially to be, require arguments that are true, certain, and necessary. And what can be more contrary to faith than that doubt and Academic skepticism, which the most learned disputations of Augustine and others had long since condemned and buried, but which the Scholastics have revived, as it were, from the shades below? Formerly

Jerome, in his Apology against Jovinian, reproached him with disputing on a theological question gymnastically, not dogmatically. What, I pray, would he have said to those who, on the most important subjects, are tossed about by so many and various waves of arguments, sometimes on this side, sometimes on that, and scarcely find at last what harbor to betake themselves to? How often do Scotus and others who follow him leave the question for the most part doubtful and undecided, permitting the reader to incline to whichever side he pleases! "If you wish it so," say they, "I will answer the contrary arguments. But if you prefer that other way, lo, you have wherewith to reply in turn to the contrary arguments." Again: "Let him find the solution who can." "Let him answer to this who is able." "I suspend," &c. I beseech you, is this to dispute theologically? Nay, is it philosophically and apodictically? Where the philosophers order us to place things themselves in the most certain position of truth. How much more rightly do we follow the admonition of the Apostle faithfully warning Timothy: "But abide thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of," (he does not say, "wander," "fluctuate," "be tossed about,") "knowing of whom thou hast learned them," 2 Tim. 3:14. We have a most sure word of prophecy, which proceeds from certain and well-understood principles, and especially from its foundation. Let us never desert this, and carefully and cautiously avoid those Scholastic doubtings or that game of chance, as the most certain shipwreck of faith.

XIII. Scholastic Theology also merits censure in this respect, in the third place, that it does not so much aim to illustrate the truth as to involve and obscure it with all its subtleties and monstrous prodigies of abstruse terms; and, after the example of the scribes, Luke 11:52, labors to hide "the key of knowledge." For it renders things which are difficult, still more difficult by its tortuous, thorny questions, distinctions, and terms, so as to be unintelligible even to the most learned, or at least to none but blinded reasoners; and things which are in themselves easy, clear, and perspicuous, it renders most difficult by an intricate and craggy mode of expression, and obscures them with dark questions, to unravel which seems to require some Œdipus skilled in solving riddles, like the interpreter of the Sphinx, or a Delian diver. So that it appears to find a knot in a bulrush. But clearness, simplicity, and ingenuous sincerity of language is the most excellent and absolutely necessary virtue and the only ornament, especially of that mode of speech which treats of matters necessary to be known for eternal salvation by every one, not only the learned, but even the unlearned. For "the testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple; the precept of Jehovah is pure, enlightening the eyes," Psalm 19:8, 9. As God is an upright Teacher and Leader, a most sincere Guide, 2 Cor. 1:12, so the discourse concerning Divine things ought to possess a certain graceful simplicity and sincerity. Hence Paul requires from Timothy, 1 Ep. 1:13, a pattern of sound words, which he heard from him in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. Those sound words, therefore, which Timothy heard from Paul, he will have him make an exemplar of speaking, thinking, and healing, and that too in faith and charity, and place them conspicuously before the ears and minds of all. And thus all believers, and especially Teachers, ought to shine as luminaries in the world, holding forth the word of life, Phil. 2:15, 16. This is the banner of Christians. Thus the man of God constitutes himself a leader to others in sound speech, when he sincerely and clearly propounds the sound words of Christ and the Apostles, and in this manner becomes their guide to eternal life. And thus the mind (or the Teacher) temperately governs his mouth, and addeth knowledge to his lips, and his words become pleasant as the honeycomb, sweet things to the soul, and health to the bones, Prov.

16:24. But now what has Scholastic Theology in common with this clearness, sincerity, simplicity, sound speech which is pleasant as the honeycomb, and sweet things to the soul? Who is there that would not be terrified and scared away even by the horrid din alone of those new words and new phraseology (for certainly that language is most alien from Latin; Cicero, if saluted, could by no means have understood expressions like "enneities," "formalities," "realities," "subjibilities," "proportionabilities," etc.), and would not despair of ever being able to comprehend with his mind what he cannot even receive with a patient ear? Certainly Erasmus, that most learned man, testifies, in his Commentary on 1 Tim. 1:8, that a celebrated theologian confessed to him that scarcely a period of nine entire years would suffice for one who wished rightly to understand even the Preface alone of Scotus on Lombard. Not without reason, therefore, does the eminent theologian Antony Sadeel apply to the Scholastics what Augustine formerly said of the Sophistic art, that it resembles the cavern of Cacus, when, glorying in foreign dogmas as if they were foreign riches, they affect such obscurity, and, like the dwellers in darkness, seek lurking-places, that as often as they dispute, they seem not so much to lay open as to cover up things, and to send forth, not the voice of men, but certain obscure mutterings from the dusky caves of questions and the den of Trophonius. What! do they not even glory in not being understood, and wonder at not being understood in what they themselves have dreamed, as if all were Josephs or Daniels skilled in interpreting obscurities? They are most like jugglers, who rejoice and vaunt themselves hugely whenever they deceive the eyes of the spectators, as Ludovicus Vives somewhere justly reproaches them. But is not this to despise the simplicity of the language of the Gospel (although such men despise simplicity because they by no means attain to the force and efficacy of the words), to disregard the living words of Jehovah of Hosts our God, Jer. 23:36, and to attempt, as it were, to translate them into horrid, barbarous, and Scythian terms, that the people of God may forget His name, ibid. v. 27, to speak the swelling words of vanity, 2 Pet. 2:18, and to say with those, "With our tongues will we prevail; our lips are our own; who is lord over us?" Psalm 12:5. And so is most truly fulfilled in these despisers of God the ancient complaint, "How say ye, We are wise, and the law of Jehovah is with us? Lo, certainly in vain He hath made it, the pen of the scribes is in vain," Jer. 8:8.

XIV. But it will be worth the pains to weigh carefully the sentiment of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 2:12, 13: "Which things (namely, the things that are freely given to us of God) we also speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual." By which sentiment of the Apostle, Scholastic Theology, consisting of obscure, abstruse, ambiguous, and, in fine, such terms that there can be no doubt more labor must be expended in perceiving their meaning than in understanding the things themselves, is as it were struck by a thunderbolt. I ask, therefore, are discourses of this kind taught by the Holy Ghost, and are they not rather words "taught by human wisdom"? That all the Apostles carefully observed this in delivering and expressing the mysteries of God, is what the Apostle Paul undoubtedly enjoins on all theologians to observe, as often as they speak of the same mysteries; and this the more, because no teacher at the present day is endowed with the same degree of the Holy Spirit and the same infallibility as the Apostles, and because, since the Apostles have spoken, the Church has been already enriched with every word and all knowledge, 1 Cor. 1:5, so that she has no need to look to any other than the words of the Holy

Spirit. It will be very useful to attend somewhat more diligently to the series and connection of this Apostolical discourse. The Apostle indicates that the mystery of our salvation could not be revealed except by the Spirit of God, as being the only one who searcheth the deep things of God, v. 9. For as the things which concern men are not known except by him who is endowed with the spirit of man, so the things which concern God are not known except by the Spirit of God, v. 10. And that he may prove his Gospel to be most worthy of all reception, v. 11, 13, he adds that he, with the other Apostles, has not received the spirit of the world, but that Spirit which is from God, that they may know the things which are freely given them by God. And he subjoins that he announces these gifted things in words not taught by human wisdom, but by the Spirit of God. And by this order of discourse the Apostle not obscurely intimates that the Gospel of Christ, in order that it may be received by consciences without scruple or doubt, cannot be delivered and taught in better and wiser words than those of the Holy Spirit; and that no one, therefore, ought to deem himself competent to bring forward the mystery of Christ before the public view of the Church in a garb more august or fitting than that in which the Holy Spirit has clothed it. An example of this is afforded by Solomon himself, Eccles. 12:9-11, where he says: "And moreover, because the Preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yea, he gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs. The Preacher sought to find out acceptable words, and that which was written was upright, even words of truth. The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies." Behold, the wise man professes that the more he studied wisdom, the more carefully he sought words of delight, in which, namely, the mind of the hearer or attentive person might fully and with pleasure acquiesce, and not only the words of Scripture, that is, the words of truth, beyond which he thought it a crime to affect wisdom, given by the one Shepherd, Christ, speaking by His Spirit in the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles. Why, then, should not Christian teachers also confess that they are bound, as far as possible, to the style of Scripture, that we may learn from it to speak of spiritual things with the Holy Spirit? And further, if we must also use human words, let us beware lest they add to or take from the revelation speaking of the same things, or, what is worse, pervert and change its sense; lest the terms and distinctions which philosophers and scholastics have employed to define natural things be rashly applied to supernatural and spiritual subjects; lest the phrases and words be of ambiguous signification and calculated to deceive, so as not to have a fixed and definite meaning among all, but to be differently understood by different persons; lest they be more obscure than the things themselves which are taught in Scripture; lest they be preferred to the Scripture phrases, so that these are omitted, and those substituted in their place, as being more significant and more recondite, which would be nothing else than to accuse the Holy Spirit, who has assuredly spoken most wisely and in language by far the most suitable to the things themselves, of unskilfulness and barbarism. With all which and even more faults the language of Scholastic Theology is most abundantly replete.

XVII. A fourth error of no small magnitude is, that the Scholastics, or rather the contentious Disputers, waste their time on vain, curious, and ludicrous questions, and those too not so much explicable as inextricable. But the Apostle, 1 Tim. 1:4, forbids us to give heed to "fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith." By these he means all discourses which have no certain authority, concerning which no one can be

assured unto faith. Thus all probabilities, Col. 2:4, in which there is no certainty, which have no manifestation of the truth to the conscience, 2 Cor. 4:2, are nothing but fables, to which the Apostle forbids us to attend. And 1 Tim. 6:5, he vehemently dissuades from "perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, who suppose that gain is godliness." Not without reason does he call those who indulge in vain and unprofitable questions men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth. For if they held the truth which is according to godliness, they would neither inquire into things which ought not to be searched into, nor contend with idle conjectures, but would teach the truth with meekness, and show to every conscience that this is the true and salutary wisdom. Hence the same Apostle, 1 Tim. 6:20, commands to avoid and reject indisciplinate and undisciplined questions. Compare 1 Tim. 1:4, 6:4, Tit. 3:9. Vain and curious questions are to be classed with those which do not proceed from wisdom, nor tend to any certain utility, in which there is more labor and vexation and a wasting of the spirit than fruit; which, if you are ignorant of them, you are no worse off, and if you understand them, you have made no progress. A question of this kind is proposed and rejected by the wise man, Eccles. 7:10: "Why is it that the former days were better than these?" So any question will be indisciplinate if one inquires, concerning Divine things, too curiously: as, how God created all things out of nothing? How the three are one? How God foreknew future things? For such things are inquired into by those unstable persons who do not bring their minds to believe God except on condition of knowing the reason of His words; much worse than the heathen, whom, as Tacitus notices, in his book on the Manners of the Germans, ch. 34, it seemed more holy and reverent to believe concerning sacred things than to know them. But the Apostle commands us to reject such questions, not because they cannot be solved, but because there is no necessity for solving them, as Chrysostom and Œcumenius rightly remark. For Augustine rightly teaches, in his Enchiridion to Laurentius, ch. 59, that "there is no need for those things to be defined with accuracy which are in no way ill understood." A vain desire of prying into things which can be of no use toward life, profits nothing toward piety. Neither can the boundless ocean of Theology be traversed in the little skiff of the human mind, as the wise Pachymerius has well remarked, book 6 of his Byzantine History.

XVIII. But now who doubts that Scholastic Theology is stuffed with such vain, futile questions, closely bordering on blasphemy? On entering the Scholastic thicket, you may hear such questions as these discussed: "How does God love contraries? How does He love things which never existed? Whether God could command anything evil, even hatred of Himself? Whether this proposition is possible: God hates the Son? Whether God could cause an angel to inform matter? Whether God could distinctly understand some things if He had not distinct relations of reason to them? Whether the practical ideas in God are speculative or not? Whether the intellect in God is active or passive? Whether number in God pertains to the first or second intention? Whether these propositions, 'God is a hoopoe,' 'God is a beetle' (not to mention direct blasphemy), is the same as that, 'God is man?' Whether the nature of the universe is more amiable than human nature? Whether Christ ought or could have assumed the nature of a woman, an ass, a serpent, or a dove? Whether a Divine suppositum could at the same time assume several natures, distinct in species and number? Whether Christ merited the Incarnation? Whether the Angelic Salutation to Mary was rightly commenced by the words, 'Hail, Mary!' What sort of form had Mary, What sort of form had Mary, whether fleshy or thin? Could

not Mary, after giving birth to the Word, have had several sons by the same act of generation? Could the Devil have known Mary's virginity? Did Mary have the use of reason while sleeping? Was she the Apostle of the Apostles, and perfect in all the mechanical arts? Could God have made this world better? Were the angels produced from eternity? Was the soul created before the body? In the state of innocence, would there have been an equal number of men and women? Would the first man have generated? Would baptism be valid in these words: 'I bathe thee in the name of the Father,' etc., or 'In the name of the Father and the Daughter,' etc.? Or if baptism were conferred in the name of St. Anthony, or any other saint, or even of the Devil? Could anyone be baptized in lye, mulse, beer, rose-water, gravy of flesh, fish-brine, urine, dew, snow, etc.? Would baptism be valid if conferred by a Jew or a pagan? Could a dumb priest, one with but one eye, with six fingers on one hand, a leper, a madman, a lunatic, a demoniac, consecrate and celebrate mass?" I say nothing of the infinite number of such foolish, futile, and almost blasphemous questions, and, to use the word of Caecilius, "sad insipidities," which occur everywhere in that kingdom of darkness, and can scarcely be read or repeated without the greatest disgust and detestation; nor ought they to be recounted for any other reason than that credit may be given to the accusation.

XIX. And from this idle fooling of the Scholastics springs another error not less disgraceful, which I place last, namely, an perpetual itch of contention, wrangling, and fighting, and, to use the words of Galen, "a scabies, a more incurable evil than any Democritus ever saw." For what the Apostle, 2 Tim. 2:23, testifies, that "foolish and unlearned questions gender strifes," is here eminently exemplified, where you will find nothing but pot against pot, as the saying is, a very Euripus of altercations, one strife constantly generating another, like the heads of the hydra. For such is the nature and propensity of foolish questions, to excite quarrels and contentions. For they minister to vain-glory, and are agitated by those who are wise in their own eyes, that they may appear to others more learned, and the children of a white hen. In this sort of dialectic combat, subtlety and the artificial framing of abstruse niceties bear the bell. There is now scarcely a single question, however important, which is not degraded by the foulest dissensions of clashing opinions, so that the saying of Ludovicus Vives concerning the learned, in his book On the Communication of the Sciences, that "robbers and lions live with greater unanimity among themselves than they do," may be most fitly applied to these academic men. As often as a question is proposed, they are not ashamed to enumerate, word for word, the different opinions concerning it: "The first opinion, the second, the third," etc. Concerning the interpretation of the words, "This is my body," thirteen opinions occur, one of which if you embrace, you must reject the remaining twelve. Between Thomas Aquinas and John Scotus there was such a stubborn and radical dissension, that what Cicero writes concerning Carneades and Chrysippus may be truly affirmed of them, namely, that Scotus would neither have said nor written anything if Thomas had not said or written it first. After them followed the most determined sects, in which was fulfilled the prayer of David, Psalm 55:9: "Destroy, O Lord, and divide their tongues." And their counsel was "to set the Lord a law by their tongues" (Psalm 12:4), but they fell into so many questions, that no prince and judge can impose an end upon them. And what, after all, are such brawlings, contentions, contradictions, pertinacity, and that incurable scabies of scratching everything, those polemics, other than incentives to hatred and the deadliest poisons of Christian charity? What else do they betray than uncertainty of

doctrine? For in those disciplines which are certain, as in Mathematics, such quarrels, strifes, and contentions have no place. How much more ought they to have been far removed from that doctrine which professes to explain and preach the heavenly wisdom and divine oracles? That line of the witty Mime is most true: "By excessive altercation truth is lost." For as those who, actuated by the titillation of itching, scratch too much, draw blood, pain succeeding in the place of pleasure; and as bad surgeons, while they cut away too much of the diseased part, also attack the sound; so while these men scratch truth too much, they lose it, and fall into falsehood, which presents itself with some appearance of probability greater than truth itself, just as orpiment sometimes better expresses the color of gold than gold itself. Add to this, that with litigants the serious investigation of truth is not so much the end as the vain-glorious praise of victory. Hence these pugnacious men have not blushed to assume to themselves the title of Invinctissimi, or "Most Unconquered," as well as princes. It is on record that there was a man at Paris who styled himself the "Horrible Sophist," considering this no less a glorious title than those of Africanus or Cossus. This is what the learned Ludovicus Vives, quoted above, testifies in his book On the Communication of the Sciences.

XX. And for these and other causes, but especially on account of a doctrine subject to the tyranny of the Pope, and in most respects false, the most pious and wisest Reformers of the Church, especially Zwingle, Luther, Melancthon, Œcolampadius, Bullinger, Calvin, and others, expelled Scholastic Theology from the territories of the Evangelical Church, and instead of it delivered and established by voice and pen, from the Word of God, a system of pure, sound, simple, perspicuous and properly arranged doctrine, composed according to the rule of the language of the Holy Spirit, in opposition to the Sophists. Nor is it without cause that learned men observe this Theology to be indicated in the prophecy of Daniel, ch. 8:23, where the King of "a fierce countenance," that is, Antichrist, is called "understanding dark sentences," or riddles, problems, questions, sophisms. Nay, the Interpreters of the Apocalypse also warn us that it is portended by the Angel pouring out his vial upon the earth, whence there arose "a grievous and malignant sore upon the men who had the mark of the beast and worshipped his image," Rev. 16:2. For as an ulcer does not immediately divide the skin, but leaves the semblance of union, while the flesh within is decaying, inflamed and putrid, whence scabbiness, itchings, and erosions arise: so was this Theology, and the numberless dissensions thence arising, that dialectic leprosy, those undisciplined questions, that hereditary dissension of the Thomists, Scotists, etc., in the kingdom of the Pope, which outwardly preserved the semblance of union, like an ulcer which caused scabbiness and inward rupture, and greatly subserved the mystery of iniquity. And what were "the depths of Satan," Rev. 2:24, unless they were the depths of the Scholastics? Whoever cursorily inspects the sayings of Scripture, 1 Cor. 1:19, 20, 21; 3:19; Col. 2:4, 8, 18; 1 Tim. 1:4, 6, 7; 6:3, 4, 5, 10, 20; 2 Tim. 2:14, 16, 23; Titus 3:9, will find Scholastic Theology depicted and vividly portrayed in all its parts by the pencil of the Holy Spirit.

XXI. For these causes also, that I may no longer keep that inept Monk waiting, who would uphold Scholastic Theology like another Atlas bearing the heavens on his shoulders, I have somewhere stigmatized it as "the Sophistic Art," "a muddy and flowing lake" (not, as he, from his ignorance of the Latin tongue, maliciously charges me, "a turbulent torrent pouring along"). Neither, however, do I thus cast reproach upon my teachers, as he objects to me. For I have

nowhere confessed, what he calumniously imputes to me after the fashion of monks, "that I formerly learned this method from my teachers, but am unwilling to use it." For thus I expressed myself, p. 137, against D. Baldinger: "The Synodal Disputation does not affect the syllogistic form, the author of which, although he has learned it, and uses it where convenient, yet deems it unworthy to be employed in grave dissertations written for the use of the learned." I spoke of the syllogistic form, which I gratefully profess to have learned from my preceptors, not of the Scholastic fooleries. These things are very different. One thing the parrot, another the quail, utters. The whelps have one scent, the swine another. I did not, moreover, reject the use of the syllogistic form, but only advised that it should be employed in its proper place and mode. But it is a marvelous instance of levity in that Sophist to have had the front to write that Scholastic Theology was consecrated by Christ Himself, inferring the article of the resurrection from the words of God, Exod. 3, where He calls Himself "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;" and that it was also used by the Apostles, and especially by Paul reproving the idolatry of the Athenians. Forsooth, because Christ, by the force and meaning of the words of God, educes the doctrine of the resurrection, and Paul, by the argument from the judgment of conscience and of reasoning from the grounds of his adversaries, refutes the idolatry of the Athenians, they are the authors of that theology which, deriving its conclusions from the mutilated and distorted writings of the Fathers, the dogmas of Philosophers, and especially of the corrupted Aristotle, the decrees of Popes, and employing terms monstrous and obscure, disputes skeptically and topically on both sides, and in a dogmatical manner, and beside and contrary to Scripture, defines anything whatever for the sake of displaying acuteness and practicing sophistry! Ought not that Disputer to have been ashamed to derive the controversies of his Scholastic Theology, as he styles his prefatory question, not from Christ and the Apostles, nor even from the Fathers, but from Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas? As if those meager, frivolous, and futile questions thence arising, such as, "What does Thomas mean by the word doctrine? Whether our Theology is in strict Aristotelian language a science? Whether it is formally a science, or at the same time eminently practical and speculative? Whether our Theology is properly subalternated by the Theology of the blessed? Whether it is one, and that the lowest species of science? Whether it is a habit supernatural in substance? Whether God under the formal notion of Deity is the formal object of Theology?" and other such insipid questions, which have no connection with piety, could be discussed and decided by any other judges than Aristotle and his apes. Although it may be doubted whether Aristotle, that prudent and wise philosopher, would have suffered Theology to be built up on his philosophical principles.

XXII. But no one ought to wonder that this Scholastic Sophistry, the prolific mother of errors, is as loathsome to me as to all good men. For there have not been wanting in the very Papacy itself men of nice discernment to whom it was but indifferently approved. There is extant an epistle of Pope Alexander III against the heresy of Lombard, written to William Archbishop of Sens, in Matthew Paris's History of England, p. 21, where, among other things, he calls the doctrine of Lombard, that "Christ, as man, is not anything," "a meadow," and commands, by Apostolic authority, that it be abrogated by him, having convoked his suffragans and other religious and prudent men. Alexander the Pope there also adduces Joachim, Abbot of the Monastery of Flora, who called Lombard a heretic and insane, as having maintained not so much a Trinity as a Quaternity in God. Trithemius, Abbot of Spanheim, in his account of Peter

Abelard the Dialectician, who lived about the year 1150, uses these words: "From this time secular Philosophy began with its vain curiosity to mock sacred Theology." Gerson everywhere brands the Scholastics as Sophists. Nicolas Beroaldus, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, complains as follows concerning the Scholastics, Catal. Test. book 16: "The heavenly Scriptures have too long been depraved and overwhelmed by sophistical trifles. For those petty captious niceties do not sharpen the talents of the studious, but rather blunt the keenness of the mind." Nicolas of Clemangis, a Master of Paris and Archdeacon of Bayeux, who flourished A.D. 1416, in his Epistle On the Theological Student, applies to the Scholastic Theologians those words of Paul: "They dwell on questions and strifes of words." He even compares their Theology to the waves of the Asphaltic Lake, which outwardly have a beautiful appearance, but within are full of smoke and ashes. Cornelius Musso, Bishop of Bitonto, in his Commentary on Romans 6, also gravely complains of it. "Formerly," says he, "to what an injury of all was the Divine Scripture neglected! There prevailed, I know not what, thorny and irksome theology, treating of instants, relations, hesitations, formalities, and all these things were handled by syllogisms cunningly involved, and depending solely on human subtleties; which, beyond all doubt, might be refuted by the same authority by which they are received. He was regarded as a sublime theologian who knew best how to attach the greater prodigies to his traditions; and a vain-glorious boast made part of the value, not to have those mighty words understood which, with elevated supercilium, they poured out among gossiping females on sacred subjects.

All the leaders of the divine word had sworn allegiance to the words of their masters. Hence arose six hundred sects - Thomists, Scotists, Occamists, Baconists, Albertists, Ægidians, Alexandrians - oh, crime! The Gospels and Epistles were neglected, Christian philosophy lay hid, it was treated by very few, and that coldly, not to say insincerely."

Ludovicus Vives, in his work On the Truth of the Christian Religion, book 1, ch. 3, complains that "the Scholastics have made reason the measure of faith," and subjoins: "What shall I say, that many of them are unwilling that the light and divine reason should be applied to these divine subjects, but that human reason, so unhappy and depraved by its own faults, as to be made, as it were, the foundation of all piety?" And a little after: "From the disputations and contentions of the Scholastic circles have sprung pertinacity and an inextinguishable desire of scratching everything. They have indeed made vast advances, and by their vain and feeble sophistic ratiunculae have detracted greatly from the weight of most important subjects."

The most celebrated civilian Alciatus, in his Oration on Laws, delivered at Avignon, among other things complains "that the infinite volumes of the Scholastics and their innumerable inept questions have as much influence in divine worship as a dog in a bath."

The blessed Rhenanus, in his Preface to Tertullian, says that "the Scholastics ought rather to be called philosophers than theologians."

Wesselus of Groningen, called the Light of the World in his time, as often as the authority of Thomas on the one hand, and of the Seraphic Doctor on the other, was objected to him in disputations, was wont to reply: "Thomas was a Doctor, what then? I am a Doctor too. Thomas

scarcely understood Latin, and was unacquainted with other languages: I have attained to a moderate acquaintance with the three principal languages. Thomas scarcely saw the shadow of Aristotle: I have learned the Greek Aristotle himself in Greece."

John Staupitz, the preceptor of Luther, related that Conrad Summenhart, a theologian of Tubingen, often exclaimed: "Who shall at length deliver me from this contentious theology, the Scholastic, to wit?"

I have above quoted the judgment of Aventin concerning the Scholastics. Cornelius Agrippa has spun out a prolix complaint concerning Scholastic Theology, in his work On the Vanity of the Sciences, ch. 97. He says "that it was formed at Paris, in the College of Sorbonne, by a mixture of the divine oracles and philosophical reasons, as it were from the Centaurs' race, a two-formed discipline; that it gradually degenerated into sophisms, while those more recent Theosophists and hucksters of the word of God, who are theologians merely by a purchased title, have made of that most sublime science a mere logical contest." He subjoins many other things to the same effect, which most powerfully confirm the complaint we have above made concerning this Theology. In the very Council of Trent, the Scholastic method was disapproved of and rejected by the Fathers, although resisted and prevailed against by the Theologians, and especially the Italians, who had been taught in no other mill than this, as we have shown in the History and Notes on the XIIIth Session. The most express complaint of Erasmus of Rotterdam concerning the Scholastics, which occurs everywhere, but especially in his Commentary on 1 Tim. ch. 1:8, his Praise of Folly, and his treatise On the True Method of Theology, I will here comprise in a summary.

XXIII. What! have not even some holy men been instructed by celestial visions concerning the vanity of this Theology? The vision of Robert Gallus, who flourished about the year of Christ 1250, is related in these words by the Catalogue of Witnesses, book 17, p. 1663: "I was seeing a vision," said Robert, "and behold a man went about bearing delicious bread on his shoulders, with the best wine hanging down on both sides of him; yet he was holding in his hands an extremely hard stone, and gnawing it with his teeth, as one famished is wont to do about bread, but effecting nothing. And from the stone proceeded two serpents' heads, which spake to me. And the Spirit of the Lord instructed me, saying: 'This stone represents useless and curious questions, in which the famished labor, leaving substantial things.'" And I said: "What then are those heads called?" And He said: "The name of one is Vain-glory, of the other, the Corruption of Religion."

To Brother Nicholas, a Swiss Hermit, a vision is ascribed by Charlos Bovillus, who transmitted the picture of it, shown to him by the son of Nicholas, and expressed in effigy, to Nicholas Horius, Archbishop of Rheims. He saw, namely, enclosed in a bright and pellucid circle, the Papal Head, crowned with the triple diadem, on the summit of which was placed an orb with a cross, as was usually borne before emperors. The Head itself occupied the middle area of the circle. The countenance was ruddy, the visage fierce and very menacing. The forehead was contracted into frowns, and the stern and lowering eyes expressed a heated anger. A very rough beard, divided into three plaits, but squalid with age, covered the chin. The upper lip also

protruded fiercely with a projecting mustache. From the circumference of the circle, moreover, three sharp points of swords projected toward the face, one, proceeding from the bottom of the circle, directed its point through the divided beard toward the Papal mouth, while the other two from each side threatened the eyes. On the other hand, three other points projected from the Head itself, two from the nostrils sending their cusps toward each side of the circle, and the third rising upward by the whole length of the diadem toward the orb placed upon the tiara, etc.

This vision, after the Bishop of Rheims and Luther, was illustrated and explained, by applying it to the plague of the Papal kingdom, by that most sagacious man Conrad Graser, a Franconian knight, in his Royal Chase, pp. 220, 221, etc. To him the circle itself represented the circumference of the Roman Papacy: the Head crowned with the triple coronet, the Pope; the position of the swords, the horrible image of the European schism which broke out in the last age between the oppugners and advocates of the Papacy: the bristly mustache of the upper lip signified the divided power of ordinary jurisdiction under the Papacy: the three distinct plaits of the under beard designated the three most celebrated Scholastic Orders of Sophists (for the ancients made the beard the symbol of the philosophical profession) - the Scholastics, the Canonists, and the more modern monastic sects. With what verisimilitude that most acute man interprets this vision, let those inspect who please. It will be sufficient for us to have related these things, leaving the decision entirely to the reader.

XXIV. But as God has so wisely tempered all things that there is nothing so perverse and evil from which some good may not be elicited, not innate indeed, but by an external force: so does the same thing occur even in Scholastic Theology. For in the very midst of its mire we sometimes find a union and a pearl, that is, some golden, significative, and nervous saying, which may contribute in some measure to the scriptural and positive method of teaching theology. Just as among the Rabbins, frivolous and trifling men as they generally are, some opinion not altogether contemptible occasionally occurs. For the Cretans do not feign everything. And most of them formerly possessed great powers of judgment, by the right, pious, and sober use of which they might have greatly assisted and blessed the Church. Moreover, they more candidly deliver the mysteries of their corrupt theology than its modern revisers, and therefore furnish an occasion of more easily detecting, convicting, and dragging these night-revelers into the light. Besides, their pertinacious discordancy in most doctrines of the faith, and the incongruity of their opinions, supply the Church with arms which may without difficulty be turned against the very vitals of the Sophists themselves. For it is delightful to the faithful to see these men attacking each other's throat with the sharp weapons of their disputations, and occasionally, amid the billows of their contradictions, fortifying, from reasons drawn from every quarter, the stronghold of truth; just as of old it was delightful and pleasing to the Israelites to behold how, while they were themselves blowing their trumpets and clashing their pitchers, the Midianites destroyed each other by mutual slaughter, the Lord directing every man's sword against his fellow, Judges 7:20-22. So that Truth is sometimes compelled to receive testimony, strange to say, not otherwise than from Balaam's ass and the soothsayer Caiaphas. Hence there have not been wanting learned men, exercised and inured in the writings of the Scholastics, who have successfully supported the truth by their confessions and testimonies. "For that proof is genuine and obnoxious to no contradiction which is deduced from

the sayings of adversaries," as the blessed Irenaeus well observes, book 4, against Heresies, ch. 14. Various writings of this kind are extant in the hands of the learned, especially the Scholastic Orthodox Speciman, by that most learned man Paul Ferrius of Metz; also, The Confession of the Evangelical Truth by Thomas Aquinas, by George Derschaeus; besides others, from the perusal of which it will easily be seen that Augustine's remark is true, that "the manifest truth strikes even blind eyes, and compels its very adversaries to become its witnesses."

XXV. And for these causes we do not disapprove the study of those who, after diligent reading and meditation of Scripture and the Fathers, provided their talents and leisure so permit, also turn over the Scholastic writers of better note, and import into the Church's hive whatever good they may find. But all this must be done very sparingly, and as it were with a grain of salt; and their writings should be consulted, as the most learned Chamier writes, in his Jesuitical Epistles to Cotton, that he himself did, in no other way than if one visiting a palace after viewing the magnificence of its halls, chambers, and roofs, should not disdain even to inspect the latrines, though cautiously on account of their nastiness. Most salutary cautions and various observations on reading the Scholastics are also laid down by that learned man Christopher Binder, in his Scholastic Theology, chs. 3 and 4, which come to this: that they should not enter the School unless they have first laid the pure and solid foundations of Christian doctrine; and unless they first accurately understand the language of these Barbarians: that on being admitted within the penetralia of this School, they should not burden themselves with reading all or most of them, but a few of the best, such as Lombard and his interpreter Paul Cortesius, Thomas Aquinas, and who is judged the fittest of all, Bonaventura, as well as Gregory of Rimini, a pretty strict follower of Augustine: that all the questions which occur even in the best writers should not be read, but those especially which either derive their occasion from Scripture, or contain the arguments and examination of the ancient heretics, lest the vigor of their minds be wasted on things not necessary: that the genuine and general end of all the Scholastic doctrines should be attended to, which is, by vain and erroneous disputations, to uproot the principal articles of Christian doctrine, and then by means of these attack the cardinal points of the remaining and dependent articles: that it should be observed how the later Scholastics have always rendered the fountains of Israel more turbid, how in the article especially of gratuitous justification, of good works, of predestination, they wandered furthest from the doctrine of the pure fountains: that their works should be read principally, and especially that of Aquinas against the Gentiles, Jews, and Saracens: that it should be noted how many things the earlier Scholastics said disputatively, not positively, which the later at first suggested, but gradually brought into the number of certain doctrines: finally, that from hostile teachers we should learn to entertain a wholesome hatred.

XXVI. There are some to whom it appears that the Scholastics ought to be read and even highly prized on account of their accurate method and skill in disputation. But we consider that for both these a knowledge of the analogy of Scripture and of the analogy of faith delivered in it, as well as of sober philosophy, especially of that part of it called Analytics, is amply sufficient. This may be evident from the example of those two most learned and judicious theologians, Piscator and Altingius, neither of whom was skilled in Scholastic Theology, and yet each was a truly accomplished and well-disciplined reasoner. And concerning Piscator, indeed, it is the judgment

of that very acute theologian, William Twiss, in his Vindication of the Doctrine of Election, book 1, p. 1, that "he is most deserving of praise for his accurate and truly scholastic method of treating Theology, which he attained by the study of the Sacred Writings alone, calling in merely the auxiliary disciplines of Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic, so that in him God willed there should be an example showing how great accurate and scholastic erudition on subjects pertaining to salvation may be attained even from the assiduous reading, meditation, and commenting on the Sacred Scriptures alone, without the aid of any Sententiaries or Scholastics whatsoever." Consult the most useful preface of Sadael, On the True and Scholastic Method of Disputing in Theology. Lastly, some fear that unless we become thoroughly versed in Scholastic Theology, we must yield to the modern Sophists in the combat. But this fear is groundless. For the Sophists cannot justly impose upon us the condition that, deserting the testimonies of Scripture and the resources of sound philosophy, we should handle the same arms with themselves, and creticize with the Cretans. For this would be just as if the Americans of the new world, when the Europeans came among them by sea and made war upon them, had wished to lay down the law that they should use no other arms than their own, their arrows namely, and that, like them, they should fight with their bodies naked; to which effect, I remember, I formerly heard the witty repartee made by the Queen of Sweden to a certain Jesuit who was recommending to her the study of Metaphysics on a similar argument.

XXVII. Finally, let us learn wisdom from the Scholastics at the cost of others, as to what may be for our own advantage. While indulging in unnecessary and curious disputations, without end or object, they themselves have lost the truth, or at least, to their own grievous injury, have covered it in the deepest shades, "always learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," 2 Tim. 3:7. But let us, having our hearts fortified with the fear of the Lord and treading in the footsteps of our first Reformers, who determined to have nothing to do with this Sophistry, and on whose pious simplicity God has bestowed His abundant and admirable blessing, let us religiously search out that truth which is according to godliness from the Word of God, learning and edifying one another by disputation. The most holy martyr Cyprian long since admonished us that "the mysteries of God cannot be comprehended, and that therefore our faith ought to be simple," which he confirms by numerous testimonies of Sacred Scripture, in his work addressed to Quirinus, book 3, ch. 10. Let us, therefore, abhorring all idle, contentious, and sophistical "foolish talkers and babblings," everywhere love pious and Christian simplicity, and with firm grasp retain the pattern of sound words which has been committed to us and accurately defined, fully persuaded that by foolish, curious, and impious disputations nothing can be effected, neither the law nor the prophets nor the gospel understood, nor can they in any respect be compared with the discourses of those most pious and learned men by whom, in the Catholic Church, the eyes of the worthy are opened, as Augustine somewhere speaks against the Manichees. But do Thou, O Lord, "sanctify us through Thy truth: Thy word is truth," John 17:17.

THE END.

DISSERTATION ON THE PRESENCE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD IN THE EUCHARIST.

In which ten arguments opposed to the Pontifical error in the Anatomy of the Council of Trent are presented, freed from the objections of D. Carolus Baldingeras.

Concerning which,

GOD MERCIFULLY ASSENTING, A Public Discussion will be held by

JOH. HENRICUS HEIDEGGERUS, D. and P.P. of Sacred Theology

The Respondents being

PETRUS MORICOFERUS, V.D.M. and
JOH. JACOBUS LAVATERUS, Student of Sacred Theology

On the day after the Synod of May, 1670.

ZURICH, Printed by David Gessner.

DISSERTATION I.

On the ANALYTIC ESTABLISHMENT of the PRESENCE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD IN THE EUCHARIST.

Summary.

1. The occasion of the dissertation.
2. The cause and reason of the undertaking.
3. The preface of the adversary examined. The cause of the Swiss dissensions.
4. The title of the Anatomy of the Council of Trent defended.
5. What sort of work is Cardinal Pallavicini's History of the Council of Trent?
6. The adversary's trifling about the state of the question. 7-14. The state of the question is formed, and the argument distributed. 14. Argument I, from Christ's prophetic words in Matt. 24:25-27, is opposed to the bodily presence. 15. Three exceptions of the adversary are refuted, and the indissoluble connection of our argument is shown. 16-19. Argument II, from the words and history of the institution of the Eucharist, is fully asserted, as first 17-18, Christ testifies that His body is present in the Eucharist, just as His blood which is shed. 19. The exceptions of the adversary are retorted. 20-21. Secondly, that Christ teaches that His body and blood are present

in the Supper in the same manner as the bread is His body, and the wine or fruit of the vine is His blood. 22. The responses of the Brethren are ventilated. 23-24. Thirdly, that the bread is Christ's body in the same way as the cup is the New Testament: but the cup is not the New Testament in such a way that this is locally included in that. 25. Exceptions are met. 26-27. Fourthly, that what Christ gave to be drunk He expressly calls the fruit of the vine, which properly is not blood. 28. Three exceptions of the adversary are discussed. 29-31. Fifthly, that what is present in the Eucharist is expressly called the bread. 32-33. The interpretations of Vedarminus and the adversary are refuted. 33. Sixthly, that Christ in the Holy Supper commanded to eat the bread as His body, and to drink the cup, or wine, as His blood, in remembrance of Him until He comes. 34. An exception is met. 35. The general Argument III, from the fact that the bread which is broken in the Eucharist is called the communion of the body of Christ, is proposed. 36-38. And asserted against the responses of D. Parish. 38. Arg. IV, from John 3:13, is proposed. 39-41. And vindicated from exceptions by an accurate exposition of Christ's conversation with Nicodemus. 42. Arg. V, from Christ's words in John 6:63, "The flesh profiteth nothing," etc., is formed. 43-45. The adversary's instance is met. 46-47. Whether the oral mode of eating, which the adversaries maintain, makes common cause with the Capernaites. 48. Arg. VI, from Christ's bodily ascension into Heaven, is adduced. 49-54. And fully defended. The vision of St. Paul, Acts 9:3-5, is discussed. 49-50. Christ's words in John 6:61, 62, "Doth this offend you?" etc., are freed from the adversary's corruption. 52-53. Arg. VII, derived from the nature and properties of Christ's body, is proposed. 54. The responses of the adversary are examined. 55-59. In what sense Christ is said, John 20:19-26, to have entered when the doors were shut? 58. Arg. VIII, is drawn from the impossibility of circumscriptive existence. 59. The responses of the adversary are examined. 60-63. The example of the soul, which is said to be entire in the whole body and in each of its parts, is ventilated. 60. Whether a body loses its natural unity in this way? 61. An exception against the passage Acts 3:21 is discussed. In what sense Christ is with us until the consummation of the age. 62. Arg. IX, is proposed from pious antiquity. 63. The origin of the error is briefly touched upon. 64. What caused the belief in the bodily presence to be gradually introduced into the Church? 65. Why were the Scholastics so prone to consent to the error recently introduced? 66. The ancient formula "Lift up your hearts" is explained and vindicated. According to the same authorities, the Eucharist is for eagles, not jackdaws. 67. The testimonies of St. Basil are vindicated. 68. Of Chrysostom. 69. Of Augustine. 70. Of Ambrose. 71. The unanimous opinion of the Holy Fathers stands, that Christ is present in the Eucharist as in a figure, sign, etc. 72. Arg. X, is derived from the fact that, according to the Thomists, one and the same body cannot be present circumscriptively in several places even by a miracle; and hence, according to the consequence deduced by the Scotists, much less can it be circumscriptively in one place and penetratively in another, even by a miracle. It is produced. 73-76. And accurately defended against the instances of D. Parish.

I. It has lately pleased D. Carolus Baldingerus, Parish Priest and Canon of the Church of Baden, to publish to the world his and his deceased brother Bernhardus Baldingerus's molestations concerning the Real and Substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord in the Eucharist, in opposition both to the Orthodox judgment on that subject of the venerable and noble divine of former times, D. Joh. Rodolphus Stuckius, of most fragrant memory, whose

responses to it he had impugned seventeen years ago, and also to my own arguments adduced in the Anatomy of the Council of Trent against the bodily presence. These molestations of his are so contrived that in most respects I could justly and deservedly desire in them neither candor, nor erudition, nor that humanity which his genius everywhere breathes.

II. It was my sole wish that, without prejudice to the truth, which is a paramount concern with all good men, I might at length be permitted to rest secure from these irksome contests, which are not grateful to all, and are judged by some to be injurious to civil peace, and in which strife is engendered from strife, and the abyss invokes the abyss. But it appears that the intention of that adversary was, that by the publication of this one specimen, the entire work of the Anatomy of the Council of Trent might be considered as utterly overthrown. For thus he expresses himself in his Preface, p. 2: "If you shall read this single question, and shall attentively consider with what a powerful blow it smites and strikes the Council of Trent, you may easily conclude what you ought to think of all the rest." A weighty necessity has therefore been imposed on me to examine this specimen thoroughly, and to try it by the unshaken tests of Divine truth, that it may be manifest to all that the entire truth, which the Anatomy defends, stands firm and unshaken in its citadel. Piety also demands that I should not be wanting to the pious manes of the venerable Stuckius, who, while he survived, cherished me with paternal affection, and loaded me with many favors, not to mention his other most brilliant merits toward the Church. Moreover, the question here instituted is not concerning a trifling matter, or a mere shadow, but certainly on an arduous and most momentous subject. For if the bodily presence be taken away, it is all over with almost the whole Papacy; the Mass, certainly, and the Priesthood, on which as its principal foundation it rests, are utterly overthrown. Hence Cardinal Perron, in his Epistle to the King of England, did not hesitate to write that "if the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the truth of the sacrifice be acknowledged, there will be an easy agreement concerning all the rest." Finally, it is not lawful and pious that we who, by the stupendous grace of God, so greatly enjoy the long-wished-for halcyon days, should disdain both ingenuously to confess and strenuously to assert that truth which our glorious and most holy martyrs, most pious souls, on whom, as of old the carnal persecuting the spiritual children, the sword and flames were cruelly inflicted more than once, because they loved not their lives unto the death, have sealed with their blood. Moreover, I greatly felicitate myself that I have met with an adversary endowed, as his friends proclaim and his writings argue, with learning, probity, and a swan-like purity of morals. I will strive in turn, by the grace of God, that he may be able to acknowledge that I have done him no injustice; and that, if the Spirit of God shall vouchsafe to impart to him eyes enlightened by grace, abandoning the error by which he is possessed, he may come over into the royal path of truth.

III. The preface of the adversary discusses some irrelevant matters, in dwelling upon which neither the cause itself nor we are particularly interested. The causes of the Swiss dissensions are there derived from diversity of religion. He ought, however, to have remembered that, even before the mass of the people, through the fear of God, had deserted the Papacy, dissensions had abundantly exercised the sacred body of Switzerland. We confess, meanwhile, that the gospel of Christ, if all would heartily embrace it, pure, uncontaminated, and defecated from the leaven of human traditions, and would in good faith yield to Christ, the only King, Head, and

Lord of the Church, the glory which they owe Him, would bind dissenting minds in a closer bond. That this may one day occur, we worship God with our whole heart, that in the efficacy of His strength He would graciously bestow on the erring the heavenly gift of saving faith, and powerfully excite in us all the sincere affection of the love of Christ! And to this end also tends the assertion of the truth which we here undertake.

IV. D. Parish manifests no little indignation, both in the Preface and elsewhere, that the Anatomy of the Council of Trent bears the inscription that in it "a compendious refutation and conviction of the whole Papacy, as revised at the Council of Trent, is exhibited." Thus he reproaches me with having boldly challenged the whole Papacy single-handed, and even with having sung the song of victory before the battle. Indeed, it was the mere confidence of a good cause, not a spirit of insulting any one or provoking any, from which I profess myself averse, that prompted those words. Nothing has been done by me if the arguments produced by me do not convince, so far at least that it cannot be solidly contradicted with reason. Nor did I here seek to sacrifice to my own honor, but to the truth, which is ever gloriously victorious. But I am certain that, as to the main point, I have produced arguments that are manifest, with the manifestation of the truth to every conscience, from the Word of God. But that the subterfuges of those who contradict are of such a nature that they can be solidly discussed, this very specimen will, as I trust, clearly show, and at the same time will establish confidence in the rest.

V. From what sources I have derived the history of the Council of Trent, the Anatomy itself openly professes. Peter Suave Polanus, that is, Paul Sarpi the Venetian, among others, furnished most abundant materials. Before me, Father Fulgentius, Adam Newton his Translator, Stanislaus Felic, Caesar Aquilinus, all addicted to the Pontifical communion, and men of most illustrious name, not "aiders of untruth," as D. Parish rashly calls them, vindicated his History from the weighty reasons it contains. In vain does D. Parish object to me Cardinal Pallavicini, relying on the judgment of a most prudent gentleman among the Reformed, who, as he says, "when he first saw the books of Cardinal Pallavicini, and having confessed the truth, prized them highly, made no account of the history of Suave [Sarpi], as having been convicted of many errors." It may perhaps be doubted whether the matter is so; and if it is entirely so, whether that gentleman, on this most imprudent point at least, was one of the Reformed. We say with the prophet Jeremiah, ch. 23:28: "What is the chaff to the wheat?" But I would most courteously request D. Parish, and at the same time that gentleman whom he brings forward as a witness, that they would attentively and considerately, without prejudice, read the Sixty-four Moral, Censorious, and Historical Notes on the Inscription, Epistle to the Reader, Approbation, and first thirteen chapters of the Introduction to the History of the Council of Trent, by P. Sforcia Pallavicini, by the author Stanislaus Felic, a most learned man and not an unknown adherent of the Roman Church, published at Cologne in 1664. From these they will clearly perceive how wide is the difference. Since the time when the Anatomy appeared, Pallavicini's own History, translated from the Italian into Latin by Gio. Battista Giattino of Palermo, has come into my hands, and was last year printed at Antwerp, the reading of which now fully confirms the judgment of Stanislaus Felic and Caesar Aquilinus concerning it, quoted by me, as we shall be prepared to make plain, — and to place more clearly in open light the rashness of that

gentleman, — on a fit occasion, with the favor of Providence. But enough of this by the way. We now come to our subject.

VI. Concerning the state of the controversy, D. Provost spends many words, pp.1-9, in order to show that it was improperly constituted by the venerable D. Stuckius. The pious reader will scarcely find anything there but vain logomachies. In the distinction also of the spiritual, sacramental, and bodily presence of the body and blood of Christ, as explained by me, the D. Parish himself approves and admits not a few things. But the rest, in which he animadverts upon my orthodox explanation, are of such a nature as to rest on the doubtful and overbold hypothesis of the bodily presence, which we impugn and confute by solid arguments.

VII. Indeed, he toils much, p. 236, etc., in order to prove that the sacramental and symbolical presence, as explained by us, cannot be considered and called true and real, unless it be acknowledged that the body and blood of Christ, according to their real entity or essence, are locally united in the Eucharist to the species of the symbols and present. But in what sense we maintain that there is a true and real presence of the body and blood of the Lord, we have not omitted to explain. It is true, that is, not shadowy or imaginary. Real is opposed to a sterile and naked figure, to husks without a kernel, to bare and empty signs destitute of Christ. Certainly the blessed symbols in the Eucharist are not a sterile and naked figure, but most fruitful of the best fruits. For together with them, believers, by faith and mental action, eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, and are thence made more and more united to God and their Savior, are enriched with heavenly graces and gifts, and their salvation daily becomes fuller and more abundant. These things, barren, naked, and empty to our adversaries, to whom nothing is fruitful unless it swell with prodigies and transubstantiations, are to the pious, truly heavenly and incomparable riches.

VIII. It is well known among metaphysicians about the thing and the truth. But what prevents it from being said to be truly and really present, which is present not only in shadow, in a vain figure, in a bare symbol, but through faith and the Holy Spirit in the symbol both powerfully signifying and sealing, and in the legitimate use of faith exhibiting. And faith is the substance and evidence of things hoped for, according to the Apostle in Hebrews 11:1, because it presents and represents those things which are believed and hoped for, no differently than if they were already possessed. Indeed, our union with Christ, which is by faith, is most true and realistic, notwithstanding the distance of places. Nor can it be said that what is contained within the sphere of faith is absent. Moreover, the Holy Spirit offers, gives, applies, and appropriates to the souls of the faithful the ground and fruit, that is, the body of the Lord given, and his blood poured out for us, and all the benefits which he obtained for us by his death, through external symbols and the word of promise, so that by faith we may be daily more strongly united to Christ. But what is thus offered, given, applied, and received by faith, is truly and really present to the souls of the faithful, who by partaking of this spiritual food and drink by true faith, are in turn united with Christ, refreshed, and nourished unto eternal life.

IX. Truly and really is the presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist, which we teach following the word of God. For it arises from true and real causes, the Holy Spirit, and the word and sacrament exhibiting, and faith receiving. Through it we are truly and really united with

Christ, even as man, we are implanted together and made members of the same body with him, saving faith converting the whole Christ received into juice and blood. By means of it the body of Christ given for us unto death truly and really exists for our spiritual perception. But if that presence by which the object of faith, though locally absent, is yet present to the spiritual perception, and also in the spiritual perception or in the soul of the believer after the apprehension and application is made, is not real but false and imaginary: then the spiritual eating, which cannot even be conceived without a true presence, will also be false and imaginary. I do not think anyone can deny that those things which we see are rightly said to be present to us; at least from that part by which they are represented to our eyes. And yet what we see must necessarily be at some distance from our eyes; otherwise it could not be seen. Therefore, when it is effected by the power of faith that the body of Christ, which is substantially in heaven, is set before the view of our mind through the Spirit, the word, and the sacrament, what reason is there why it cannot also be said to be truly present to it? For what nature has given to thought and the eyes, to make present to themselves things that are far away, God has given much more effectually to faith. But since our communion with Christ is wholly spiritual, and is not carried out by the bodily senses but by the soul: it ought certainly not to be estimated from the nearness of places, but from that relation which the soul has with Christ, so that it may enjoy him wholly. Whence it is perfected not by bodily contact, but on our part by faith, and on Christ's part by his Spirit. For these effect that we are able to feed and be satiated by Christ's bodily and blood, and his merit. Added to this is the presence of the symbols and the handling of the outward pledge, which eminently furthers our faith. Thus Christ is present in the Eucharist, not locally or bodily (for a spiritual object, such as Christ is here for the most part considered, cannot be perceived by bodily sense any more than a spirit can be converted into a body), but truly and really, not imaginatively or intentionally only, as the Reverend Parish Minister everywhere objects.

X. If I ask you, Reverend Parish Minister, for what purpose you posit this kind of presence which you imagine: you will not, as I think, answer me anything else than that the body and blood of Christ may be united to us. But since the whole work of this union is heavenly and spiritual, a presence, for which you so strenuously contend, is in no way required for it to take place. For what need is there here of physical contact, or any nearness of place? You will never, I am confident, deny that this union with Christ, and salvation, is given without these things. For I ask, when the Sacred Scriptures preach that we are not only joined to Christ, but also that we are members with the brethren among one another, so that we together form one body: will you not confess that those believers who are in Switzerland, Germany, France, etc. are so joined to us that they are members with us? But if this unity, by which we are connected into one through Christ, is not hindered by distance of place and bodily contact, why have you denied that we are truly joined to Christ without bodily presence? And, to use a plainer similitude, husband and wife in the Holy Scriptures both are and are called one flesh. And indeed this similitude is so appropriate to the matter we are treating, that Paul in Ephesians 4:28-29 makes the Church the body of Christ, just as the wife is the flesh and bone of the husband. And yet that bodily union between husband and wife is not hindered if the husband and wife are separated by a distance of place for a time. There is therefore no need, for the sake of entering into union with Christ, that you should strive so much to enclose his body and blood under the species of bread and

wine. Without such a fiction we are truly joined to Christ, the Eucharist is a complete and true Sacrament, and the words of Christ saying "This is my body" etc. are most truly consistent with themselves. For establishing these things, a bodily and substantial presence is by no means necessary. And what kind of presence is that which you imagine? Is it permanent and lasting, which perpetually glues us to Christ's body? Certainly not, by your own opinion. For Bellarmine in Book 1 of The Mass, chapter 27, defines the sacrifice of Christ's present body in the Mass as "that by which Christ's body is placed on the altar through the consecration, and is thus offered to God, and is ordered towards a true, real, and external change and destruction; the destruction follows, which occurs through the eating by the sacrificing priest, by which the body loses its sacramental existence, and ceases to be sensible food." The whole mystery of bodily presence, the whole apex of the Pontifical religion, which is carried out with such pomp and horror, consists in this: that at the voice of the sacrificing priest the body begins to exist on the altar, and when he puts the species into his mouth, it ceases to exist on the altar, and begins to exist in his mouth and stomach, and soon after the species are destroyed it ceases to exist there. This is that presence and communion of Christ's body, this food abiding forever and giving life to the world! O blind minds of men! But for us it is enough to seek the things above, where Christ is, whence he will come to judgement, so that he may take us to himself, having already because of the true and real communion with him (which on God's part offering the Spirit, word and sacrament, and on our part faith, effects) been situated in the heavenly places.

X. It pertains to the shame and confusion of the Adversaries that, while contending for that substantial presence, whatever they may say or do, whether they wish it or not, they cannot explain themselves without it following from their own hypothesis that the body of Christ is present in the Eucharist only figuratively. First, they do not know what they want to say. For they say it can be said that Christ's body is in the Eucharist truly, really and substantially, but not bodily. Indeed, Bellarmine also says the same about the Eucharist, Book 1, Chapter 2, that it can also be said to be spiritually, as Bernard writes, that in this Sacrament is exhibited to us the true substance of the body, but spiritually, not carnally. Soon, however, he adds that this word "spiritually" does not seem to him to be used too frequently. Nor is it of less danger if one too often uses the word "bodily" in this Sacrament. What then is to be done? Or how will Christ be in the Sacrament, if it cannot be safely said that he is there neither bodily nor spiritually? The Council of Trent defined that the same is truly, really and substantially contained under the species of sensible things, but not according to the natural mode of existence, but sacramentally. But how do they understand that word "sacramentally"? Do they mean simply that it is in this Sacrament? This would be saying nothing. For the question would always remain, how he is in this Sacrament, and what that signifies. It would be an eternal petitio principii. But that must certainly be referred in general to the form and nature, and mode of the other Sacraments. Therefore, when Christ is said to be in the Eucharist sacramentally, this must be understood thus, that he is believed to be in the other Sacraments, namely, spiritually, and by the presence of the Holy Spirit, the good things sealed in the Sacrament being claimed by faith. For is he present in baptism in any other way? Is there in baptism after consecration a change of substance? Is Christ present in it sacramentally, that is, with his body and by the nearness of substance there present? Moreover, when the Adversaries wish to express the mode in which Christ exists in the Eucharist, they express one that is merely spiritual. For certainly it does not

suit a bodily one, inasmuch as he is not perceived there by the senses, nor moved, nor locally contained. They affirm that in every particle, even one as small as a point, he is contained indivisible and whole. But this mode of existence suits no natural body, but only a spirit. For that Christ's body was or is never able to be present as in an atom, without situation or disposition of parts, without place, and be itself an atom and the whole, in whatever way it is regarded. Finally, according to the opinion of the Adversaries, such a body is neither sensed by taste, nor seen, nor touched, nor subjected to any sense, and its whole is believed to be intelligible, not sensible. And this also suits a spiritual, not a bodily existence. Do they not therefore labor under a spirit of giddiness, who fight for the substantial presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, as for their altars and hearths, but hiss at the spiritual and sacramental presence, by which the spirit through the word and sacrament exhibits Christ's body to faith, and yet in reality testify that they acknowledge no other mode of the presence of Christ's body than a spiritual one?

XI. But the Reverend Parish Minister objects in vain on p.236 that the presence which we acknowledge does not exclude empty signs and a figure merely shadowing or signifying, no more than the sermon in which the mysteries of faith are set forth and explained. The Very Reverend Provost also urged this same thing against Venerabilis Stuckius, p.79-80. For it is abundantly clear from the discourse of the Lord in John 6 that not a shadow or imaginary thing, as they seem to intimate not without reproach, but the very body and blood of the Lord is also the chief object of the evangelical sermon. But the Eucharist does not change the object of the Gospel, but rather confirms it more, adding external symbols visible to the faithful, so that in this way the Gospel, which is properly the object of hearing according to the testimony of Paul in Romans 10:17, is in a way made visible, in order to animate and excite faith more. Hence St. Augustine aptly calls the Sacrament "the visible word" (Tract. 80 in John), where he gives this definition of such a Sacrament: "The word is added to the element, and it becomes a Sacrament." For by "the word" is understood especially that which you may rightly call the soul and kernel and sum of the Gospel, namely, the word of promise, indeed in the Eucharist concerning the communion of Christ's body and blood, and spiritual nourishment. Finally, that the Gospel has nothing constituted with empty signs and mere figures, but also offers the very body and blood of the Lord, is clear from this, because it is also the object both of faith and of the Gospel. What the Gospel sets forth, faith embraces. Whence it is called "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth" (Rom. 1:16), "the law of faith" (3:27), "the word of faith" (10:8), "the living word" (Heb. 4:12). Moreover, faith receives not mere shadows, but the true body and blood of the Lord, indeed offered in the Gospel through the audible, in the Sacrament more strongly through the visible word, and converts it into juice and blood. Let those men certainly consider whether in this way, depreciating the preaching of the Gospel, and endlessly and excessively reproaching us with bare and vain figures, they are not putting a slur both on the Gospel itself and on Christ the Lord, whose institution we religiously follow.

XII. The philosophers wisely warn that every falsehood indeed depraves the intellect, but the "first cause of falsehood" (proton pseudos) generates countless errors, whose first origin, if rightly recognized and removed, allows the remaining faults to be easily met, indeed all their branches to be cut off with one stroke, as it were. Come then, and let us also show the proton pseudos and the first cause of those who do not acknowledge that a true conjunction with the

body and blood of the Lord actually occurs through faith. It consists in this: that they do not consider the divine and excellent power of saving faith, indeed they scarcely esteem it more highly than some sort of imagination or opinion residing in that faculty which is called imagination and phantasy. Hence it is that they are accustomed to maintain that what is not locally conjoined cannot, when received through the preceding word of God and the Sacrament, be posited as truly and really, but only imaginatively or intentionally present. But the Holy Scripture speaks far otherwise concerning the faith through which we are joined and justified with Christ, when it says that it is a most full certitude most firmly apprehending the promises in Christ (Col. 2:2); a firm confidence (2 Cor. 3:4); a strong confidence (John 16:33); a demonstration, or representation, or subsistence of the things hoped for (Heb. 11:1); through it is given the indwelling of Christ in us (John 14:23); the agglutination (1 Cor. 6:17); the concorporation and joining of our conjunction with Christ (Eph. 4:16); the being conformed to the likeness of Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. 6:5); the access with confidence (Eph. 3:12); through which we are made sharers of the root and fatness of the olive tree, that is, of Christ (Rom. 11:17); we put on the Lord Jesus Christ (13:14), so that Christ altogether dwells in our hearts through faith (Eph. 3:17). If therefore God in the word and Sacrament offers and represents the body and blood of Christ to the souls of the faithful to be eaten and drunk, and faith itself through its assent and confidence eats and drinks the body and blood of the Lord, who can doubt that to it the body and blood of the Lord, though by no means locally conjoined, ought nevertheless to be regarded and said to be most intimately, truly and really concorporated, present and united? It is truly unworthy of Christians to derogate from the efficacy of faith, through which it makes most present even things that are very distant; just as if the body and blood of the Lord could not be posited as present unless it were present in the same way as ancient fable depicted the companions of Ulysses to have been present within the belly of the Cyclops. Are not, even among men themselves most present to one another, the actions of spirits, and especially the harmony of minds arising thence, regarded as much more perfect and excellent than carnal and bodily activity, and the union of bodies produced thence, and does it not produce most real fruits and effects? And those who of old beheld and followed Christ from afar with true faith, certainly had him present more truly, really, divinely, and excellently, than the executioners, torturers, and the cruel and frenzied soldiers who stood close beside his sides, and with wicked hands touched, wounded, and lacerated his most holy body.

Moreover, what kind of presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist, whether true and real, or rather monstrous and phantastic, the Reverend Parish Minister and his accomplices possess in their Mass – they who distinguish between the sign and the thing signified in the Eucharist, who deprive the clergy of God of the blessed cup, who abolish the whole signification of the symbols, because their explanations show that they remove the signification both of the body as given in death and of the blood as poured out; who imagine bare, inert and separated accidents for the external symbol, and for the body indeed an invisible and indivisible and therefore not a body, a figment of dreamers, and display a Nothing under a Nothing to be adored; who finally hiss at the presence that proceeds from the life-giving Spirit and faith, and make a mockery of it – let them certainly consider for themselves.

XIII. But the truth of this presence will become even clearer if we shake the foreign and impious mode of that bodily presence, by which the body and blood of the Lord is posited in the Eucharist as present according to local distance, and indeed united with the empty species of the symbols, by solid arguments vindicating them from the objections of the Reverend Parish Minister. For then we will have established either that no true and real presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist is given at all, which would be blasphemous to say; or that the spiritual and sacramental presence which we have explained is altogether true and real, and abundantly sufficient for the salutary use of the Lord's Supper.

XIV. The question therefore is: Is the body and blood of the Lord in the Sacrament of the Eucharist truly, really, substantially, that is, according to local distance, present under the species of sensible things? The Reverend Parish Minister himself does not deny that I have properly informed him of the state of the question. And he defends the affirmative view in such a way that he labors to satisfy my arguments with many circumlocutions of words and examples, and so operously that he strives to overturn my three pages with fifteen whole leaves. But we asserted the negative with ten arguments. I now intend to repeat these, and free them from the objections, doing so succinctly and briefly, with God's favor, in this way: first, I will set forth each argument, and (since the Reverend Parish Minister seems to demand this, indeed his words on p. 349 appear to express an earnest desire for it) reduce it to the form of an evident syllogism; then I will collect and summarize the responses which the Reverend Parish Minister has pursued at length, and which the Very Reverend Provost also opposed to the Venerable Stuckius (for what need is there for us, with little profit, to make such long digressions?); finally, I will endeavor to respond to them briefly and clearly. When I have completed this task, it will be my aim to also set forth the opposing party's arguments, and vindicate the responses made to them by the Venerable Stuckius.

XV. We opposed the first argument against bodily presence from the words and history of the institution of the Eucharist, which admits of no greater objection. But since in them lies the citadel of our proof, we will distinctly draw out what pertains to the matter from them. And first, Christ testifies that his body is present in the Eucharist as given unto death, and his blood as poured out. The words of the Savior are clear: "This is my body which is given for you" (Luke 22:19). "This is my body which is broken for you" (1 Cor. 11:24). "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28). If therefore the body and blood of the Lord were present in the Eucharist locally and bodily, that which was broken would certainly be present locally, this which was poured out. But it could not be thus present in the first Eucharist, because then his body was not yet broken, nor his blood poured out; nor after the resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven, because his body, once broken, and his blood, once poured out, can no longer be broken and poured out. For "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. 9:28). "In that he died, he died unto sin once" (Rom. 6:10). We form the following syllogism:

If the body and blood of the Lord is present in the Eucharist, that as given and broken, this as poured out, then it is not present there locally, according to local distance.

But the body and blood of the Lord is present in the Eucharist, that as given and broken, this as poured out.

Therefore the body and blood of the Lord is not present there locally, according to local distance.

The consequence of the premise is evident, and rests on the axiom of eternal truth: "Of a non-entity there are no accidents." He who after the resurrection from death is no longer bodily broken, bloodily poured out, cannot after the resurrection be present bodily as broken, bloodily poured out in the Eucharist. How can a broken body, poured out blood, be present locally, which is no longer broken, no longer poured out? Thus in the first Eucharist also the body was not yet actually broken, the blood not yet actually poured out. Therefore the broken body, the poured out blood, could not be present there locally either. By a commemoration, representation, exhibition in legitimate use, the body as once broken, the blood as once poured out, can be present in the Eucharist sacramentally and spiritually: but not locally and bodily. The antecedent is testified by the sacrosanct mouth of our Savior himself.

XX. The Reverend Parish Minister contends with this argument in more than one way. But his verbose concepts come down to this: 1. From the fact that some things are contained in one period, it does not follow that they must be understood in precisely the same sense. Thus Paul in Philippians 2 says in one and the same period that Christ the Son of God took the form of a servant, and humbled himself even unto death. Yet it does not follow from this that because he was incarnated as the Son of God, he also died as the Son of God. It is enough if each is in the way in which it can be truly and plainly asserted. And if therefore the living and glorious body of Christ cannot in the strict sense, as to its own entity, be truly and really broken, yet it can still be said to be broken in another, true and customary sense, inasmuch as the species of bread, under which in place of the substance Christ's body is contained, are broken. Thus in Luke 8:44-45 the woman is said to have touched Christ, who touched the fringe of his garment, p.260-263.

Response: 1. That things said in the same period are not always to be understood in the same sense, but each in the appropriate and intended sense of the Holy Spirit, is doubtful to no one. 2. But the passage in Philippians 2 is wrongly brought in here. For there the discourse is about Jesus Christ, v.8, who as such both emptied himself, and took the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. 3. The sense that Christ's body is broken, given, his blood poured out, is not true, customary, or foreign, but most violently distorted, to the utmost degree. Christ's body was truly given, broken, his blood truly poured out. Therefore the Holy Spirit means the broken body, the poured out blood, not the species of either, as their explanations show. For the Son of God as such was not truly dead. The latter sense is most absurd; the former genuine, agreeing with the word of God and the events, weighty, apt, salutary. But that the broken body, the poured out blood, is said because the species of bread is broken, the species of wine poured out, is not only asserted nakedly, without any authority of the Divine word or shadow of reason, but also fulfills all the numbers of absurdity, especially among those who abhor all tropes in this matter.

And what rhetoric, whether sacred or profane, has given a name to so unheard-of a trope, according to which a body is said to be broken, killed, because not the species of that body, but of a completely different substance, and indeed separated from its proper subject, is broken? What sound reason would not shudder, indeed be indignant, at the assertion that a species separated from its proper subject is broken, poured out? How can that which has no part outside a part be broken, poured out? Finally, what consolation for the faithful soul is there in the breaking, pouring out of the species of bread and wine? Is this not to lose the kernel of the Gospel, and to wish to heal the people's affliction with a trifling nothing, a contemptible thing (Jer. 8:11)? Was the species of bread crucified for our sins, given unto death?

3. That Christ broke bread, not the species of bread, and that the bread thus broken is the body which is given and broken, the history testifies. Certainly the breaking of the bread is one thing, the breaking of the body another. The former is the sacrament of the latter. 4. But to take away the force of the example adduced, certainly Christ in Luke 8:45 says he was touched because the woman touched the fringe of his garment. But the woman did not touch the species of the fringe separated from the fringe: and Christ could then be truly touched. But here, when the species of bread is broken, it is said that Christ's body, which could not be broken before that hour in the first Eucharist, nor can be broken after his death, is broken. There is therefore no similarity of places, no comparison at all.

XXI. But the Reverend Parish Minister goes on, saying that Christ says in the Supper that his body is given, his blood poured out. For he used the present tense, "which is given," "which is poured out." Further, that "is broken" is taken in too crude a sense, for the bloody breaking of Christ, whereas indeed Christ's body was never broken in the rigorous sense (John 19:33, 36) and the Evangelist has not "which is broken" but "which is given," and therefore they mean a bloody giving, such as obtained both in the first Eucharist and does today. And this is also the meaning of Chrysostom in Homily 24 on 1 Corinthians, p.269-281.

Response: 1. Christ's and Paul's "which is given," "is broken," "is poured out," is the same as "shall be given," "shall be broken," "shall be poured out": a customary enallage of tense. Without this the discourse of Christ could not have been true. For when he spoke thus, his body was not yet being given, broken, nor his blood poured out: but his body was now being offered to be given, broken on the cross: his blood to be poured out. Christ spoke in Hebrew. But it is customary among the Hebrews to also designate the future with the same participle that they use for the present tense. Thus among the Prophets "coming days" often signifies "days to come." And although Christ's body was not yet broken, it is easy to understand that Christ instituted the bread as the sacrament of his body as broken, and his blood as poured out. For he immediately added: "Do this, as often as you do it, in remembrance of me." Christ therefore willed that the bread be eaten repeatedly in his remembrance. But his passion was then imminent. Therefore the bread could not long be the sign of his body yet to be broken: but it was necessary that it soon be the sign of his body now already broken. From the time that Christ's body was broken, it was never again the sacrament of Christ's body to be broken, but always of his body already broken. This is the reason why Christ used the participle of the present tense, not the future.

2. The giving of Christ's body unto death, indeed, according to Luke, and the breaking of the same according to Paul, are completely synonymous, denoting not indeed the breaking of bones, or corruption, as is clear from John 19:33-36, Psalm 16:10; but the laceration of the body and death. Thus to the Hebrews, breaking, rupture signifies death. When the members are no longer governed by one Spirit, they cease to be one, nor are they any longer organs. It is therefore just as if they were broken, ruptured. And what else does the breaking of the bread mentioned by Christ and Paul signify, than the breaking of the body? For the symbols must have an analogy with the thing signified. "If the sacraments," says St. Augustine to Boniface, Epistle 23, "had not some resemblance to the things of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all."

3. Nor indeed is any other breaking of Christ's body given, except that conjoined with his death, and therefore bloody. The breaking of the bread is the symbol and sacrament of his body broken on the cross, not the proper breaking of his body, whether bloody or unbloody, of which there is none at all. But the breaking of the species of bread is a mere fiction, which both lacks the authority of the Word of God, and conflicts with sound reason.

4. Nor does St. Chrysostom lend support to this fiction. For in the cited place he clearly treats not of the breaking of the species of bread, nor of the breaking of the body, but of the bread. Indeed he denies that Christ's body was broken on the cross, as regards the bones, that is. For he adds: "For he says, 'A bone of him shall not be broken.'" But whoever would deny that Christ's body was broken on the cross, would contradict Paul calling it the body "which is broken." Chrysostom was not so shameless as that, for in the following Homily 25 he speaks thus distinctly: "He gave his body equally. For he was equally broken for all, and his body was made equally for all."

XXII. Secondly, of the bread taken into his hands, blessed, broken and distributed, Christ said "This is my body." Likewise of the cup, or fruit of the vine: "This is my blood" (Matt.26:26-28). He therefore taught clearly that his body and blood are present in the Lord's Supper insofar as the bread is his body, and the wine or fruit of the vine is his blood. Whoever has added to these words will be found a liar. But the bread is his body, and the wine is his blood, in no other way than sacramentally, insofar as the one is divinely instituted as the sacrament and symbol of the other. We reduce the argumentation to the following syllogistic form:

If the body and blood of the Lord are present in the Eucharist in such way that the bread is the body, and the wine the blood, then neither is present locally and bodily.

But the former is true.

Therefore also the latter.

The consequence of the premise is evident, because the bread can be the body, and the wine the blood, through sacramental representation and sealing, in the customary manner in the

other sacraments, and sufficiently for faith and salvation; but not through the local existence of the body under the species of bread, of the blood under the species of wine. For neither do the bread and wine anywhere signify the mere species and accident of each; nor is what exists locally in the one directly predicated, or accustomed or able to be predicated, of the other. The antecedent is clear from the very sequence of the text and construction, and also from Paul's paraphrase explaining Christ's words thus: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. 10:16). From the sequence of the text we adduce the following bare and express syllogism:

What the Lord gave to his disciples was the very same thing which he willed them to receive and eat.

But the bread which the Lord took into his hands and broke was that very same thing which the Lord gave to his disciples.

Therefore the bread which the Lord took into his hands and broke was that very same thing which he willed his disciples to receive and eat.

The major premise radiates with its own clear light. For the Lord did not give one thing to his disciples, and will them to receive and eat another thing. The data are related. The minor premise is equally manifest. For when the Evangelists had said that the Lord took and broke the bread, they add that he also gave the same bread to his disciples. The conclusion therefore stands on a sure and firm foundation.

Moreover, because that bread which the Lord took into his hands and broke was that which he commanded his disciples to receive and eat, it is necessary that the same bread was also his body. Concerning this matter we again set forth a bare and express syllogism:

What the Lord commanded his disciples to receive and eat, that was his body.

But the bread which the Lord took into his hands and broke was that which he commanded his disciples to receive and eat.

Therefore the bread which the Lord took into his hands and broke was his body.

The major premise is greater than all exception. For when the Lord said "Take, eat, this is my body," it is certainly just as if he had said "Take, eat, what I command you to receive and eat, that is my body." For the word "this" is relative, and refers to and represents those things in the coherent discourse of the Lord which precede it. The minor premise is proven in the prior syllogism.

XXIII. The Brethren labor to cast shadows on the clearest light. Let us examine with what success they have labored. Therefore, first of all they object that Christ took bread and gave it to the disciples, but not in the same way as it was. He took the bread unchanged; he gave it

changed and transubstantiated by the consecration, that is. They say this is in the same sense as the master of the feast in John 2:9 is said to have tasted the water become wine, p.114-116, 282-283.

Response: 1. We readily admit that the bread was changed in its use by the benediction or consecration, so that from ordinary bread it became a sacred symbol. But the assertion that it was changed by the consecration, that is, transubstantiated, with the substance perishing and the accidents remaining without their proper subject, is an utterly rash assertion which is proved by no reason and contradicts the Word of God and sound reason. Bread substantially changed, that is, transubstantiated, is not bread. For it has lost its very substance or essence of bread. And Christ did not say of the blessed bread "This has become my body" but "This is my body." Which words are manifestly not practical but theoretical, demonstrating what they were, in the true sense, that is.

2. But even the judgment of the senses, implanted by the very Author of the senses, God himself, strongly prescribes against substantial change. And how, I ask, did that substantial change occur? Was it by the benediction? In that case the change would have been made before the words "For this is my body" were spoken, which they claim are the words of consecration. Or by the utterance of the words "For this is my body"? In that case therefore the change did not proceed until after the utterance of the words was completed, and so the word "this" spoken before the utterance was completed in no way designates the bread as substantially changed.

3. I add that such a substantial change cannot be asserted without the destruction of the Eucharist, just as a substantial change of the water in baptism cannot be asserted without the destruction of baptism. But bread and wine, indeed the very body and blood, are removed from the Eucharist, since bread and wine are not converted into the body and blood of the Lord, but into certain phantasms, properties of mind-entities, as the Venerable Stuckius gravely warned. Finally, all the arguments by which the dogma of transubstantiation is overturned elsewhere apply here too.

4. In John 2:9 the master of the feast is said to have tasted wine made from water. But was that wine made from water really water under the accidents of water? Did not his sense of taste rather detect what it was, namely wine, concerning the goodness of which he testified in verse 10? Just as the wedding guests believed him testifying about the wine from his tasting it, so the faithful ought to believe those testifying about the bread and wine in the Supper and appealing to the senses. And doubtless the judgment of the Apostles was the same as that of all the faithful, because the mind of all is one by the one Spirit, though the Evangelists did not write this explicitly, nor did the Venerable Stuckius ever pronounce it in so many words and syllables, as the Very Reverend Provost rashly imputes to him (p.113).

5. I add that it is called "wine made" there, where the prior substance along with the accidents departed so that a new form could be introduced into its matter; the added words "wine made" remove all doubt about a change having been made. But in this matter all things are otherwise.

Finally, just as in such transformations, such as that of water into wine, the new substance sometimes retains the name of the former, so in such institutions of signs, the signs are often called by the names of the things themselves. Since therefore parallel examples of speech are abundantly available, what is more fitting than that here also the judgment of the senses and reason, and other evidences of truth, should prevail, and prove that the bread is called the body because it is the sacrament of it?

XXIV. The Brethren further insist that none of the four Evangelists refers the demonstrative article to the bread, so as to say either openly "This bread is my body" or covertly "This is my body." But all refer it to the word "body", p.359-361.

Response: 1. But this is truly frivolous and skipping about. The Evangelists and Paul did not wish to change anything in this formula, because it is briefer, equally clear, and free from the tediousness of repetition. For what good would it do to repeat what was just put, and what the whole context indicated must be repeated?

2. Yet the Ethiopian Liturgy does not hesitate to render it "This bread is my body." And Tertullian in his verses: "The bread received, likewise the juice of the vine, 'This,' he says, 'is my body and blood which is shed.'"

XXV. Third, the bread is Christ's body in the same way that the cup is the New Testament, Luke 22:20. But the cup is the New Testament in such a way that it does not locally exist and contain it. Therefore the bread is not Christ's body in such a way that this is locally present under it. The argument is in this form:

The bread is Christ's body in the same way that the cup is the New Testament.

But the cup is the New Testament, not because this is locally present in it, but because it is the sacrament and symbol of this.

Therefore the bread also is the body, not because the body is locally present under it, but because it is the sacrament and symbol of this.

The major premise rests on the logical axiom "The reason for equals is equal." But the minor premise is evident from this, that the New Testament, which is not a bodily substance, is not even capable of such a manner of speech and substantial presence.

XXVI. The Reverend Parish Minister first responds that the bread is nowhere called the body.

Response: The preceding argument both proved and asserted that Christ called the bread the body. And the analogy of the other symbol also supports this.

XXVII. He persists in objecting that the cup is called the New Testament because the blood of Christ was contained in it, by which the New Testament was ratified and confirmed. For this

reason Christ said "The cup is the New Testament in my blood." And Mark 14:24 "This is my blood of the New Testament," that is, by which the New Testament is sealed. For it was sealed not by the wine, but by the blood, p.286, 289.

Response: 1. The New Testament was indeed ratified by the blood of Christ the testator poured out on the cross, and so by his death, as Paul testifies in Hebrews 9:16-18: "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is in force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Yet it is most foreign for the blood to be properly called the New Testament on this account. For that by which a thing is confirmed and ratified is not the thing itself. And what sound person has ever properly called the blood, the death of the testator, the testament itself? Or said that the blood and death of the testator exists locally with the very testament?

2. But what does it contribute to the ratification of the Testament if the blood were invisibly poured out from the cup? And if this were done, and indeed poured out for us, for the remission of sins, why did Christ die on the cross? And what did he accomplish by dying? And what is that remission which excludes the "bringing in" of an offering (Heb. 10:18)? How can Christ's death be a propitiation and redemption, if his blood must be invisibly poured out from the cup daily?

3. By a trope of the container for the contained, the "cup" certainly denotes that which was in the cup, since not the cup but what was in the cup was to be drunk; and it is equivalent to the pronoun "this." What Matthew and Mark expressed as "This is my blood of the New Testament," Luke and Paul have as "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Which words, though transposed in the outward speech, do not differ in sense, since each of the sacred writers has doubtless happily expressed the mind of the Lord. The sense comes to this: This cup, or that which is contained in this cup, is my blood by which the New Testament is ratified.

But "this" or "this cup" denotes not the blood but the wine contained in the cup, both because in the interpreter beyond all exception, Paul in 1 Cor. 10:16, the cup and bread mutually explain each other, so that the cup opposite to the bread signifies wine; and because he calls it the "cup of blessing which we bless", whereas according to the opinion of the Adversaries he would rather have said "the blood of blessing by which we are blessed", since what is less is blessed by what is greater (Heb. 7:7) (where the Very Reverend Provost, p.150, contrary to the view of his partisans who understand that blessing to be the consecration, and indeed the priestly consecration which changes, confounds the blessing of the cup, that is, as he wants it, of Christ's blood, with that blessing by which Daniel's companions blessed the Lord in the furnace, ineptly confounding simple blessing with the blessing of consecration); and because what Christ received and "gave thanks over" is denoted, and what he doubtless received in the cup, as the Adversaries themselves admit who claim that the wine was changed by consecration, was wine; and because Christ himself called the drink which he gave to the Apostles the "fruit of the vine"; and because, as Jansenius himself argues, the words "in my blood" would have been ineptly added, if by the word "cup" Christ's blood had been designated (for what is this but to say "This blood is the New Testament in my blood"?). I pass over all the arguments by which it is proved that the blood is not present under the species of wine.

4. The words of Luke and Paul are quoted less faithfully by the Reverend Parish Minister as "This is the cup, the New Testament in my blood", as if the "cup" belonged to the predicate, not the subject. But Paul has it expressly: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood", making "This cup" the subject, the remaining words the attribute.

5. Truly the New Testament was properly ratified not by wine but by the blood of the testator. Yet the wine was instituted by Christ as the sacrament and seal of that blood by which the New Testament was ratified.

6. The diversity of words among the sacred writers does not aid the Adversaries, but rather confounds them; indeed, it seems to have been chosen with studied care for confounding them. For the cup is as much the blood according to Matthew and Mark as it is the New Testament according to Luke and Paul. But just as the drink in the cup is properly not the New Testament, nor is it transubstantiated into this, so it is also not properly the blood, nor is it transubstantiated into this.

XXVIII. Fourth, in Matthew 26:29 and Mark 14:25, at the words of Christ by which he gave the cup, these words are added: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." He calls it "new" both in the sense it sometimes has of "a new kind", as "new tongues" in Mark 16:17, Acts 2:4; and in the sense of "hitherto unusual". So the "fruit of the vine, this new", is simply the thing sealed by the symbol, then indeed promised for the near future, but soon to be truly bestowed, namely the joy flowing from him as the true vine, which they were to receive from his resurrection and in his kingdom. It is clear from this that the wine which Christ gave to be drunk was the symbol of the thing promised by him, the "fruit of the vine", and so true, natural, substantial wine. The syllogism will be as follows:

What is present in the Eucharist as the fruit of the vine is not locally present as the blood.

But what is contained in the cup is present in the Eucharist as the fruit of the vine.

Therefore what is contained in the cup is not locally present as the blood.

The major premise is confirmed by the common rule that disparate opposites are not the same. But the fruit of the vine and the blood are doubtless disparate opposites. The minor premise is drawn from Christ's words.

XXIX. The Adversary receives this most powerful weapon in such a way as to oppose three things to it especially. They are the following:

First, therefore, he replies that Christ in clear words called what was contained in the cup his blood. And so it was not the fruit of the vine, but truly and really his own blood, p.290-291, 292.

Response: The diversity of respect removes the opposition. What was contained in the cup was properly the fruit of the vine, wine; improperly it was also the blood, according to the sacramental signification, that is. But it could no more be properly at once the fruit of the vine and the blood, than an opposite can be the same thing.

XXX. Secondly, the Adversary objects that not the wine, but Christ's own blood itself, can be called the fruit of the vine by an allusion to passages like John 15:1, where Christ calls himself the true vine; and Gen. 49:11, where Christ the same is said to "wash his garments in wine, and his vesture in the blood of grapes." He argues that the words by which the cup is called the blood are to be understood more in their proper sense than those by which it is called the fruit of the vine. This is partly because neither Paul nor Luke makes any mention of the fruit of the vine, though all mention the blood; and partly because no Father ever concluded from those words that wine, not blood, was contained in the cup. He also argues that the remaining words, such as "cup", "kingdom of God", "new fruit of the vine", are to be explained by us through tropes, p.292-296.

Response: 1. All philologists know that by the customary Hebraism the "fruit of the vine" is the same as the "blood of the grape", properly speaking of wine. For the Hebrews are accustomed to call wine the "fruit of the vine", as in their familiar benediction "Blessed be our God, the Lord of the world, who created the fruit of the vine." For a similar reason the poet Anacreon called wine the "offspring of the vine."

2. Moreover, that the "fruit of the vine" here denotes not the blood but properly speaking wine, not only does the Adversary himself soon acknowledge, but other things also confirm it. For besides the fact that it is called not the offspring of an animal body but of a vine, and apart from the prejudice of the Adversaries, no solid reason can be given why we should depart from the literal meaning; the Lord also, by implying that he was speaking of the fruit of the vine, shows most clearly that he is speaking of a potable liquor. But the blood of the Lord in the Eucharist, inasmuch as it was not shed outside the veins but contained in the body, is not properly a potable matter. Otherwise the Lord would have drunk himself, though as Cyril rightly observes in Book 9, he can partake of nothing of himself. In the words "I will not drink of this fruit of the vine" he clearly implies something distinct from himself, which the blood was not. As often as the Lord speaks of himself under the metaphoric name of the vine, he always adds something by which he is differentiated from the vine properly so-called, as in John 15:1 where he calls it the "true" vine; and in Genesis 49:11 where, by a prophetic and openly metaphorical phrase, he expresses not the "fruit of the vine" but the "blood of grapes" with which the robe of Shiloh is to be washed.

3. That the cup is not properly called the blood, but the sacrament of the blood, we have proved above. But the silence of Paul and Luke about the authentic words of Christ is in no way detracting from their truth. Nor did the Fathers have to deal with the error of the Pontificians, since being novel, it had not yet reared its head in their time. Nevertheless, Clement of Alexandria in the Pedagogue Book 2 Chapter 2 refutes with those words of Christ the error of the Encratites or Hydroparastates, who abhorred the use of wine. I will quote his words: "Know

for certain that Christ also made use of wine. For he too was a man, and he blessed the wine and said: 'Take, drink, this is my blood—the blood of the vine.' For the holy stream of joy is allegorically signified, the Word shed for many for the remission of sins." Behold, the Holy Father teaches that Christ in the Eucharist blessed the wine, drank the wine. He teaches that the sense of Christ's words "This is my blood" is "the fruit of the vine is my blood." He teaches that in that statement the fruit of the vine allegorically signifies the blood of the Word shed for many for the remission of sins. He teaches, finally, that the Lord in saying "I will drink no more, etc." understood by the fruit of the vine the wine which he drank in the E*ucharist.*

4. That the words "cup", "kingdom of God", "new fruit of the vine", must be taken improperly is admitted by all, and the reason for this is clear. But no reason at all appears why the "fruit of the vine" should be understood properly as Christ's blood. Though indeed calling the wine the "offspring of the vine" is not a proper expression either.

XXXI. Finally, the Reverend Parish Minister objects that Christ in the cited words is not speaking of the Eucharistic cup that was consecrated, but of the Paschal cup, in which there was certainly the true fruit of the vine. For Luke distinctly relates those words before the consecration. He is to be followed more than Matthew and Mark, who relate them after the consecration, because he was accustomed to observe the order of events better; and here indeed in chapter 22:15-16 he first distinctly mentions the Paschal supper, and in it the cited words by which he implied that a far more excellent feast than the Paschal feast was to be instituted; only after that does he describe the Eucharistic supper. Moreover, it is said that Matthew and Mark can be reconciled with Luke in this way: that they first related the Eucharistic words, then added the words by which Christ had already in the Paschal supper predicted this institution of the supper as a new fruit, p.296-302.

Response: 1. Noble Papists, such as Vasquez, Gamachaeus, and others, not only assert but also prove that Christ's words there are about the Eucharistic cup, both because Matthew and Mark relate those words of the Lord "I will not drink, etc." immediately after the consecration of the Eucharistic cup, and make mention only of it; and because the Church also uses these words to prove that wine is the matter of the consecration of the cup; and because Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Augustine interpret them thus. And to the Fathers named many others could be added. But hardly one Father favors the opposing view.

2. Luke, because he mentions Christ's words signifying that this was the last Passover, also added those words to the Paschal cup, which was substantially the same as the Eucharistic cup. Yet both he and the other Evangelists signified that what Christ and the disciples drank in that supper was the "fruit of the vine", and that a new kind, that is, of another sort than they would drink in the Kingdom of Heaven. It follows from this that it did not matter to them in what place those words were mentioned. But if at the end of the supper they did not drink the fruit of the vine, it would not have mattered where those words were mentioned, and so Matthew and Mark would have erred. Thus the Evangelists are best reconciled, and at the same time the connection of the orthodox explanation is more tightly bound.

I will not now say that it also seems to learned interpreters that those words were pronounced twice by Christ, both after the Paschal cup and after the Eucharistic cup was drunk. However that may be, it is certain that the Evangelists are not to be set at odds, nor Matthew and Mark to be corrected from Luke, but both are to be given credence.

3. But the attempted reconciliation by the Reverend Parish Minister cannot be accepted at all, both because it is never the custom to postpone the prophecy of a future thing to the thing done itself, which would certainly be most unworthy; and because in Matthew the particle "but" in the words "But I say to you" connects those words with the preceding Eucharistic words; and because the present time is expressly noted by Matthew, as "from now on"; and because the consecrated Eucharistic cup just mentioned is as it were pointed out by the words in Matthew "not drink from now on of this fruit of the vine", and so from the cup just mentioned (for no mention of the Paschal cup had preceded); and finally, because the "new fruit of the vine" cannot designate the Eucharistic cup given by Christ in that Eucharistic supper, because he predicted it to be drunk "new" in the Kingdom of the Father, that is, after Christ's resurrection, either on earth when after the consummation the Church was to be governed by him alone in righteousness and liberty and joy under the rule of God alone, and he was actually to impart those excellent blessings of the New Testament; or in heaven through the enjoyment of heavenly glory—neither of which had place in the first Eucharist preceding Christ's death, and so could not be predicted to have place in it. The Reverend Parish Minister can show no one who has interpreted the Kingdom of the Father in these words about the first Eucharist preceding Christ's death. And so that interpretation is from his own thought and fiction.

XXXII. Fifth, what is present in the Eucharist locally, that is, is expressly called "bread" by Paul, the exquisite interpreter of Christ's words. For he often speaks distinctly of what is present in the Eucharist as "bread". Thus he says in 1 Cor. 10:16 "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" And v.17 "We being many are one bread and one body." And in chapter 11:26 "As often as ye eat this bread." V.27 "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." V.28 "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." Three times therefore after the consecration, with a few words in between, he calls it "bread". Hence it is easy to forge the following syllogism:

If in the Eucharist even after the consecration the bread remains, then it is bread, not Christ's body, that is locally present.

But the former is true.

Therefore also the latter.

The connection of the consequence is acknowledged by the atomists themselves. For they forbid believing that both the substance of the bread and the body are locally present together, a doctrine which they rightly consider, along with us, to be that of the Synousiasts, or rather Disousiasts, as the great Salmasius rightly thinks they should be called. Nor indeed is it possible

that in the same single place, under the heterogeneous accidents of one and the same heterogeneous body, two disparate substances lie concealed. The antecedent is proved by the indisputable testimony of the Apostle.

XXXIII. Bellarmine, that great Achilles, in Book 4 of The Sacraments, Chapter 1, opposes various, even conflicting, responses to this argument. First he says that Scripture ordinarily calls things by a trope as they outwardly appear, as it calls a bronze serpent a serpent, etc. Thus he does not reject a trope here, but that fictitious one of the Cardinal's. But furthermore, things that are called what they outwardly appear cannot easily be known from elsewhere to be not what they outwardly appear. But when the Eucharist is called "bread", what could be more natural than for all who do not rage against our senses to think that it is truly bread, with our senses testifying, our reason guiding us, religion itself and the nature of the thing not so much calling as dragging us to it? If the bronze serpent had truly been similar to a serpent, and if moreover Scripture had called it as absolutely a serpent as it called the Eucharist bread, who would have doubted that it was to be considered a true and natural serpent? But if Christ's body can rightly be called bread because of the similitude it has to bread, then it can just as rightly be called Christ's body because of the similitude, or rather singular relation, which it has to that. But let us dismiss this vain trifling.

Second, therefore, the same Bellarmine asserts that Christ's body, as the heavenly food of the faithful, can well be called bread, because by the name "bread" in general any food can be understood. And thus Christ himself in John 6:51,53 is called the "living bread, the bread which came down from heaven", that is, the supercelestial food, as the Very Reverend Provost also argues. Thus the sense of the Apostle's words will be: "The communion of the heavenly food which we bless or consecrate is the communion of the body of Christ." But what has this to do with the scope of the Apostle? What force is there in this statement? What coherence of words? What coloring of interpretation? The Son of God, insofar as he descended from heaven to be manifested in the flesh, is called the bread that came down from heaven; but his body, insofar as it was broken on the cross, is truly food indeed, but heavenly only in view of the person; and it was taken up into heaven indeed as food and heavenly food, but not so that it was broken (in which way it is signified in the Holy Supper), nor so that it descended from heaven in order to become food, but we have communion with him through the Spirit of Christ.

But why say more? The Apostle is speaking of the bread which, as he had said in the preceding, the Lord took, and having given thanks, broke and distributed. For he says in 1 Cor. 11:26 "As often as ye eat this bread", that very bread which, as he had mentioned, was taken, broken, and distributed. But Christ took not just any food, nor the heavenly bread which he himself was, but true, natural, and substantial bread. If so wonderful a change had taken place here, the Apostle, who gave no indication of a change, would have ceased to use the customary word here. But a few words later he used it three times.

Moreover, Christ's body is nowhere simply called bread, but always with an addition, "the bread of life", "the living bread", "the bread which came down from heaven". And the Apostle also speaks in v.29 of such bread which can be unworthily eaten unto judgment and death. But

Christ and his body cannot be so eaten, as he himself testifies in John 6:54 "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

XXXIV. Sixth, Christ commanded in the Eucharist to eat the bread as his body, to drink the cup or, as we have proved, the wine as his blood, for a "commemoration", Luke 22:19, 1 Cor. 11:24-25, and indeed in such a way that this commemoration is made by the "showing of the Lord's death till he come", v.26. A syllogism readily adapts itself here:

Of him of whom such a commemoration is made in the Eucharist, that in it he must be announced as dead, and yet as one who will come again to us alive hereafter, he is not locally present in the Eucharist under the species of the symbols invisibly.

But of Christ according to his human nature such a commemoration is made in the Eucharist, that in it he must be announced as dead, and yet as one who will come again to us alive hereafter.

Therefore Christ according to his human nature is not locally and invisibly present in the Eucharist under the species of the symbols.

The major premise will doubtless be admitted by all who have a sound mind. For how can he be locally present in the Eucharist, of whom we commemorate in the Eucharist as having once died for us, and as one who will come again to us hereafter when the Eucharist will no longer have place, and to whom therefore in the Eucharist itself a monument is established and fixed by the Savior? Is anyone so absurd that if he had a father present, but wrapped in a sheet or lying on a covered bed, he would wish to celebrate his memory as absent by some rite?

We are indeed said to commemorate God though present, not properly, but in a certain similitude, both on account of the works by which he manifested himself before, and because when we are said to commemorate him, we do those things which we are accustomed to do when we recall someone to memory. But nothing of the kind happens here. For in partaking of the Supper we do not merely call Christ to memory outwardly; but the Supper was also instituted for this end, that by such a reminiscence we might call to mind him as having gone elsewhere and as going to return from there at the end of the world.

I add that this commemoration also pertains to our consolation, namely to mitigate the grief of our longing which we feel on account of Christ's absence. For by this rite Christ willed to assuage the sorrow of his disciples arising from his departure from them which he was planning. The minor premise is almost stated word-for-word by Christ himself, and repeated by the Apostle Paul speaking by the Spirit.

XXXV. They in no way strike this most express argument with what the Reverend Parish Minister objects on p.303 etc. He argues thus, that the discourse is either about a thing, namely the body and blood of Christ, or about an action, namely the giving of the body and shedding of the blood. If about a thing, certainly the body and blood contained in the Eucharist can be the

commemoration of it as given and shed on the cross. If about an action, namely the giving of the body and shedding of the blood, certainly that action, inasmuch as it occurs today in the Eucharist, can be an optimal commemoration of that which occurred on the cross - just as David displayed the head and sword of Goliath in commemoration of that victorious action by which he himself cut off that head of Goliath with the same sword. Similar examples are brought forward on p.304 etc.

Response: Indeed Christ commanded that a commemoration be made in the Eucharist both of himself and of his action. For he says in Luke 22:19 "Do this in remembrance of me." And in 1 Cor. 11:26 "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." And the Savior himself and his interpreter commanded that a memorial be kept in the Eucharist both of Christ himself, and of his body and blood, and of his passion.

Yet neither can the body of Christ supposed to lie invisibly under the species of the symbols, nor the examples adduced be similar cases. Not the former, for that which is supposed to be the body, and yet does not fall upon the senses, so that it is both invisible and indivisible like a Democritean atom, can in no way be a monument, sign, or memorial of a bodily and sensible thing and action, since every sign, and therefore every memorial too, according to St. Augustine, must subject itself to the senses, though the thing signified is subjected to the mind.

Nor can a living, invisible, indivisible, and impassible thing be a monument of a dying, suffering, broken thing. Nor, finally, did Christ most manifestly institute a commemoration of himself as absent, and as one who was finally, namely at the end of the world, to return again, as Paul says "Ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."

Nor the latter examples either, for both the head of Goliath and his sword were present in a visible manner, but the body of Christ is neither known by sense, nor reason, nor revelation to be present, indeed a monument of it is set up in the Eucharist as one formerly visibly dead and finally to return again, and so as absent.

And just as the head and sword of Goliath could be an illustrious trophy and monument of the preceding action, here an invisibly lurking body is set up as a monument of an action, or rather passion, not so much past as continued in its performance. I ask you, Reverend Parish Minister, to please unfold for yourself the book of nature and Scripture. You will find nowhere even the shadow of a similar example.

XXXVI. Thus far we have asserted the special arguments drawn from the institution of the Eucharist itself. There follows now the third general argument, connected with the second, derived from this, that in the Eucharist the bread which is broken is called the "communion of the body of Christ" in 1 Cor. 10:16. In which words is contained a lucid exegesis of Christ's words "This is my body", as is argued both by the other part of the Supper, the cup; and by the proportion of the subjects; and by the similarity of the predicates and the predication itself; and because it cannot be said that Christ gave anything greater by the communion of his body. The argument is in this form:

If in the Eucharist the bread which is broken is the communion of Christ's body, then his body is not locally present in the eating of it.

But the former is true.

Therefore also the latter.

The consequence is firm, because the bread which is broken, and so the substance of the bread (for this is what is broken), can be the communion of the body not by the local presence of the body lurking under alien species, but only by sacramental signification and sealing, which provides a right to the body of Christ, and to fellowship with him, his merit and righteousness, as its pledge and earnest money, so to speak.

"Communion" is also one thing, "communication" or bringing of the body into this or that place by putting the species of bread into it is another. The Apostle is not speaking in this latter way, but in the former. For he explains himself quite clearly in the following verse 17, saying "For we being many are one bread and one body." This is an express explanation of the words of the Apostle, as the causal particle "for" indicates. To have communion of Christ's body through the bread, namely the broken and eaten bread, is to become one body with Christ through the bread. This is that "communion of the body of Christ."

But how are we many one body? Is it by the local existence of Christ's body orally eaten in the viscera of believers? Not at all. For we are already one body through something else, namely the Spirit of Christ. And so for the rationale of being one body, it is not required that Christ's body orally eaten be present to our body. For "the flesh profiteth nothing, the Spirit quickeneth" (John 6:63). And according to the Adversaries themselves, not all who receive the body in this way are "one body."

And thus we are one body, thus we have communion of the body of Christ, in the same way that the Israelites partaking of the victims were "partakers of the altar" (v.18). But did those eating the victims enclose the altar within themselves, and thus become one with the altar? The antecedent is taken from the irrefragable testimony of the Apostle.

XXXVII. The Reverend Parish Minister strenuously tests the powers of his wit here, so as to deflect this weapon. But in the end, the circumlocutions of his prolix response come down to this: The Apostle by "the bread which we break" did not mean the substance of the material bread, but the supercelestial bread, the food itself, the body of Christ, of which John 6:55 speaks. For it is said that this, not the bread, is broken in 1 Cor. 11:24. Why did he not say: "The bread which we take, eat, signifies the communion of the body of Christ"? Why not: "The wine or fruit of the vine which we drink denotes the communion of his blood"? Why does Paul call it the "cup of blessing which we bless", if nothing more excellent than wine is contained in it? How can the breaking of the bread signify union with the body of Christ? How can the substance of the bread make us one body with Christ? It is certainly by the Holy Spirit that we are made one

body with Christ, but at the same time also, as Paul says in v.17 speaking thus, "we being many are one bread and one body." But also that Paul in v.18 saying "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" is not speaking properly of the carnal Israelites of that time who were believers before Christ, awaiting his coming, but of the carnal Israelites of his own time, who were such not according to the faith of their forefathers, but only according to carnal generation, and who in Paul's time by partaking of bloody sacrifices became partakers not of the true altar of Christ, but only of the material altar. And this, he says, is clear from the whole context of the Apostle. Finally, we are one body with Christ through the eating of the bread in the same way that the Holy Spirit also is in us, 1 Cor. 6:19. But he is in us really, not merely by signification. Therefore we are also really one body with Christ, p.310-324.

XXXVIII. Truly the Reverend Parish Minister uses long words and long circumlocutions, but advances absolutely nothing to the substance of the matter. For 1. that the "bread which we break" designates not the supercelestial bread or Christ, but the very substance of bread, we have already made manifest above. The Adversary says that Paul calls it "bread" because it retains the appearance of bread. Certainly they are forced to invent strange tropes, they who utterly abhor all true and customary tropes! Is that which was, and is no longer, the communion of Christ's body? And indeed the argument that we are one body? For in the following verse the Apostle infers that we are many and yet one body precisely because we partake of one bread, that is, of the same nature and having the same scope. The proving argument must not at all be confused with the thesis here. How absurd it would be to say: That which was bread is the communion of Christ's body! Supposing it refers to Christ's body, it is false that Christ's body was leavened bread baked in an oven. Nor is "bread" put for the accidents, because neither are the accidents of bread the bread, nor is what they wish to be contained under the accidents of bread the bread or the communion of the body, nor are the accidents the body or the communion of the body.

Moreover, Paul clearly argues that those who partake of things sacrificed to idols have communion with demons, just as he who partakes of the bread has communion with the body of Christ. Suppose then the Apostle had spoken thus: "The bread, that is, not the bread, but the body of Christ, is the communion of the body of Christ." Would this not be trifling? For what would this have to do with things sacrificed to idols? Do things sacrificed to idols have the same relation to demons as the communion of Christ's body has to the communion of Christ's body? Where did Christ, where did the Apostle say that the bread was bread and is no longer bread, and that by the bread is to be understood not the bread? Is this to adhere to the letter? But finally, what does the Reverend Parish Minister want by bringing in the testimony of the Apostle in 1 Cor. 11:24 that it is not the bread but the body of Christ that is broken in the Eucharist? For did not Christ himself take bread, break it, and command us also to do what he did? Does not the Apostle clearly say "the bread which we break"? Why then does the Reverend Parish Minister deny what is clearer than the noonday sun? Why, moreover, does he bear false witness against the Apostle himself, who nowhere asserts that in the Eucharist we break the body of Christ itself by the breaking of the species of bread, and so kill it, crucify it? For the sole killing, crucifixion, breaking of Christ is his. Did our Apostle by his teaching make faithful Christians such dire Cyclopes "crucifying the Son of God afresh" (Heb. 6:6)? But his words in 1 Cor. 11:24

sound thus: "This is my body which is broken for you," not which we break. Christ's body was broken for the Corinthians on the cross, not in the Eucharist. It is excessively sad that they are compelled to interpret Scripture so wrongly, who are unwilling to understand one thing rightly, that we may here repeat the complaint of St. Irenaeus.

2. I may with equal fairness retort on the Reverend Parish Minister, who asks why the Apostle did not clearly say: "The bread which we eat or break signifies or figures the communion of Christ's body": Why did the Apostle not also clearly say: "The bread, that is, not the bread but the flesh of Christ clothed with the species of bread, of which we break the species but not the substance, is the communion of Christ's body, namely the invisible and indivisible, and therefore spiritual"? But for me it has been enough to show the exegesis of Christ's words thus far, that the Apostle put the express words "the bread which we break" in place of the pronoun "this", and so the subject; and in place of the words "is my body", and so the predicate, those: "is the communion of Christ's body"; and explained those very words again so as to teach that his meaning is that through partaking of the bread we become one body with Christ, that is, Christ is in us and we in him; Christ is our head and we who receive the seal with faith are mutually members; moreover, that Christ's sacrifice for sins and to obtain righteousness is also ours, because Christ is ours.

3. I am moreover struck with amazement that it occurred to the Reverend Parish Minister to ask: Why did Paul call it the "cup of blessing" if nothing more excellent than wine was contained in it? For can not the wine, the sacrament and most certain pledge of the blood of Christ which cleanses us from sins, having been made sacred by the benediction, be just as properly called the "blessed cup" as the baptismal water consecrated by benediction can properly be called the "blessed water"?

4. That he also denies that the breaking of the bread can signify the communion of Christ's body has likewise been refuted. Can not the breaking of the bread be a sign of communion with Christ's body more than the breaking of the species of bread can? And our union and communion with Christ is not only with him as risen, but also as dead and broken, according to the testimony of the Apostle in Rom. 6:5 "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." And v.8 "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." Therefore in this way, by the divine institution, in the legitimate use, signifying, sealing, and exhibiting, the substance of the blessed bread makes us to be one body with Christ, mutually members.

5. As for the words of the Apostle in v.18 "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?", it matters little to the present discussion whether they are understood of the carnal Israel as it was before Christ, or as it was in the time of the Apostle. Both can be called "partakers of the altar" - those, if they ate the victims with true faith, truly and really according to the truth of the thing; these, outwardly and according to their intention. But neither had communion with the altar in such a way as to enclose it within their viscera and convert it into their juice and blood, but in such a way as to testify their hope of the expiation of their sins, whether through Christ whose altar the sacrifice was the sacrament and figure, or

through the opus operatum, which was the error of the carnal Israel deflecting from the true faith. In the same way, those who eat the bread do not have communion with Christ's body in such a way as to receive and enclose it present and united with the substance of their body. On this alone the nerve of our argument consists. Here is Rhodes, here is the dance!

6. Finally, the Holy Spirit and Christ's body are considered in a completely different way. The former is most present to all believers both in essence and gracious operation. But the latter, because it resides gloriously at the right hand of God until the last judgment, can in no way be locally present.

XXXIX. The fourth argument is taken from the words of the Savior in John 3:13: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." He clearly teaches that it is impossible for anyone to descend from heaven to earth, and yet remain in heaven, without local motion, unless he is God, the Son of man. How then can Christ according to his human nature with his body so descend to earth without change of place, and yet remain in heaven at the same time? Hence the following syllogism is forged:

Whoever descends to earth without local motion, and at the same time remains in heaven, is the true God.

But Christ according to his human nature is not the true God.

Therefore Christ according to his human nature does not descend to earth without local motion, and at the same time remain in heaven; and consequently is not locally present in the Eucharist.

XL. This argument seems trifling to the Reverend Parish Minister. Therefore he almost laughs at and derides it. Let us see with what right. But the tortuous windings of his responses come down to this: Christ does not say that it is impossible for someone to descend from heaven while at the same time remaining in heaven, just as he certainly does not say that it is impossible for someone to ascend into heaven unless he descended. For the just too are going to ascend bodily into heaven, which has once happened before and can happen again. What is here taught is certainly that Christ is bodily present in the Eucharist, and at the same time in heaven. It is absurd, according to Augustine, for something to be said not to be possible merely because there is no example of it. For God can certainly create an angel as large as the world, and such an angel will then exist at once in heaven and on earth. Finally, the sequence of the text discloses the genuine sense of Christ's words, namely this: that Christ is to be believed, who ascended into heaven and descended from heaven, even though he teaches things that seem impossible to the flesh. Just as it seemed impossible to Nicodemus for a man to be born again. But this makes for the council against us, inasmuch as we refuse to believe Christ testifying to the presence of his body, as teaching something impossible, p.334-348.

XLI. But we, in order to pluck out the fibers of this perverse interpretation, will briefly set forth the genuine sequence of Christ's words. Nicodemus, a teacher of the Jews, had come to Christ by

night, to drink the streams of heavenly wisdom from him as a heavenly Teacher. Christ teaches him that no one can see the Kingdom of God unless he is born again (v.3). But this surpassed Nicodemus' faith, for he said "How can a man be born when he is old?" (v.4). Christ responds, strongly asserting: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh" etc. (v.5-6). Nicodemus replies "How can these things be?" (v.9).

Christ answers that it is more amazing that he, who was esteemed a teacher of Israel, should be ignorant of such things. Then he adds in v.11 "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know (that is, both he himself and the Spirit, of whom he had just spoken in v.8, as Cyril also observes), and testify that we have seen. And ye receive not our witness." Thus he proves the authority of his testimony. As if he were saying: God has not only spoken through his Spirit by the Prophets, but now also speaks through me, who regenerate men by my Spirit that they may see and receive the kingdom of God. And we both speak our own things and what we know; and then the things that are God's, but so as to be ours also, because we have seen them. Thus Christ himself in John 5:19-20: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth."

Because therefore, Christ implies, you have two witnesses and attestors, you ought to have known that the Kingdom of God, in which he was going to pour forth his Spirit and Son, was at hand; since indeed the only begotten Son of God has appeared, who is in the bosom of the Father, who expounds God and demonstrates him to be seen (John 1:18, 14:9). Moreover he reproaches the Jews for their oscitancy in v.12: "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" As if to say: What I have said about pure water and cleansing, which is the cause of regeneration, and also about the Spirit to be poured out, that you may be regenerated by it, is to be carried out on earth. But what I have said about seeing and receiving the Kingdom of God is also to be carried out on earth. Thus far I have spoken of earthly things, but on which heavenly things depend. For the Kingdom of God begun on earth will be consummated in heaven.

Moreover, in v.13 he shows that in the Kingdom of God the King is the Son of man, who came down from heaven: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven" (for it is customary for the Prophets to speak of future things as present, preceding them with words which they will also see when those things are happening, as all learned men know) "but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." Here Christ recalls Nicodemus, a master of Israel, to the words of David in Psalm 68:18: "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive," etc. And he implies a descent not just any, but one by which he who descends and then ascends can rightly be called "the Son of man." He therefore argues that he is that "God manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16) who alone has descended from heaven, that is, has manifested himself in the flesh in order to become man, and at the same time remained in heaven, and alone will ascend again into heaven, namely as God by his own right, merit, will and power, not by another's.

You see a similar argumentation in Eph. 4:9. And this explanation also pleased St. Augustine, and after him the truly great and excellent interpreters of Scripture, Bullinger and Cocceius. It also pleased Cajetan, whose words on this passage I wish to add: "Lest Nicodemus should understand that this descent was made by forsaking the point from which he descended" (just as there is a local descent), "he added that he so descended as the Son of man that nevertheless he remained in heaven. That from this Nicodemus might understand that Jesus himself is the true God and the true Son of man, who so descended from heaven as the Son of man that yet he is in heaven. For this is IMPOSSIBLE for any but God."

Now therefore the response to the Adversary's sophistical argument is easy. For 1. it is certainly impossible that anyone should ascend into heaven so as to have first descended, and yet without change of place to have existed in heaven nevertheless, unless he is the true God, who descended to be manifested in the flesh, yet remaining in heaven without change of place. Why does the Reverend Parish Minister claim this for others, and thus contradict Christ affirming that no one ascends, and so returns to his own home by his own virtue, merit, and power, except he who descended, the Son of man, who is in heaven? If others besides the one God alone can so ascend, then the Savior did not prove what he set out to prove, namely that he alone is the Savior of the world, the King of the Church, the way, the truth, and the life; or also, as others explain it, the sole and unique and great Prophet and Teacher of Israel.

2. But it is one thing to be assumed into Heaven, as the spirits of the just have been assumed to be perfected in Heaven (Heb. 12:23), and Elijah in the body; another thing to be assumed at the same time as man (Isa. 53:8); and finally another thing to ascend as God, by his own right of merit, will, and power. Let me explain this with the words of Augustine, Tract. 12 on John, vol. 9, p. 24: "Behold he was here, and he was in Heaven. He was here in the flesh, and in Heaven by his divinity, indeed he was everywhere by his divinity, etc. Understand, brethren, God willed to be the Son of man, he willed men to be the sons of God. He descended for us, let us ascend for him. For the Savior descended and ascended, who says this: 'No man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven.' Shall not they then ascend into Heaven, whom he makes sons of God? They shall indeed ascend. This is the promise to us: 'They shall be equal unto the angels of God.' How then does no one ascend but he that descended? For one descended, and one ascended. What then is to be understood concerning the rest, but that they shall be his members, that the one may ascend? Therefore it follows: 'No man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of man which is in Heaven.' If then no one but he descended and ascended, what of the rest? This is the hope of the rest, that he descended and ascended for this reason, that in him and with him they might be one who were to ascend through him."

3. The statement of the Reverend Parish Minister that "God could create an angel of such magnitude as to be present throughout the whole world, and of the same magnitude as the body of the world, and that such an angel would certainly be able to descend from Heaven to earth and yet remain in Heaven without local descent, if it were not God" is plainly false, and ought to be attributed not to any of the older doctors but to some modern, for he conceives of the place of an angel as the place of a body, as if a spirit could be in place by extension and

measurement, with part outside part, so that magnitude of extension would pertain to a spirit just as to a body. This is an egregious failure to understand the nature of spirit. Apart from such a crass concept of a sick judgment, it cannot be said that God can create an angel of the same magnitude as the body of the world. And if nevertheless God could create, or even actually did create, such an angel, it could in no way be said of it that it descends from Heaven to earth and at the same time is in Heaven, but only this, that it is not present according to its whole self and adequately, as they say, but according to parts both in Heaven and in the intervening places and on earth - which cannot be said of Christ, the Son of man, according to his divinity, since being most simple he is not according to parts in place; nor is it asserted even by the Adversaries themselves of his body, that it is present according to its whole self in the intervening places. God alone fills Heaven and earth at once, is in Heaven and on earth impartibly (Jer. 23:23-24, Ps. 139:7-10), whose throne is Heaven and the earth his footstool (Isa. 66:1). It is the part of a Christian to vindicate this glory to him alone with a pious mind, not alienate it to non-gods.

4. But does the Reverend Parish Minister think that this doctrine, so illustrious, by which Christ manifested himself to Nicodemus as the God-man, the Savior of the world, who without local motion descended from Heaven by his divinity in order to become the Son of man, and so to visit men, and at the same time existed in Heaven, and in his time was going to ascend into Heaven by the power of his own merit, and his own virtue and power - does he think this contributed nothing to the matter? Finally, neither do the Adversaries follow the rule of faith shown by Christ, nor do we in this matter do anything at all like Nicodemus. For Nicodemus, being doubtful and anxious in mind about a thing testified by all the prophets, namely the regeneration of man, inquired of Christ "How can these things be?" But we demand reason and revelation not from Christ but from men certainly liable to error, concerning that thing which we know with certainty to be revealed nowhere and to be contrary to reason, and which the Adversaries do not blush to feign with their wit not simply as possible, but as happening daily. Thus far then our argument stands on a firm footing, beyond all exception.

XLII. The lucid discourse of our Savior in John 6 furnishes us an argument. There among other things, in v.63 Christ expressly teaches that his flesh profits nothing when eaten orally (for it is such an oral eating that Christ expressly refutes), but the Spirit, that by which we are baptized into one body, so that we may be considered to have eaten Christ's body, quickens; and that his words are spirit and life, that is, the instrument of the Spirit for converting the soul, that the Spirit of God may purify their hearts by faith and dwell in us unto eternal life. Hence the following syllogism is woven:

That is not present in the Eucharist which profits nothing to the users.

But Christ's flesh eaten orally profits nothing to the users.

Therefore Christ's flesh to be eaten orally is not present in the Eucharist.

The premise is evident from this, that the Eucharist was instituted for the utility of the faithful. The assumption consists in the words of the Savior.

XLIII. Our Zwingli rightly branded this argument as "a brazen wall and an unshaken adamant." But to the Reverend Parish Minister it is a mere spider's web. How truly he has called it such, his straw-like responses demonstrate. I am pleased to present them contracted for the pious reader. Thus he argues, does Christ's flesh profit nothing? Will the substance of bread profit more? But if the substance of bread is of no profit in itself, yet it profits as a symbol instituted by Christ. Certainly then Christ's flesh will also profit very much, inasmuch as it is eaten with living faith under the species of bread as the containing symbol, so that we may be said to have eaten not only the Spirit but the flesh itself. If Christ's flesh profits nothing, why was it truly and really assumed by the Son of God and offered on the cross? Will not the Manichees themselves thus conquer? Christ does not say "My flesh profits nothing," but simply "The flesh profits nothing." The ancient doctors understood by "the flesh" here not the flesh assumed by the Son of God, but something else. Just as the "Spirit" opposed to "the flesh" denotes spiritual things, so "the flesh" signifies not the substance of Christ's flesh, but rather whatever is carnal that resists this Spirit. If we hear Christ's words and perceive them by our mind, how do we seem to have eaten the flesh itself? Christ opposes the flesh and the Spirit; what is ascribed to the one, is detracted from the other. If therefore we perceive this Spirit of which he speaks, we shall seem to have eaten not the flesh contrary to the Spirit, but only the Spirit. Christ's flesh also can be eaten really, though not carnally as the Capernaites imagined, but spiritually. Flesh eaten in the Capernaitic sense profits nothing; but eaten really and spiritually, it profits very much. The genuine sense finally is that the carnal understanding of Christ's words, by which they were understood merely carnally by the Capernaites, profits nothing. And "the flesh" is so received in Genesis 6:3, Matthew 16:17, 1 Samuel 16:7, etc. This sense is also held by Saints Augustine, Cyprian, and Chrysostom, p.348-378.

XLIV. In this response the Reverend Parish Minister marvellously contradicts himself. But the following will make manifest that he is leaning against a rotten wall. We confess that the flesh of Christ given for us unto death is the life of the world, and so profits very much, and more than any, even the most eloquent, human tongue can expound. For it is the salutary sacrifice, the expiation of the world, the pledge of salvation, the earnest money of our hope and resurrection. Therefore in this matter we have nothing in common with the execrable heresy of the Manichees.

We further confess that Christ's flesh is to be eaten, and indeed in such a way that whoever does not eat it cannot have life in himself (John 6:53-54). The whole hinge of the question turns on this: whether Christ's flesh eaten with the bodily mouth profits or not? We deny this from Christ's own mind; they assert it, though at the same time they confess that those who eat Christ's flesh orally, like unbelievers, indeed like dogs and mice, do not immediately become one with Christ; indeed, that to the unworthy the flesh thus eaten orally goes to their condemnation; and finally, that eaten in the Capernaitic manner it profits absolutely nothing. And indeed, if the belly of the Jews had absorbed Christ's body either whole, as the whale did the body of Jonah, or lacerated, as hell does, it would nevertheless have been necessary for him to rise again, nor by that means would they have become his household. For it is not by a mingling

of bodies that we become one with Christ, but by the migration of the mind into him through faith.

XLV. But in order to cut the sinews of the Adversary's response, two things must be briefly demonstrated: one, that by "flesh" in the words of the Savior is not meant the carnal mind and intelligence of man, but the flesh of Christ; nor by "Spirit" the merely spiritual and enlightened mind of man; the other, that neither Christ's flesh eaten in parts nor whole and indivisible profits anything, and so both modes of eating are equally refuted by Christ's assertion.

As to the former, the very continuous sequence of Christ's words proves that nothing else than his flesh is meant. For in v.51 Christ had said that the bread which he would give is his flesh, which he would give for the life of the world. Hence arose a contention among the Jews, asking "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (v.52). Hence the Savior demonstrates at length the necessity of eating his flesh in vv.53-56, where he mentions the eating of his flesh four times. When even then the murmurs did not cease, and the Capernaites and some ill-advised disciples (compare v.66) traduced Christ's speech as harsh, and their secret thoughts easily lay open to Christ the searcher of hearts, he begins a new discourse, by which he demonstrates that they ought not to be scandalized by that speech, and does so with four arguments.

First, because they would see the Son of man ascending where he was before (v.62). Second, because the Spirit, namely Christ's, by which we are in Christ and he in us, and so we are baptized into one body, quickens (v.63). Third, because the flesh profits nothing when eaten orally, for it is such an oral eating of the flesh that he is speaking of, which the Jews judged impossible (v.63). Fourth, because the Spirit, namely of Christ and the faithful, quickens through the words, that is, the promises inscribed on the hearts of the faithful by the Holy Spirit (ibid.).

Hence it is evidently clear that the discourse is about Christ's flesh. For Christ had so often spoken about it in the preceding; the Capernaites had doubted about eating it orally; concerning that Christ certainly responds, and teaches that it, eaten as the Capernaites imagined it, profits nothing: but that it then first profits if the Holy Spirit inscribes the words of the Savior about the life-giving flesh to be eaten by faith in the word of promise on the hearts of the faithful. But the Adversary's distortion overturns the whole connection of Christ's discourse, and makes Christ in no way responding in appearance to the question of the Capernaites, nor at all deciding the doubtful issue of the dispute.

For that saying of Christ, expounded so generally as the Reverend Parish Minister would have it, could be applied to any doctrine of the Christian faith wrongly understood, and would do nothing to soften that harshness which the Capernaites, Jews, and some disciples had conceived from the Lord's speech. For what could be more ready to be gathered than this, that Christ's body is not to be eaten orally, because it was going to ascend into Heaven? For the Son of man could not be seen as if going to put his body into the mouths of men, he who was to be taken up into Heaven, to leave the earth, to abide in Heaven until he returns for judgment, and returns in that manner in which he ascended. For what is visibly taken away is not invisibly present. For then the same thing would be both absent and present. It is also plain in what way

Christ solved the argument they had brought up. Their objection was "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" - as if to say, Every carnal eating of human flesh is horrendous even to hear about. But Christ commands his flesh to be really eaten. Therefore he commands what is horrendous to hear.

Christ does not respond directly by denying either part of the antecedent, but obliquely by opposing that from which it could be known which part was to be denied. For he opposes his ascension. But it is manifest that this does not pertain to the denial of the major premise, but of the minor, in this sense: That flesh cannot be given as food on earth which is to ascend into Heaven. But my flesh is to ascend into Heaven. Therefore it cannot be given as bodily food on earth. The reason for the major premise was manifest, because bodily food must be most present to the eater. But the distance of places for flesh situated in Heaven from those who are on earth is immense. Therefore the direct demonstration of the solution was manifest even to the witness of the senses.

But the solution which the Reverend Parish Minister attributes to Christ in no way agrees with his words. For he did not promise understanding in the future, when he was going to ascend into Heaven, but willed to meet the present scandal and so to explain his words that anyone attentive could comprehend his meaning. Nor would it follow, granting the Reverend Parish Minister's explanation: "Now my speech, by which I give you my flesh as food, scandalizes you: therefore what will happen when you see the Son of man ascending where he was before?" Rather the contrary would follow: then at length you will recognize my speech, you will give me faith as one proving his mastery and infallibility by his ascension. And would not this response have been so general as to be opposable to any doubt raised from any quarter? Indeed, not only obscure but also uncertain and ambiguous, since even the angels very often ascend into Heaven where they were before, to whom nevertheless on that account no Divine authority belongs. For if an angel should preach another gospel, we are expressly forbidden to believe him (Gal. 1:8). Not to mention that even evil angels ascend into Heaven, as is clear from the history of Job.

But Christ's solution, explained according to our sense, namely that Christ willed to teach that his words were not to be understood concerning the eating of his flesh locally present, since it was going to ascend into Heaven - though oblique, is nevertheless clear and consequent, and contains no difficulty. The scruples opposed by the Reverend Parish Minister urge no prudent person. Nor are the words spoken by Christ to Nicodemus in John 3:13 at all similar to those which are opposed here to the Capernaites, since it is not said there "who is in Heaven", from which words therefore, so dissimilar, the ancients more aptly gathered the infallibility of Christ, the heavenly Teacher, at least from the scope of the speaker, as we have noted above.

XLVI. Nor are the exceptions which the Adversary heaps up on p.367-375 of any value. Christ did not say "My flesh." Yet the preceding shows that he meant his flesh. But he omitted to say "my flesh" because, though speaking of his flesh, it was brought to the understanding of the Capernaites. But in what sense Christ's flesh profits or does not profit, we have abundantly expounded above. The Adversaries themselves confess that Christ's flesh eaten by the

unworthy, by dogs, by mice, or eaten in the Capernaitic manner, profits nothing. Nor does "Spirit" denote merely the spiritual mind, but its author the Holy Spirit himself. Certainly Christ opposes the flesh and the Spirit, and whatever he vindicates to the one he derogates from the other. But to the Spirit he vindicates that it quickens. He therefore derogates this very thing from the flesh when eaten orally, as the Capernaites imagined it. Nor either, as the Reverend Parish Minister falsely argues, shall we seem to have eaten only the Spirit and not the flesh. For Christ nowhere said that the Spirit was to be eaten by us. He had spoken in vv.52-59 about the eating of his flesh. But he shows that his flesh is then only so eaten and becomes life-giving in us, in vv.61-63, if the most efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, by whom Christ dwells in us, effects this, that we believe with firmest assent the words of Christ offering his flesh to be eaten, not by the bodily mouth but by the mouth of faith, and so most abundantly pledging himself entirely with his most precious merit, and that we flee to him as the citadel of our salvation, and through him enter upon most auspicious peace with the offended Father.

I pray for the salvation of the Reverend Parish Minister's soul, that he may be untaught his manifest error from the very mouth of truth, Christ himself, speaking thus in John 5:24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." But no one can have eternal life unless he eats the flesh, John 6:53-54. Let him hear Christ speaking again: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst" (John 6:35), compared with v.51.

XLVII. Now it is also manifest that neither Christ's flesh, whether torn in pieces or, as the Adversaries will have it, whole, indivisible, spiritual, eaten orally by the bodily mouth, and indeed spiritually with the spirit animating the mind of man to perceive that mystery, profits anything. The Adversaries concede this concerning Christ's flesh torn and rent by the teeth, though the Roman Council held under Pope Nicholas II compelled Berengarius to swear in these words, that "the bread and wine which are placed on the altar, after the consecration are not only the sacrament, but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are truly handled and broken by the hands of the priests, and masticated by the teeth of the faithful, not only in a sacrament but in reality." It is well indeed that better reason has returned to the Adversaries' minds, that they no longer wish to be considered among those who break and masticate Christ's body with their teeth.

Meanwhile, neither can the other mode of oral eating consist, whereby Christ's body is eaten whole, indivisible, and spiritual, by the bodily mouth. For first, it doubtless seemed harsh not only to the Capernaites, in their foul misunderstanding of his words, that Christ should expose his body to be lacerated, but this especially, that by their carnal judgment they thought Christ was offering his true and natural human body to be absorbed and eaten through the instruments of the body, the mouth, teeth, palate, esophagus, stomach. This especially seemed harsh. For granting that Christ's body is to be eaten through the instruments of the body and conveyed into the stomach, will it not seem harsh whether it is to be eaten torn in pieces or whole and indivisible? Perhaps to the Adversaries accustomed to error the latter will no longer seem harsh: but to those who examine the whole matter without prejudice by the rule of the Divine Word and sound reason, it cannot but seem harsh to propose an indivisible body, and one almost

converted into a spirit, to be eaten by the bodily mouth, which yet exerts no operation at all on Christ's body, such as takes place in true eating.

Second, in his response Christ in no way distinguishes modes of oral eating, so as to reject the one mode which is by mastication and division of parts, but affirm and establish the other which is posited as occurring by the swallowing of an invisible and indivisible thing. And yet this necessarily had to be done if, according to the Adversary's view, he willed to respond and, as the Adversaries themselves confess he did, to remove the offense. I ask you, friend, how can you eat Christ's indivisible body spiritually, that is, with your spirit enlightened by the revealed Word, if revelation fails you, if the Word of God nowhere unfolds to you so great a mystery, that Christ's body is to be swallowed whole and indivisible by the bodily mouth, not indeed to be chewed and lacerated?

Third, in his response Christ speaks indefinitely: "The Spirit quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing," namely when eaten orally as the Capernaites understood it. But it is not for us to add anything of our own devising to the words of Christ, or to elude the very force of Christ's words by a human fiction. Fourth, in his response Christ uses arguments which solidly exclude any oral eating of his flesh or body. For he opposes his ascension into Heaven where he was before (v.62). The body leaving the earth and ascending into Heaven can neither be broken nor whole and indivisible, eaten by the bodily mouth on earth. Then he says "The Spirit quickeneth", opposing it evidently to the flesh eaten orally. For since it is certain that he who has the Spirit of Christ is in Christ and has life, it is certainly not to be thought that oral eating of Christ's flesh is necessary for us to have life in his communion. For if this were necessary, the Spirit would not quicken.

Moreover, here Christ opposes the Spirit and the flesh. Therefore if the "flesh" designates oral eating, the "Spirit" opposed to it can in no way affirm and include that oral eating. And since the Adversaries maintain that the "Spirit" is here taken for the spiritual intelligence, who would say that the eating which occurs through the bodily mouth and jaws and merely carnal organs is the spiritual intelligence of the eating of which the Lord speaks? That fiction about some "spiritual" eating which is nevertheless at the same time bodily, is vainer than any dream, and more tenebrious than the very darkness itself.

Christ adds in v.63: "The flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." He names the flesh, namely eaten properly in any way by the bodily mouth, and opposes to it the Spirit operating not through the swallowing of the flesh, but through the Word.

XLVIII. But even the authority of some of the Fathers, especially Cyprian and Augustine, quoted by the Adversary on p.367 and 374, who assert that Christ's words were opposed to the carnal judgment of the Capernaites who thought his body was to be lacerated, does not hinder this. We indeed doubt not that this is so, yet not in such a way as to exclude the other mode similar to it, whereby Christ's body is posited not indeed to be lacerated and rent, but to be consumed and swallowed whole by the bodily mouth. For neither Christ, nor those Holy Fathers according to

his mind, speak so precisely concerning the laceration of Christ's body as to imply that no other interpretation is to be admitted except one which adheres verbatim to this laceration; but they intimate in this way, namely, that the Capernaites imagined the same flesh to be eaten in a bodily manner, for example, as the flesh of lambs is lacerated when they are butchered and masticated by the teeth. Which mode, though it expressly includes this laceration, does not exclude the other species of bodily eating.

Otherwise laceration is read of only in Cyprian and Augustine. The rest speak more generally of the eating of the flesh corporeally. Cyril in his Mystagogic Catechesis 4 simply calls it "eating". Chrysostom too in Homily 46 on John denies that Christ's words contain anything carnal, and so removes from that eating even the teeth, palate, esophagus, and stomach, which members nevertheless the present-day Papists necessarily and expressly retain along with the Capernaites. The same Chrysostom removes every "natural consequence", by which is doubtless meant: It is eaten: therefore it is diminished and torn in pieces: therefore it is put into the mouth, let down through the gullet, carried into the stomach, digested, etc. All these are "natural consequences" which Chrysostom expressly rejects. Indeed, he opposes the mystical sense to the carnal imagination: "just as it behooved to understand mystically" - yet not laceration only, but not even swallowing, is the mystical sense. For the mystical sense departs from the letter. For as far as the proper signification of the words extends, so far extends the literal sense, and the mystical is excluded.

Just as the specific does not remove the genus, so Cyril and Chrysostom did not therefore speak more restrictedly because Cyprian and Augustine spoke more narrowly. Just as he who teaches that men are mortal does not thereby deny that all animals are mortal. Nor do Cyprian and Augustine adhere verbatim to laceration. For Cyprian said not only torn but also roasted and boiled; he does not mention raw. If this consideration is precise, by the same right you might deny that he disapproved the eating of raw flesh, as you deny that he disapproved swallowing it. Augustine too in Psalm 98 distinguished that some sacrament was commended "to be celebrated visibly", and "understood invisibly." The sacrament is therefore to be so understood, that although it is said that the body is to be eaten, yet it is understood that the body is not to be eaten, just as in every metaphor the very thing is not said which seems to be said.

Let the Reverend Parish Minister therefore henceforth acknowledge that the truth rightly triumphs in those words of Christ, and that here he is stripped of all supports both from Scripture and the Fathers, and has in no way by his many circumlocutions obstructed the truth.

XLVIII. We derive the sixth argument from the bodily ascension of Christ into Heaven. For it is not the least head of the Christian faith that Christ, a little after his resurrection from the dead, left the earth with his body, ascended into Heaven to the right hand of God the Father, and there fixed his stable abode until the end of the world. For the Holy Scriptures testify that Christ was taken up into Heaven in the sight of the Apostles, and that Heaven must receive him until the times of the restitution of all things (Acts 3:21). But Christ himself also opposes his ascension into Heaven to the Capernaites misinterpreting the eating of Christ's flesh, as if he ought to be

locally present to be eaten, with these words in John 6:61-62: "Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" From this results a most efficacious argument:

He who with his body left the earth and ascended into Heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God, and there remains until the consummation of the age, is not after his ascension locally present with his body in the Eucharist.

But Christ with his body left the earth, ascended into Heaven, sat down at the right hand of God, and there remains until the consummation of the age.

Therefore Christ after his ascension into Heaven is not locally present with his body in the Eucharist.

The major premise is certainly firm. For the same body in number cannot at once leave the earth and fix its abode in Heaven and there remain until the consummation of the age, and at the same time be locally present on earth in the same interval of time. That body which left the earth is no longer locally present on earth during the whole time of that leaving. The minor premise rests on the infallible testimony of the Scriptures.

XLIX. To break this argument, the Adversary moves several things. He opposes first of all the vision of Paul in Acts 9:3-5, where it is narrated that a light from Heaven shone around Paul, and Christ spoke with Paul lying prostrate on the ground. Hence he labors to conclude that Christ was at the same time in Heaven at the right hand of God the Father, and in the air not far distant from Saul himself; and by the same reasoning can be at once in Heaven and at the same time locally present in the Eucharist. Moreover, the Reverend Parish Minister strives to prove that Christ was bodily present in the neighboring air and mingled conversations with Paul, both because the light from Heaven is said in v.3 to have "shined round about him", namely Christ coming; and because Saul is said to have seen someone whom by reason of the brightness he could not recognize, and yet he called him Lord, and so did not see him sitting at the right hand of the Father, whom he would certainly have more easily recognized; and because Luke in v.5 implies that Saul both saw and heard someone not far distant, but his companions saw no one, but heard a voice; and because in v.17 Ananias said to Saul that Jesus had appeared to him on the way as he was coming; and because Paul could not be a witness of Christ's resurrected body in the same way as the other Apostles, if he had not seen Christ with his bodily eyes; and finally, because even St. Chrysostom in Homily 38 on 1 Cor. 15, and Ambrose in On the Benediction of the Patriarchs ch. 12, vol. 1, and his Exposition on Psalm 39, Augustine in Epistle 50 to Boniface, and Cajetan acknowledge that this was a bodily vision, p.381-394.

L. Thus indeed the Adversary attempts to elude rather than dissolve the argument opposed to him with a slight turn. For first, even granting that Saul saw Christ bodily descending from Heaven for a time, what has this to do with the Eucharist, in which they maintain that Christ

does not leave Heaven but lies invisibly, thousands and thousands of times from his ascension into Heaven until the consummation of the age, which they expressly deny is ever seen bodily?

Second, Saul saw Christ bodily, but it does not therefore follow that he saw him present on earth or near the earth with his body. For could not Christ remaining in Heaven converse with Paul lying prostrate on the earth? Thus a little before he appeared and was seen in Heaven itself by the protomartyr Stephen suffering his punishment on earth (Acts 7:56). Certainly Irenaeus Book 3 ch. 12 & 15, Basil against Eunomius Book 4, Ephrem on the Pearl and on All Saints, Epiphanius at the end of vol. 1, Against the Anacebalists, Caesarius in Dialogue Question 132, Gregory Book 14 Morals ch. 27 & 39, etc. understand that Christ spoke and was seen by Paul in Heaven and from Heaven. Estius and Justinian also in their Commentary on 1 Cor. 15 confess that Christ could give himself to be seen and heard by Paul from the highest Heaven, just as he gave himself to be seen by Stephen. That the vision of a distant thing could be inserted into Paul's eyes, no sane person will doubt. For even through optical tubes those things which are far off and beyond the sphere of vision are brought into the eyes. But this can be done even more by the power of God. But that it was done otherwise, the feeble reasons of the Reverend Parish Minister in no way persuade.

For did not the Sun of Righteousness, infinitely more bright, perform the very same thing, just as the sun, though remaining in Heaven, diffuses its light to the earth and blinds those gazing too intently upon it? And it is truly amazing that the Reverend Parish Minister is blind in so clear a matter. If that light came forth from Christ's body, yet "shone round about from Heaven", it invincibly follows from this that Christ's body shone from Heaven, not from the air near the earth. How too could Paul, hitherto an unbeliever, more easily recognize Christ sitting at the right hand of God than standing nearby? And yet nothing had become known to him about Christ's session at the right hand of God. Moreover, by the will of the Lord who formed the eye, it was possible for Saul to see the same glorious body of Christ shining in Heaven and from Heaven, but his companions, since he so willed not, did not see it. For God gives each one to see as he wills. The Scholastics themselves teach, as Cornelius a Lapide admonishes on this passage, that a glorious body can diffuse its voice and appearance to one but not to others. How much more could the glorious body of Christ, hypostatically united with infinite power, do this?

It is indeed said that Jesus was "seen by Paul in the way as he came" (v.17). But it is not said that the Lord himself was in the way, but only that Paul saw Christ on the journey. Finally, why could not Paul be a witness of Christ's resurrection, even if he did not see Christ's body with his bodily eyes and in the same way as the other Apostles? For why would he not have been a fit witness of those things which he saw by the divinely-illuminated Spirit? For in 1 Cor. 15:6-8, though Paul affirms the truth of his vision, yet he in no way equates its mode with that of the others. Therefore the Adversary wrongly attributes this argument to St. Chrysostom, in trying to make him a witness of a bodily vision. He likewise wrongs St. Augustine, from whose words in Epistle 50 to Boniface he labors in vain to argue a bodily vision from the bodily prostration and blindness which no one denies, for bodily blindness rather removes than establishes bodily vision as long as the blindness lasts. If we must stand on the authority of St. Augustine, I have certainly won. For these are his express words in Psalm 131 p.314: "For he who is placed in

Heaven, and raised his flesh to immortality, through which he was for a time mortal, and suffering nothing of persecutions in Heaven, nothing of malice and reproaches, as on this earth when he deigned to endure all things for us, yet having compassion on his body laboring on earth, said 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' - now no one was touching him, yet he cried out from Heaven that he was suffering persecution. We ought not to be offended, indeed we ought to presume with great confidence; for if by his love he is with us on earth, by that same love we also are with him in Heaven. But I have said in what manner he is with us on earth - we have spoken of his voice sounding from Heaven, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?'" - he clearly affirms that the voice of Christ sounded from Heaven, that is, from that Heaven where we also are by his love, and so not from the air but from the highest Heaven.

LI. That Christ ascended into Heaven and there remains circumscriptively, and at the same time is definitively on earth, the Reverend Parish Minister on p.394 merely asserts, not proves. Sounder philosophy and theology have hitherto taught that bodies are in place only circumscriptively, but spirits only definitively. Nor will the Adversary gain assent even from a prudent person, unless he proves that a body can become, and Christ's body has actually become, a spirit. But we are far removed from such fictions, by which no less than by alchemical smokes Christ's flesh is reduced to nothing.

LII. Moreover, the Reverend Parish Minister laboriously endeavors to prove that the words of Christ alleged from John 6:61-62, and even the local ascension of Christ's body into Heaven, do not hinder the local presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist: first, because the ancient doctors of the Church firmly believed the substantial presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, as well as Christ's ascension into Heaven, and not one of them opposed the impossibility of Christ's presence from that passage; second, because Christ opposed those words to the bloody and Capernaitic mode of oral eating, not to any mode of oral eating whatsoever; third, because John immediately subjoins in v.66 to those words of Christ that many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him - which they would not have done if Christ had clearly demonstrated by those words the easy-to-believe spiritual eating, and overthrown the oral eating; fourth, because in those words Christ solved the difficulty by demonstrating that he, the infallible teacher of truth coming from Heaven, was to be believed, even if they did not yet grasp what he taught, as St. Chrysostom also explains; fifth, because otherwise Christ would have expressly said that his words were to be understood not concerning carnal or substantial, but spiritual eating, p.394-408.

But the Reverend Parish Minister gives us mere words here, I say with his peace. I will consider the opinion of the Fathers later. But it is not to the bloody, carnal and Capernaitic mode of oral eating alone, but to any oral eating whatsoever of Christ's body, that his words are opposed, as we have already firmly established above. It is also manifest that the ascension is opposed not only to the Capernaitic laceration, but also to local presence. If Christ's words do not avail against oral and carnal eating, they will not avail either against laceration. If when I say "Christ ascended into Heaven: therefore his body is not eaten bodily on earth", the Reverend Parish Minister denies the consequence, I likewise, when he says "He ascended whole into Heaven: therefore he is not torn in pieces on earth", will deny the consequence. For wholeness no more

contradicts laceration than absence contradicts bodily eating. I grant that many of Christ's disciples "went back, and walked no more with him." But this argues not so much a lack of clear demonstration (for certainly Christ demonstrated the truth, whatever the sense is) as the hardness and stupor of those disdaining to search the word of God. For what could be more ready to gather than this, that Christ's body is not to be eaten orally, because it was going to ascend into Heaven? For the Son of man could certainly not be seen as about to put his body into the mouths of men, he who was to be taken up into Heaven, to leave the earth, to abide in Heaven until he returns for judgment, and to return in that manner in which he ascended. For what is visibly taken away is not invisibly present. For then the same thing would both be absent and present.

It is also plain in what way Christ solved the argument then brought up. Their objection was "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" - as if to say, Every carnal eating of human flesh is horrendous to hear of. But Christ commands his flesh to be really eaten. Therefore he commands what is horrendous to hear. Christ does not respond directly by denying either part of the antecedent, but obliquely, by opposing that from which it could be known which part was to be denied. For he opposes his ascension. But it is manifest that this does not pertain to the denial of the major premise, but of the minor, in this sense: That flesh cannot be given as food on earth which is to ascend into Heaven. But my flesh is to ascend into Heaven. Therefore it cannot be given as bodily food on earth. The reason for the major premise was manifest, because bodily food must be most present to the eater. But the distance of places for flesh situated in Heaven from those who are on earth is immense. Therefore the direct demonstration of the solution was manifest even to the witness of the senses.

But the solution which the Reverend Parish Minister attributes to Christ in no way agrees with his words. For he did not promise understanding in the future, when he was going to ascend into Heaven, but willed to meet the present scandal and so to explain his words that anyone attentive could comprehend his meaning. Nor would it follow, granting the Reverend Parish Minister's explanation: "Now my speech, by which I give you my flesh as food, scandalizes you: therefore what will happen when you see the Son of man ascending where he was before?" Rather the contrary would follow: then at length you will recognize my speech, you will give me faith as one proving his mastery and infallibility by his ascension. And would not this response have been so general as to be opposable to any doubt raised from any quarter? Indeed, not only obscure but also uncertain and ambiguous, since even the angels very often ascend into Heaven where they were before, to whom nevertheless on that account no Divine authority belongs.

For if an angel should preach another gospel, we are expressly forbidden to believe him (Gal. 1:8). Not to mention that even evil angels ascend into Heaven, as is clear from the history of Job. But Christ's solution, explained according to our sense, namely that Christ willed to teach that his words were not to be understood concerning the eating of his flesh locally present, since it was going to ascend into Heaven - though oblique, is nevertheless clear and consequent, and contains no difficulty. The scruples opposed by the Reverend Parish Minister urge no prudent person. Nor are the words spoken by Christ to Nicodemus in John 3:13 at all similar to those

which are opposed here to the Capernaites, since it is not said there "who is in Heaven", from which words therefore, so dissimilar, the ancients more aptly gathered the infallibility of Christ, the heavenly Teacher, at least from the scope of the speaker, as we have noted above.

LIII. The Adversary here alleges St. Chrysostom in bad faith. For he does not think that Christ by those words "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" willed to establish faith in himself as the heavenly Teacher, but indicates that all the things Christ had said and done hitherto tended to lead them away from the opinion that Joseph was his father. He says: "All these things he both does and says, to lead them away from this opinion that Joseph was his father." That Christ said he descended from heaven, that he is the life of the world, that he will ascend where he was before - Chrysostom implies that all these things were said that they might understand that he is not the mere son of Joseph. Toletus himself rightly calls this exposition harsh, adding the reason: "For these things are very distant from the present sense, which refers to what is nearest, namely to the scandal, because he had said 'My flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink.' For then they said 'This is a hard saying', to which the Lord responded 'Doth this offend you?' And pursuing it, he added 'What and if ye shall see the Son of man' etc. These words therefore refer to the scandal concerning his flesh and blood being given as food and drink."

Cyril in Book 4 on John, Chapter 21, indeed thought that Christ by these words showed the argument of his power, in order to persuade them that he could give his flesh as food. "If you think," he says, introducing Christ speaking thus, "that my flesh cannot bring life to you, how shall it ascend into heaven like a bird?" etc. But it is manifest that this reason too departs from the scope. For the words of the Capernaites did not oppose the impossibility of nourishing, but the horror of eating. For they say "Who can hear it?" By far the best interpreter of these words was St. Augustine in Tract 27 on John, speaking thus: "Hence he solves what moved them. Hence they would certainly understand: for they thought that he was going to distribute his body; but he said that he would ascend into heaven, certainly whole. 'What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?', you will certainly then see that he does not give his body in that manner which you suppose. You will certainly then understand that his grace is not consumed by morsels."

Most prudently the Holy Father admonishes that Christ's ascension is opposed to the distribution of his body as food. Nor does it hinder that he adds that grace is not consumed by morsels, and so opposes the ascension to laceration. For that is added not by way of exception but illustration, so that not any carnal eating at all is thereby excluded. It suffices that the solution is by opposition. Moreover, it is well known that the ascension is opposed not merely to laceration, but primarily to local presence.

LIV. The seventh argument is derived from the nature of Christ's body. For the Apostle testifies that Christ had a body "in the likeness of men" (Phil. 2:7), or "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), that is, such flesh as that of a sinner, except for sin; and finally that he had flesh and bones, and so was not a spirit (Luke 24:39). Such therefore being and having been the body of Christ, it is necessary that it was and is finite, extended, palpable, visible, circumscribed and

finite, and marked off by its dimensions. Therefore it cannot be present in heaven indeed circumscriptively after the manner of a body, but in the Eucharist definitively after the manner of an angel or spirit, as if indeed a true body similar to ours could both have the mode of a body and at the same time not have it, and so be a body without the mode of a body; nor only definitively but also repletively, since they say it exists in several places, either circumscriptively or definitively - as if what is said to exist definitively in a place is not by that very thing said to exist here and not there. A true body can no more exist in a place definitively or repletively than it can be an angel or God. Let me hence forge a syllogism of this kind:

Whosoever had and has a human body similar to ours, except for sin, and so extended, finite, circumscribed, having flesh and bones, he with his body is not at once in heaven circumscriptively and in the Eucharist not circumscriptively but definitively, invisibly and indivisibly.

But Christ had and has a human body similar to ours, except for sin, and so extended, finite, circumscribed, having flesh and bones.

Therefore Christ with his body is not at once in heaven circumscriptively and in the Eucharist not circumscriptively but definitively, invisibly and indivisibly.

The consequence of the premise is certain. For a substance cannot put on the properties of an oppositely and generically diverse substance without that prior substance ceasing to be, and taking on the nature of the latter. Thus sound reason unanimously teaches with the consent of all who use it. Nor does revelation remove this rational truth. The minor premise is evident from Scripture.

LV. To satisfy this argument, the Adversary strains the powers of his wit. But let us see with what success. We will recount his response. He says therefore that it is not only the property of a human body to be finite, extended, palpable, but also to be animal, corruptible, infirm. Just as therefore by the removal of that corruptibility and infirmity a human body, and so also Christ's glorious body, could become and put on incorruptibility; so also by the removal of extension, finitude, circumscription by God's omnipotence, it could become spiritual and put on the properties of a Spirit, and so exist in the Eucharist uncircumscribed, invisible and indivisible. For the Apostle testifies in 1 Cor. 15:42-44 that the body is sown an animal body, but is raised a spiritual body - not indeed as to substance, but as to the qualities proper to an animal body, these qualities being put off and certain spiritual ones received. If some qualities of this kind are already actually changed in glorious bodies, why cannot others also be changed by Divine power?

That a body can have one mode in one place or time and another in another, a circumscriptive presence in one place, a definitive presence in another - just as the same body can today have the mode of an animal body, and tomorrow of a glorious body; and the soul can operate seeing in one organ, hearing in another. Nor either are the things which are said to exist definitively in a

place thereby said to exist here and not there, just as the soul which exists definitively in a place is not so in the head that it is not also elsewhere, as in the foot.

Thus Christ in rising had so spiritual a body that he went forth from the sepulchre, the stone not yet being removed (John 20:1, 19, 26), just as he entered into the closed room, and so penetrated both the stone and the door, though he was neither an angel nor God. It is true that the disciples still having their natural feelings at first thought him to be a spirit (Luke 24:37, 39). But Christ, showing his hands and feet, detected their error, and showed that although for his own free will he could attribute the quality of penetration to his body, and so penetrated the closed doors after the manner of a spirit, it does not therefore follow that he does not have a true body, but is a mere spirit.

Why then could he not also have other qualities unbefitting a natural body, and so have existence in heaven circumscriptively, but in several other places definitively, according to his free will? p.446-465.

LVI. But these things are truly frivolous and distorted, more so than to satisfy in a serious and weighty matter. For first, what will the Reverend Parish Minister say about the first Eucharist, in which Christ did not yet have a "glorious, spiritual, incorruptible body"? If a spiritual body effects that the qualities of a spirit, such as invisibility, penetration, indivisibility, definitive existence in place, are communicated to a body, how then in the first Eucharist, at which time his body was not yet spiritual, nor therefore according to the Adversary's hypothesis could have the properties of a spirit communicated to it, could Christ's body sit at the table circumscriptively after the manner of a true body, and at the same time exist under the species definitively and indivisibly after the manner of a spirit? This above all he will have to resolve.

Second, the Reverend Parish Minister certainly confuses with too great an error common and mutable accidents with proper and essential ones. That the former can be removed, no sane person is ignorant; but that the latter cannot be removed and perished except with nature itself, all sane persons likewise acknowledge. Thus corruptibility, ignobility, infirmity, just as they originate from sin entering, so from the grace of God glorifying and opposed to sin, and the life-giving Spirit, they are changed and removed, the nature of the body being preserved. The case is completely different with proper accidents, such as the extension of bodies, which results and emanates from the essence of body to such a degree that it cannot be changed while the essence of body is preserved. For it inheres in every body and in body alone and always; nor can anything prior to it be conceived in a body. It pertains to every body, not only celestial but also terrestrial, air, fire, water, earth. And though the body be very small, yet it has some extension, inasmuch as at least a right and left part can be distinguished in it. It pertains to body alone. For no spiritual thing is extended, since it would otherwise be divisible into parts, corruptible and mortal, after the manner of a body. It pertains to every and to body alone always. However all other things are removed and varied, extension remains as long as the body remains. Ice, for example, loses its hardness when it is dissolved into water; water loses its weight when it turns into vapor; vapors lose their lightness when they revert to water. But extension is absent neither in ice, nor in water, nor in vapor.

Thus Christ's body put off corruptibility, mortality. But it did not put off extension. For after the resurrection he had an extended body, flesh and bones, which whoever would feign not to be extended, you might more rightly say were not bones. Finally, prior to extension nothing at all can be conceived in a bodily thing. Every body is divisible, impenetrable, circumscribed because extended, and a body cannot be thought or conceived in the mind without extension. Nor in this matter let some Suadius, a peddler of smokes and mists, palm off on me an "entitative" or "internal extension" distinct from "quantitative" or "external". For an entitative and internal extension is a non-entity, or at least not extension. For to extend is not extension unless the parts are outside of each other. By the same reasoning you might distinguish or separate rationality from the rational soul, and subsistence from person, or extension from body.

At least the Adversaries will not have denied that extension necessarily inheres in every mere human body. Since therefore Christ took a body in all things similar to ours, sin only excepted, he necessarily took an essentially extended body, and consequently divisible, impenetrable, circumscribed. But it has been refuted that the Lord Parish Minister objects to us from 1 Cor. 15:44 "a spiritual body." For the glorious, heavenly, spiritual body is not so called from having lost the proper and essential accidents of body, such as extension, or from having accepted the essential accidents of spirit, such as impenetrability and indivisibility. For this would involve a contradiction. This is evident from the contrasted term. For the Apostle opposes to "spiritual body" not simply extended, divisible, visible, impenetrable, but "animal body." But an animal body is one not yet glorified, not yet made alive to heavenly glory by the life-giving Spirit of God. For the denomination is from the "spirit making alive", as in v.45, and Rom. 8:11.

But that the spiritual body will not put off extension and other such accidents, is evidently clear from vv.53-54, where the Apostle says: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." Behold, "this same", this same body, remaining as to substance, will put off not proper but mutable accidents, such as corruptibility, mortality, and will receive not proper and essential accidents of spirit, but common ones, namely incorruptibility, immortality. Moreover, both the mortal and immortal body, both the corruptible and incorruptible, remains extended, divisible, circumscribed. Even to his glorified body, and so spiritual, Job 19:26 promises that he shall see God "in his flesh". But flesh is not without bones, nor is it anything but extended.

For Paul too in this passage the "natural body" and "spiritual body" are the same. Third, the example adduced of the soul, which is so definitively in the head that it is at the same time also elsewhere, as in the foot, will be solidly refuted below. Fourth, we confess that the same thing can have different modes for different times or places. But again and again we deny that any substance can lay aside its own proper and essential mode, and take on the opposite substance's proper and essential mode. Sooner will griffins be yoked to horses and squares be turned into rounds.

Finally, the Adversary rushes in vain to the refuge of God's omnipotence. For though God can do all things that are, yet because he is truthful he cannot do contradictory things - make a

non-body a body, a body a spirit. For this would be to lie. As St. Jerome says in his Epistle to Eustochium: "God, though omnipotent, cannot raise a virgin after her fall." Or because God is omnipotent, could he ever make three to be four, or a hundred? fire to be water? the past to be the future?

LVII. That Christ arose from the sepulchre without the stone being removed, and entered the closed room through the doors, and so penetrated both stone and door with his body, is opposed to this most clear demonstration in vain. For neither can be solidly proved, nor is held as certain even by the Adversaries themselves.

As for the former, that Christ arose from the closed sepulchre and so penetrated the sepulchre, it is certainly nowhere said. Indeed, the contrary is intimated in Matthew 28:2, that the angel as Christ's attendant rolled away the stone for him. The Reverend Parish Minister indeed objects on p.455 that this is "a vain and merely fictitious evasion." But why, sir? Because, he says, the stone was rolled away after Christ's resurrection, that access into the sepulchre might be opened to the women. But this is asserted completely rashly. Just as neither Evangelist, neither Matthew nor Mark, affirms that Christ arose after the stone was removed, so neither affirms it before. Christ could arise at the very moment the stone was removed, and then the pious company of women visit the tomb, and the acts of each finally concur, as some Fathers affirm.

Thus Hilary on Matthew canon 33 says: "The angel of the Lord descending from heaven and rolling away the stone and sitting upon the sepulchre is the sign of the heavenly powers ministering to the Son arising from the dead to the mercy of the Father." Arnobius the younger also on Psalm 58 says: "He cried, and the Lord heard him, sent his angel round about them that fear him, and rolled away the stone from the monument, and delivered him." Moreover, miracles are not to be multiplied without necessity. Finally, let Durandus answer for us, whose words in the 4th book dist. 44 q.3 no.6 are these: "It must be said that in no text of Holy Scripture is it contained that Christ arose from the closed tomb, and therefore the contrary assertion does not prejudice the faith or Scripture. But if this is had from the sayings of some Holy Fathers, it must be taken as an opinion." But even granting that Christ arose before the descent of the angel, the penetration of the stone does not follow. For the Lord could by a mere nod remove and replace this sepulchral stone for a moment (since even to little faith, not to mention the Divine power, Scripture attributes the removal of mountains), or rarefy and suddenly condense it, or annihilate it and soon after restore it to make way for his risen body. That these and similar things could be done is admitted by all. But Scripture does not affirm, and reason utterly rejects as contradictory, the penetration of Christ's body through the stone.

LVIII. Nor does the other account, that Christ came "when the doors were shut" (John 20:19, 26), and stood in the midst, have more force. For it is certainly one thing to come when the doors are shut, another to penetrate through the shut doors. We read the former, not the latter. Jesus is expressly said to have come and stood in the midst. He is nowhere said to have penetrated. The circumstance of "the doors being shut" is noted not to designate the manner or mode of Christ's entry, but to expound the disciples' fear, as the words of the Evangelist manifestly show. And what kind of reasoning is this: The doors of the house were carefully shut

and bolted by the disciples because of fear of the Jews, and yet Christ entered unto them: therefore he entered through the doors, penetrating their dimensions? Even a blind man could see that more is concluded here than premised.

From that antecedent this alone follows, that the Lord entered without the disciples opening the doors. Let the same Durandus whom we quoted above speak for us: "When it is said 'Christ entered unto the disciples after the resurrection, the doors being shut', it must be said absolutely that this is true", etc. "But it is not said that he entered through the closed doors. For since a glorious body can move through the air or through the earth, and Christ by divine power could show and conceal his body as he willed, he could enter unto the disciples through a window or any other place, and then first show himself when he was before the disciples - and so he truly came when the doors were shut, but not through the shut doors. And if he entered through the doors, the doors could have been suddenly opened and suddenly shut, so that the opening and shutting escaped the notice of the disciples. And because a thing is not said to be done when it is not noticed, therefore they are said to have been shut, because their opening appeared to no one."

"And in this way it could be said that he arose from the closed sepulchre, if this were read anywhere. Or it could be said that Christ by that power by which as God he has dominion over the body and the form of the body, could change the form of the body into a narrow one, and so enter through any crack of the doors while they remained closed; and though some say this was not fitting, yet no one denies that it was possible to Christ inasmuch as he is God. But it seems more fitting to posit the mode which all grant to be possible, than to posit that which the majority judge impossible."

"Blessed Augustine also seems to hold this mode. Since therefore these modes, perhaps with one exception, and several others are possible, and Scripture defining nothing, nothing ought to be determined" - the Reverend Parish Minister certainly transgresses in thrusting that fictitious mode of penetrating dimensions not merely as absolutely impossible but certainly judged most difficult by all.

Nor do either Cyril or Hilary, praised by the Adversary, aid his cause. Neither defines the mode of penetration. Cyril admonishes that omnipotence surpassed nature, but does not say that it subverted nature and its properties by change. Hilary also denies rather than establishes penetration. For he says: "Jesus came, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst of the disciples. Did he penetrate the construction of walls and the solid nature of wood that cannot be penetrated?" Where an interrogative with a negative force is used. Shortly after he expounds his view, saying: "For he stands by, he is in the midst. Discourse and sense yield to this, and the truth of the deed is beyond human reason. We do not apprehend the understanding of the deed." Therefore the mode of penetration is not defined by him.

Finally, the learned warn that by those words "the doors being shut", the time rather than the manner of his coming is designated. The Reverend Parish Minister dismisses this as vain and ridiculous. But it will appear to him neither vain nor ridiculous if he will at length deign to weigh

the words of the Evangelist. For thus they have it: "When the evening was come, the doors were shut." That by the former words the circumstance of time is designated is evident. Since therefore the latter are connected with those by the conjunction, it is clear that time is also denoted by them. For it is customary for doors to be shut when night approaches (compare Joshua 2:5, Luke 11:7). It is customary for the Greeks and Latins to speak thus. Thus the Greeks call night "the key-bearer." The Romans said this by "early lamp." From Anacreon, Horace, Juvenal, and others, the very learned Daniel Heinsius has collected similar expressions. Behold therefore, Reverend Parish Minister, our argument resting on a most steadfast reed-pipe!

LIX. The eighth argument is taken from the well-known fact that no body can be substantially present in several places at once. For such a body, if any were given, would neither be one, being divided from itself; and at the same time would be actually and potentially, could be referred to itself by a real relation, could at the same time be in motion and at rest, etc. And as for Christ's body, its case is the same as that of all other bodies. Thus the angel in Matthew 28:6, concerning his resurrected body, says: "He is not here, for he is risen" - not obscurely concluding the negation of another place from the position of one. And in Matthew 26:11 he himself presages: "The poor you have always with you, but me you have not always." The Apostle testifies in Acts 3:21 that "the heaven must receive him until the times of restitution of all things." This furnishes matter for the following syllogism:

What cannot be actually and substantially present in several places at once, that cannot be locally present at once in heaven and in the Eucharist.

But Christ's body, like all other bodies, cannot be actually and substantially present in several places at once.

Therefore Christ's body is not locally present at once in heaven and in the Eucharist.

The major premise is indisputably true. The reasons adduced confirm the minor.

LX. Not once hitherto has the Reverend Parish Minister been sparing of the example of the soul. But now he urgently presses it ex professo and with studied care, and flees to it as to a sacred anchor to elude rather than solve, to speak ingenuously, the adduced argument. For since it seems to some Scholastics that the soul is whole in the whole body and in each of its parts, hence he infers the omnipresence, or at least the possibility of omnipresence, of Christ's body also. But that this sophism is frivolous and vain, by which an uncertainty is proved by something equally uncertain, or rather false by something equally false, and perspicuous things are removed by doubts, when on the contrary doubts ought to be proved by perspicuous things, we will now show.

For first, when the omnipresence of a body is treated of, what have we to do with the location of a spirit? Long ago Fulgentius, On the Faith to Peter ch. 3, warned that "bodies have not been granted to be as spirits have received to be." Nemesius also, following Aristotle, in On the

Nature of Man observes that "although the soul is said to be in the body, yet it is not said to be in it as in a place, such as bodies are in." And frequent philosophers warn that the soul is in the body as form in matter, not properly as located in place or contained in a container. Indeed we know from the testimony of its most noble operations that the soul is in the body. But in what mode it is in the body is certainly most difficult to perceive. At least this is certain, that it is not in the body in that mode in which a body is in its commensurate place.

Second, when the omnipresence of a body is treated of, the body treated of is one which is properly and positively called whole, because it has parts. But the soul, since it does not have parts, is called whole improperly and negatively. What kind of consequence then is this, I ask: If the soul exists whole, that is, not by parts, in the body and in the several members of the body, then also a human body can exist at once whole, that is, by parts, in heaven and on earth, so that the head, hands, feet and remaining members exist at once in both places? Is not the contrary rather inferred, namely that the same body exists at once in heaven and on earth not by parts, that is, without head, hands and members? But this is just as if you should say that the same body does not exist at once in heaven and on earth. For an entire human body exists nowhere except where its head, hands and members exist.

Third, our question treats of commensurate places, for which an equality between the concave surface of the containing body and the convex surface of the contained is required. The argument of the Reverend Parish Minister speaks of the human soul, which since it has no surface or extremities, so it can neither be contained by the body nor commensurable with it.

Fourth, the question is whether one body can be at once in several disjunct and separate places, so that it does not in that interval exist in the intermediate places. But those who affirm that the rational soul is whole in the head and whole in the feet, do not deny that the same soul exists at once in all the intermediate or interposed members.

Fifth, it is certainly doubtful, and a matter of controversy on both sides, whether the soul is whole in the whole body and in each part, or rather has its seat in the heart or brain. Scripture nowhere defines that it is whole in the whole body. Nor does sound reason oppose the position that the soul acts upon the remaining body from the brain as from a royal seat, and in it exercises its operations in a certain way by the instrumentality of the animal spirits, in the same way as the sun acts upon the earth from heaven, or, to speak more accurately, as an angel existing definitively in a place yet obtains a rather ample sphere of operation outside itself. But on the other hand, scarcely any great Apollo will reconcile it with sound reason, if it is affirmed that the soul is whole in the whole body and in each part, what then becomes of the soul in some new part growing up, or in some part of the body removed by cutting or in some other way.

But since both Scripture and the ancient philosophers and theologians have omitted to define that the soul is whole in the whole body and in each part, and reason itself in no way either persuades or establishes this wonderful doctrine, I certainly greatly fear lest some more acute

Scholastics forged this elaborate fiction to inlay the error of Christ's multi-presence. For it is the native character of error to heap absurdities upon absurdities.

Sixth and finally, that very phrase "that the soul is whole in the whole body and in each part" is plainly equivocal and ambiguous. For either they understand it positively of extension or co-extension with the body, and thus they speak nothing true but pronounce what conflicts with the nature of the soul; or they take their words negatively in the sense that the soul is in the body in an indivisible mode, and so not by parts, and thus they say nothing false indeed, but they explain nothing, and finally abuse the word "whole". For "whole" means "that which has parts".

Or finally they have this sense, that the whole body can follow the command and rule of the mind, and any part of the body can do the same; and conversely, that the whole body can excite a new perception in the mind, and any part of the body can do the same. Which presence indeed is neither fittingly expressed by that phrase, and consisting in the mutual actions and passions of body and soul, does nothing to demonstrate the true situation of one body among other bodies, which we are here treating of, that is, multi-presence. Therefore, whichever way the Reverend Parish Minister turns, he will sooner strike water from a pumice stone than extract his paradox from a greater paradox. And all alike will fall which with great effort he builds up on that paradox.

LXI. The Reverend Parish Minister strives to prove that a body does not lose its unity by omnipresence, from the fact that unity is not bestowed on things by place, but emanates from their very essence. He adds that just as several distinct accidents of heat, moisture, fragrance, etc. do not multiply their subjects, so neither do places, though distinct.

But this objection is frivolous. For though the unity of a body does not depend on its commensurate place as on a cause, yet it depends on it as a necessary condition of its existence and the demonstrative sign of it. Nor either do several distinct accidents multiply the subject, if indeed they inhere in it in a remitted degree and are compatible. But they cannot inhere in the highest degree. For the highest degree does not admit an opposed degree, as the sons of the Logicians know. Nor can they inhere disparately. But two commensurate places of the same subject, namely a body, are disparate. In the several modes by which the unity of a body is dissolved, it is principally dissolved by section. Whence bodies which cannot be divided, and so cannot lose their unity, are called insectible.

The reason why section removes the unity of a body is the interposition of the cutter, dissolving the continuity of the cut body. Hence with the Conimbricenses physical divisibility is when by physical contact one body is introduced into the parts of another body and separates them. Therefore the unity of a body is removed by the interposition of something diverse which, where it is placed, does not make a part of that body whose unity is in question. And the interposition of any body whatsoever suffices to remove unity. Since therefore the Adversaries themselves acknowledge that between the body of Christ which exists in heaven and that which they contend exists at the same time on earth, bodies are interposed not making any part of Christ's

body, and which in continuous quantity are certainly great and vast, but in discrete quantity innumerable and various - by what reason, I ask, do they dare to affirm that the unity of Christ's body existing in this way at once in heaven and on earth remains safe and intact? Do they so strive to illumine us by their subtleties that we must become blind?

LXII. Certainly Christ in clear words presaged that he would be in such way that he would not always be with us, nor would we always have him (Matt. 26:11). And that "the heaven must receive him until the times of the restitution of all things", Peter asserts in Acts 3:21. Nor is the evasion of the Reverend Parish Minister solid, that we shall not always have Christ present, namely in a visible and mortal body, so that his wearied members must be refreshed, yet we shall always have him in a glorious and invisible body, and that heaven so receives him until the time of the restitution of all things as to his visible presence, that nevertheless as to his invisible and sacramental presence he has place daily in the Eucharist.

For such human fictions of subtle distinctions do not so much satisfy as mock the Scriptures. For whence finally will the Reverend Parish Minister prove that Christ's body is present on earth in an invisible mode? But in Matthew 24:23ff. Christ expressly prohibited believing those who claim the invisible presence of his body. To which ought we to subscribe more firmly? But also in Matthew 26:11 it is clear that any local presence of the body, whether visible or invisible, is denied, both because Christ says "Me ye have not always", not "Me ye shall not always see"; but certainly to have Christ invisibly is to have Christ; and because he says "The poor ye have always with you" (in any bodily mode whatsoever), "but me ye have not always", certainly in the same bodily mode; and finally, because his reasons militate against any bodily presence whatsoever. For why shall we not always have Christ with us? Christ himself responds with these words: "Yet a little while I am with you... Whither I go, ye cannot come", and "I go unto the Father" (John 7:33, 14:12), "I go to him that sent me" (John 16:5), "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you" (John 16:7). Behold, they were not going to have Christ always because he was going to depart and go into heaven. But the departure of his body from any place removes not only his visible but also his invisible presence. For "departure" implies "local elongation", as Gregory of Nyssa says against Eunomius, Oration 12. Nor does it avail what Christ says in Luke 24:44, "These are the words which I spoke unto you while I was yet with you". For by these words Christ by no means insinuates that in some sense he can be said to be at once present and absent with his body, as the Adversary maintains on p.472. But he recalls to their memory the discourse which he had made to them while he was still with them, that is, abiding with a continual presence, not in successive intervals, as after the resurrection. These things certainly agree well. But presence and absence at the same time can no more agree than the same thing can be present and absent at the same time.

Nor is it an objection that Christ says in Matthew 28:20, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world". For there is an easy and simple way of reconciling this, if with the ancients we say that Christ left the world and went to the Father, and is not with us according to his human nature, but is the same with us even to the consummation of the age according to his Divine nature. St. Augustine wisely admonishes in his Epistle to Dardanus that we must always

consider in what respect anything is said of Christ. Let us see a few of the many ancients reconciling in this way.

Thus St. Augustine in Tract 30 on John says: "According to the presence of his majesty we always have Christ; according to the presence of his flesh, it was rightly said to the disciples 'Me ye have not always.' For the Church had him according to the presence of his flesh for a few days; now it holds him by faith, it does not see him with the eyes." He opposes the presence of the flesh or human nature to the presence of the majesty or divinity.

St. Vigilius in Book 1 against Eutyches: "The Son departed from us according to his humanity. But according to his divinity he says to us, 'Lo, I am with you all days even unto the end of the world.'"

Fulgentius in Book 2 to Thrasimund: "Our Lord, to show the locality of his humanity, said to his disciples, 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father'; but showing the immensity of his divinity, he says to his disciples, 'Lo, I am with you all days even unto the consummation of the age.'"

Behold the most unambiguous words of the Holy Fathers! But those little words "visibly", "invisibly", are utterly unfit for reconciling the differing passages. For the Adversaries themselves do not maintain that they denote diverse parts; and they cannot denote diverse modes or respects of the same part, since these cannot be demonstrated.

Nor either must it be thought that whenever we have an adverb ending in -ly, it denotes some certain mode. Thus Augustine in Tract 47 on John says that "in Christ descending bodily, not only the Holy Spirit but also the Father and the Son were present spiritually." Where "descending bodily" means descending according to the body, and "being present spiritually" means being present according to the Spirit. So when we say that God is present with us invisibly, we do not mean that God can be present with us both visibly and invisibly.

LXIII. We proceed to the ninth argument drawn from antiquity. For a doctrine repugnant both to the Word of God and to sound reason, and also to pious antiquity, is doubtless not to be received. Concerning the Word of God and sound reason, we have already seen. The Anatomy itself exhibits some strictures of pious Antiquity, and for the rest appeals to the Herculean and most praiseworthy labors on this subject of the great and illustrious theologians on our side, Edmund Albertinus, Forbes, John Vorstius, to whom must be added the lucubrations of the great polyhistor Hospinian, Mornay, and the celebrated Claudius.

LXIV. Here in advance the Reverend Parish Minister asks three things of me. First: "If the bodily presence was unknown to pious Antiquity before the Scholastics, which of the Scholastics first taught the belief of this presence?"

Response: But this matters very little to the truth and to us. It is enough for us that a great support for the truth shines forth from pious Antiquity, and that the sinews of error can be vigorously cut through. But the Scholastics themselves strayed from the holy footsteps of pious

Antiquity by their novel doctrine. But if the narrow bounds within which we are confined in this disputation permitted a longer excursion into history, it could easily be demonstrated that in the Western church indeed (for in the Eastern the error carried away Anastasius the Monk of Mount Sinai, John Damascene, Theophylact, a little earlier) in the 18th year of the ninth century, Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corbie, publishing a book on the body and blood of the Lord, first brought the novel doctrine of bodily presence onto the stage of the church - daring to assert, namely, that the Eucharist is at once the figure of Christ's body and the truth of the same body, contrary to the ancients, even the Council of Nicaea a little before and Nicephorus of Constantinople, who warned that "a figure is not the truth, but the imitation of the truth"; Rabanus, Amalarius the author of the books on ecclesiastical offices, Walafrid Strabo the Abbot of Augia, Heribald the Bishop of Auxerre, meanwhile retaining the sounder ancient doctrine; but especially Bertram or rather Ratramnus the Presbyter, who at the command of King Charles the Bald wrote a little book on the body and blood of the Lord, expurgated by the Roman harpies but recently translated into the vernacular by the venerable and most illustrious theologian of Paris Claudius, and solidly vindicated, most clearly asserted the orthodox doctrine; and the same was afterwards done also by Prudentius the Bishop of Troyes, Druthmar, Remigius of Auxerre, and others who made it a matter of religion not to subscribe to the novel error of their contemporary Paschasius; but that others also subscribed to it in those same times, and especially in the following tenth, most harsh and iron age, the error gradually insinuated itself among drowsy and unlearned men; but that about the middle of the eleventh century, Berno of Augia or Bruno, and Berengarius of Tours, stood firmly for the truth against the recently introduced error, both by voice and by epistles sent here and there, teaching namely that by the consecration the bread and wine do not cease to be substantially what they were, nor properly become the Lord's body and blood, but only the sacrament of his body and blood; but that the latter was vehemently opposed by Lanfranc and Guitmundus, both addicted to the novel error, was compelled under Nicholas II to recant by taking an oath so harsh that the most learned men, especially Alexander, Bonaventure, Gabriel Biel, the Bishop of Rochester, whom Vasquez cites in Disputation 231 no. 21, were ashamed of it, and which patronized not so much transubstantiation as consubstantiation; and that under compulsion of death and with his conscience protesting he recanted the truth, but nevertheless afterwards taught the truth and persisted in it until death;

and that after him several others, especially Rupert the Abbot of Deutz, Zonaras, Euthymius, Honorius of Autun, Peter de Bruys, Henry, Peter Waldo, the Albigenses, and others afterwards also cried out against the obtrusive error; and finally that Innocent III in the Fourth Lateran Council judged the word "transubstantiation" devised by Stephen of Autun, and the thing designated by it, to pertain to the Catholic faith, and ordered both this and other such things to be recited in that Council, but without any Synodical deliberation and decision, which to some seemed plausible, to others burdensome, as Matthew Paris on John, and Platina on Innocent III, testify; and yet that his words do not compel belief in the cessation of the substance of bread, but are preserved in the substitution of the substance of bread for the substance of the body; so much so that, as Durandus testifies in the 4th book of Sentences, dist. 10 qu. 1, Henry of Ostia, Geoffroy, and others enumerate among the opinions not reprobated in their age that

which asserts that the substance of bread remains after the consecration; for which opinion they cited the confession of Berengarius approved by the Council;

and that thereafter the matter was handled not by disputations but persecutions, not by the pen but by the sword; but that in the Council of Florence there was again a disputation between the Greeks and Latins concerning the divine transmutation of the bread, though nothing was defined in the Act of Union; and finally that in the Council of Trent the error was defined, and received not by others than those addicted to the Pontifical sect, but in the Greek Church and the remaining Eastern churches never publicly adopted from their beginnings down to the present day, as the venerable Claudius proved in his recent writing by which he brought the celebrated Sorbonnist Arnold to recantation. These and like things can be demonstrated by indubitable testimonies.

LXV. Secondly the Reverend Parish Minister asks: "How did it come about that the belief in the bodily presence was introduced into the universal church, since it is not only difficult to comprehend, but according to our view cannot even be conceived, and is utterly impossible?"

Response: The belief in the bodily presence was never introduced into the universal church. It was introduced only into that faction addicted to the Roman Pontiff, which in vain pretends to be the universal church. Moreover, the Reverend Parish Minister might equally ask how it came about that the whole gentile world could believe that creatures such as the sun, stars, animals, brutes are the living God to be religiously adored - which is no less difficult to believe and naturally impossible than the bodily presence in the Eucharist. What insipid fatuity cannot feign for itself?

Does the Reverend Parish Minister not know that God by a just and grave judgment sometimes sends "the energy of error" and "the working of delusion that they should believe the lie", to those who do not cling firmly to God's Word (2 Thess. 2:11)? Finally, the subtle Doctor John Scotus in the 4th book of Sentences, dist. 11 qu. 3 §15, proposes and resolves the same question. For there he writes thus: "And if anyone asks why the Church" (namely in the Fourth Lateran Council, of which he is speaking) "willed to set forth this interpretation of this article, so difficult, when the words of Scripture can be preserved according to the easy and more apparent interpretation concerning this article - I say that the Scriptures are expounded by that Spirit by which they were composed." Behold, the spirit of Pope Innocent III expounding the Scriptures according to his caprice, and blinding the eyes of faith, easily effected among those who had sworn by his words that they would subscribe with ready faith to something so difficult, or rather absurd, especially since the Popes already had that power to represent the uttermost punishments to the disobedient.

LXVI. Third, he asks: "Since the Scholastics, even from their first age, greatly dissented concerning the questions which were first raised by them, and not yet decided as articles of faith by the universal Church, how did it come about that the Scholastics all agreed in this arduous question?"

Response: We do not say that after Paschasius they immediately all agreed about the error. Indeed pious, prudent and wise men opposed both the arising and spreading error, as we have indicated above. In course of time the spirit of the Pope, whether of Nicholas II or Gregory VII who dictated harsh and dreadful words to Berengarius, or of Innocent III in the Lateran Council (as Scotus indeed thought) delivering an ambiguous but seemingly decisive sentence, reduced the Scholastics hanging on the determinations of the Roman Pontiffs to a certain concord. For even after those times there were not lacking those who handed down the sounder view. How easy it is, by the vice of the human mind most prone to fictions, and by the enticement of great examples, to agree on errors, experience and the memory of ancient heresies, especially the Arian heresy which in a short time inundated the whole world like a cataclysm, abundantly testifies.

LXVII. Let us now briefly consider some testimonies of the ancients. From St. Cyprian, Gratian in Distinction 2 On Consecration, canon "Whenever", quotes and alleges the ancient formula customary in the use of the Eucharist, "Lift up your hearts." For thus the herald of the sacred mysteries exhorted in a loud voice, the people responding: "We lift them up unto the Lord." Mention of the same formula occurs everywhere in the liturgies, and also in Arnobius, Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine, and others. If the faith of the ancient church had been that the Lord is substantially present in the Eucharist with his body, it ought rather to have been said: "Do not lift up your hearts on high, but cast them down to the host in which Christ is locally present with his grace, indeed with his glory, and on that account is to be adored". In vain are the Reverend Parish Minister's trifling little objections that they themselves, the Pontificians, use the same formula before the consecration, and at the same time believe in the bodily presence; that for the same reason the Holy Prophets lifted up their hearts, desiring the future Messiah, and yet believed in his advent in true and substantial presence; that in the Lord's Prayer, saying "Our Father who art in heaven", we do not thereby deny that he is at the same time on earth and everywhere; that by that formula we are bidden to prepare our hearts to pray to the Father, adore him, and give him thanks, who is said by Christ to be in the heavens; and finally that St. Cyprian in his sermon On the Lord's Prayer cited by Gratian expressly establishes the bodily presence.

For these things are truly quite frivolous. For the true Church, otherwise than the present Roman one, believed that the whole action of the Lord's Supper is purely spiritual. And so, lest the minds of the communicants should cling too much to the symbols, it called them up on high, that they might piously enjoy Christ's true body, not shut up in a little cake, but given upon the cross, and now sitting at the right hand of God the Father. Hence the Church, responding "We lift them up unto the Lord", in a certain way professed that all Christians so believe, that the whole of that mystery pertains to the heart, mind, faith. That this formula was customary even in the distribution itself, "that the faithful may then especially savor heavenly things when Christ is at the right hand of God", St. Augustine testifies in Book 2 On the Perseverance of the Saints, ch. 12. And St. Chrysostom in Homily 24 on 1 Corinthians compares the faithful called upwards to eagles. "For this tremendous and admirable sacrifice", he says, "induces us to approach it with utmost concord and love, and being made eagles in this life, to soar aloft to him in heaven, or rather above heaven, 'For where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.'

The carcase of the Lord is his body by reason of death; for if he had not fallen, we would not have risen again." What need would there be in the very communion of his Eucharist (not merely before the consecration) to borrow and assume the wings of eagles and to soar aloft with them into heaven, that there we may behold the Sun of Righteousness sitting at the right hand of God, if Christ were present with his body in the appearance of bread, and not merely present but also to be adored as present?

For this, the feet of jackdaws would be more than enough. And that this formula lifted up the hearts of the faithful not only to God the Father, but to Christ himself sitting at the right hand of God, is further proved by the fact that the ancients observe that this admonition "Lift up your hearts" is derived from the words of the Apostle in Colossians 3:1-2: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." Thus Arnobius on Psalm 118: "The Apostle cries out to us concerning the things above: 'Seek those things which are above.' And the priestly voice calls out to us all for the receiving of the mysteries: 'Lift up your hearts.'" Augustine speaks in the same way everywhere, especially in Book 2 On the Perseverance of the Saints, ch. 12, and on Psalms 29 and 148, etc. But he speaks clearly on this matter in his work On the Creed to the Catechumens: "The Sacrament is celebrated in its own order. First, after the prayer you are admonished to lift up your hearts. By this the members of Christ are taught: For if you have become members of Christ, where is your Head? The members have the Head. If the Head had not preceded, the members would not follow. Whither has your Head gone? What did you confess in the Creed? That on the third day he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of the Father. Therefore our Head is in heaven. Hence when it is said 'Lift up your hearts', you respond 'We lift them up unto the Lord', namely our Head who ascended and sits at the right hand of the Father." What could be said more explicitly?

It is also most clear from this that when the ancients bade those about to approach the Eucharist to lift up their hearts on high, they meant on high with respect to place, not merely dignity, as Bellarmine trifles in Book 1 On the Eucharist, ch. 14, along with others. Nor are similar the examples the Reverend Parish Minister urges. For the Holy Prophets lifting up their hearts and ardently desiring the future Messiah, certainly did not have the same Messiah present on earth at that time. And when we pray "Our Father who art in heaven", we indeed believe that God, who is immense, is at the same time on earth and everywhere, but not in the same mode of presence as that in which he manifests himself in heaven. But since Christ's body is not immense, it cannot in any mode of local presence be at once in heaven and on earth, above and below. These things therefore differ toto coelo.

Finally, St. Cyprian in that place does not favor the substantial presence either. In the Lord's Prayer he understands by "our heavenly bread" the bread which is Christ. He adds the reason - because Christ is our bread, who we are in contact with his body. But certainly the Holy Father does not speak of the manual contact of Christ's own body constituted in the Eucharist. For to be in contact with Christ's body is for him simply to pertain to Christ's body, as he speaks shortly after. Thus the Latins speak, as Suetonius on Galba: "He succeeded Nero, not being at all related to the family of Caesar." Nor does he assert that John 6 treats of the Eucharist. For

though in the Eucharist too the bread of life is designated and eaten, it does not follow that it is designated and eaten only in the Eucharist. His meaning is simply that those who by some grave offense are debarred from the communion of the Eucharist, and do not care through penitence to be restored to the right and grace of communion, are by that very fact deprived of the heavenly bread directly designated through the Eucharist, that is, Christ the true bread of life, and at the same time of communion with his mystical body, the Church.

LXVIII. St. Basil (or another author, as some think, an epitomizer of Chrysostom and Theodoretus) wisely admonishes that the Lord calls it "the most proper food of the rational faculty", because it is a most proper food of the soul to confirm its substance. He adds that there is a certain "rational mouth of the inner man" by which it is nourished, receiving the word of life, which is the bread that came down from heaven. Shortly after he says: "Since therefore our Lord is the true bread, and his flesh the true food, it is necessary that the pleasure of this bread be spiritually born in us through the spiritual taste." If therefore according to St. Basil Christ or Christ's flesh is the proper and congruous food of the soul as of the intellectual mouth, it ought not to be taken by the bodily mouth. Just as the food of the body is not taken by the soul, so neither the food of the soul by the body. But the Very Reverend Provost explains this in vain as referring to spiritual eating outside of the Sacrament. For not only does neither St. Basil nor the other ancient Fathers declare anywhere that Christ is properly eaten by the bodily mouth in the Sacrament, but he also expressly asserts that Christ as the bread of life, as he is certainly also proposed in the Sacrament, is the "most proper food of the rational soul", and so not of the body. The proper food of the soul distinguished from the body toto genere cannot be the food of the body.

LXIX. From St. Chrysostom's Homily 24 on 1 Corinthians, we have already quoted the passage above where he declares that those who approach the tremendous sacrifice ought to be eagles, and ought to soar aloft to it in heaven. Here the Adversaries greatly torment themselves, being inconsistent with themselves. For some of them maintain that he is speaking of the final flight into the heavens after the resurrection. Thus Petronius. But the Reverend Parish Minister, following in the footsteps of Bellarmine, who asserts that Chrysostom is speaking of the ascension not into the bodily heaven but to God and eternal things, neglecting earthly cares, contends on p.503 that Chrysostom likens those who approach and depart from the Lord's table to eagles "by a consideration of the preeminent food by which they are fed in the Eucharist, namely the very body and blood of Christ really and substantially present in the Eucharist, and so it befits them, despising earthly and carnal things, to desire heavenly things like eagles."

But first, he plainly wrongs Chrysostom, who nowhere says that the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present in the Eucharist. Second, the Holy Father says that we ought to soar aloft to that sacrifice in heaven, and indeed to that very heaven which is the dwelling of the Sun of Righteousness, Christ, to which we shall actually be lifted up when he descends thence to receive us to himself. He therefore locates that sacrifice, the Sun of Righteousness, Christ, in the bodily heaven. We must soar aloft to it like eagles, that there we may behold the Sun of Righteousness. But the Reverend Parish Minister teaches us to creep on the earth with jackdaws, and to seek Christ substantially present in the Eucharist on earth,

though with loftier and more spiritual cares - and so he directly contradicts Chrysostom. The Holy Father certainly requires a spiritual, heavenly, sublime care, but in such a way that he calls it away from the earth, that it may be fixed not on the spiritual food present on earth but on the Sun of Righteousness beheld in heaven with unwavering eyes. For who, I ask, is moved towards that which he has present? The whole exhortation of the Holy Father would be futile if one ought to believe that Christ is truly present on the altar. Nor can anyone's mind be in heaven and on earth at one and the same time. It is permissible indeed to be bodily on earth and mentally at the same time in heaven. But it is not permissible to be mentally at the same time both in heaven and on earth. When Christ was still on earth, he never exhorted the Apostles to seek him elsewhere than where he was present with them.

Third, the Reverend Parish Minister far too much abuses Chrysostom's words, which he distorts to the bodily presence. In that same homily the Holy Father says that the faithful worthily using the Eucharist will "meet the one descending from heaven"; that they see Christ's body "set forth" in the Eucharist; just as no one dares to touch the king's robe with impure hands, so much less is the body of God to be received with insult; whence not even the woman suffering a hemorrhage dared to touch the whole garment, but only its fringe. There he also says "This is that body", etc. Hence the Adversary with great confidence proclaims that St. Chrysostom inculcates the substantial presence of Christ's body by these words, and objects other things satis procaciter.

Indeed another would especially wonder that an ingenious and prudent man could acquiesce in such figleaves. We have already shown that the former part of this passage plainly favors us. Nor does the latter part aid him more. For Chrysostom did not say that Christ descends into the Eucharist with his body, but the Adversary feigned this. He said that the faithful will meet Christ descending from heaven, namely on the day of judgment. He never at all dreamed that they meet Christ descending into the Eucharist. Moreover, Christ's body is said to be "set forth" and "received" in the Eucharist either in the reality of the thing, and in that way spiritually, or in the visible sign and sacrament, and in that way visibly. The Holy Father is speaking of the latter mode. Let the Adversary himself inspect and weigh with sound judgment: For he says "When you shall have seen it set forth." He is therefore speaking of the body to be received visibly, and so in the Sacrament, not in the reality of the thing. For the Adversary will surely not say that he sees Christ's body set forth in the reality of the thing in the Eucharist, who inculcates its invisible presence to a nauseating degree.

Nor either does he propose that body otherwise in the Eucharist than as nailed to the cross and scourged, crucified, as he constantly admonishes that it is representatively set forth in the Eucharist - which is just what the Adversaries themselves maintain. Nor is the comparison with the royal robe touched less chastely relevant. For anyone can see that this is Chrysostom's comparison: If the robe of a mere man ought not to be touched rashly, how much less the body of the Lord, that is, the Sacrament of Christ, who is the Lord of all? He argues a minori ad majus, denying that rashness is to be employed. For just as a pure man is far less than Christ, so his robe pertains much less to the man than the Sacrament does to Christ's body. But that

the names of the things themselves are imposed on the Sacraments ought not to seem strange to those even moderately versed in the Sacred Scriptures or the Fathers.

LXX. From St. Augustine many testimonies of the truth could be cited. I have cited one from Tract 30 on John, where he says: "How shall I put forth my hand into heaven, that I may take hold of him sitting there? Put forth faith, and thou hast hold on him. Thy forefathers held him in the flesh" (for he is speaking to the Jews), "do thou hold him in the heart; through which Christ, though absent, is even present. For unless he were present, he could not be held by us at all. But because it is true what thou sayest: 'Lo, I am with you even unto the end of the world' - he both went away and is here, and returned and did not desert us. For he carried his body into heaven, he did not take away his majesty from the world." The words are clear and need an interpreter no more than they need a reader. He places Christ's body in heaven, asserts that he is held by faith there where he exists, denies that he can be held by the hand. The Reverend Parish Minister responds on p.508-509 that Augustine is speaking to the Jews, not about Christ's presence in the Eucharist, but about communion with him by faith outside of the Sacrament. But that Holy Father does not distinguish: he absolutely denies that Christ can be held by the hand, and roundly affirms that he can be held only by faith, by the heart alone. Nor does he acknowledge any presence of Christ on earth except of his majesty, that is, of his divinity. A little after, he speaks thus: "According to the presence of his majesty we always have Christ; according to the presence of his flesh, it was rightly said to the disciples: 'But me ye have not always.' For the Church had him according to the presence of his flesh for a few days; now it holds him by faith, it does not see him with the eyes."

LXXI. Let us now hear St. Ambrose. He declares his mind on Luke 24 thus: "We do not touch Christ with bodily reality, but by faith." And shortly after: "We ought not to seek him above the earth, nor on the earth, nor according to the flesh, if we wish to find him... For now we know Christ no longer according to the flesh." The same, in Sermon 36 On the Season, discourses at length on this matter. Among other things: "Blessed Paul taught us how we ought to seek the Savior in heavenly things, saying 'Seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God', etc. Therefore we ought no longer to seek the Savior above the earth, nor on the earth, nor according to the flesh, if we wish to find and touch him." The Holy Father speaks universally, roundly denying that Christ is to be sought above the earth, or on the earth, or according to the flesh; and asserting that we touch Christ not by bodily touch but by faith.

The Reverend Parish Minister ought not to have infringed this indefinite statement by positing that his body is touched in the Sacrament and Christ is found according to the flesh on earth. If this is true, the statement of the Blessed Ambrose will waver mightily. But whence will he demonstrate an exception to us? He appeals to the same author's treatise On Those Who are Initiated into the Mysteries. But how little relevance that has we will make manifest below. For now it will suffice to hear Bertram expounding the meaning of Ambrose's words on the body and blood of the Lord: "The same author", he says, "subjoins: 'Truly the flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried' - truly therefore it is the Sacrament of that flesh. The Lord Jesus himself cries out: 'This is my body.' How carefully, how prudently the distinction is made! Concerning the flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried, he says 'Truly the flesh of

Christ.' But concerning that which is received in the Sacrament, he says 'Truly therefore it is the Sacrament of that flesh', distinguishing the Sacrament of the flesh from the truth of the flesh."

LXXII. Behold therefore, Reverend Parish Minister, the testimonies of the Fathers I have alleged standing on an immovable base, and mightily confounding that triumph which you adorned on p.511! It would certainly be easy to bring forward many no less stringent. I will add only a few, from which it will be plain that the Holy Fathers altogether held the same view as we do - namely that Christ is present in the Eucharist while the substance of the bread remains, as in a figure, sign, or Sacrament - which the Reverend Parish Minister strongly denies on p.511.

Most clearly St. Theodoretus speaks thus in Dialogue 1: "The mystic symbols do not depart from their own nature after the sanctification, for they remain in their former substance and figure and form, and are visible and tangible, just as they were before." Behold, the symbols do not depart from their own nature, they remain in their former substance. The same author in Dialogue 2 calls the visible symbols "the body and blood" honorifically, "not changing nature, but adding grace to nature."

Tell me, Reverend Parish Minister, was St. Theodoretus a Pontifician or a Reformed theologian?

Augustine against Adimantus, Book 12, Chapter 12: "For the Lord did not hesitate to say 'This is my body', when he was giving the sign of his body."

The same, in Book 3 On Christian Doctrine, Chapter 16: "It is therefore a figure, commanding that the passion of the Lord be communicated and sweetly and profitably stored up in the memory, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us."

The same, Exposition on Psalm 3: "He admitted Judas to the banquet in which he commended to his disciples the figure of his body and blood."

The same, against Maximinus, Book 3, Chapter 22: "In the Sacraments, it is not what they are, but what they show forth, that is attended to; for they are signs of things, being one thing and signifying another."

Epistle 23 to Boniface: "From similitude, the Sacraments often receive the names of the things themselves. For as, after a certain mode of speaking, the Sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body, and the Sacrament of Christ's blood is Christ's blood, so the Sacrament of faith is faith."

In the Book of the Sentences of Prosper: "The heavenly bread, which is the flesh of Christ, is in its own mode called the body of Christ, when in reality it is the Sacrament of Christ's body, just as the very immolation of the flesh which is performed by the priest's hands is called the passion, death, crucifixion of Christ, not in the reality of the thing, but in a signifying mystery." This most noteworthy statement is also cited in the Decretals, On Consecration, dist. 2, cap. "This is."

Tertullian in Book 4 against Marcion: "Having taken the bread and distributed it to his disciples, he made it his body by saying 'This is my body', that is, the figure of my body."

Ambrose, On Those Who are Initiated into the Mysteries, Chapter 9: "The Lord Jesus himself cries out 'This is my body.' Before the benediction of the heavenly words, another species is named; after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified."

The same, Book 4 On the Sacraments, Chapter 4: "Make for us", he says, "this oblation approved, reasonable, acceptable, which is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

On 1 Corinthians, Chapter 11: "The testament was therefore established by blood, for the blood is the witness of the Divine benefit; and it is in the type of this that we receive the mystic cup of blood for the preservation of body and soul." He calls the cup the "type of blood" or of "the testament."

Chrysostom, Homily 83 on Matthew, calls the Eucharist the "sign and symbol"; in Homily 17 on Hebrews, the "example"; on Psalm 22 he says the bread is the "similitude" of Christ's body and blood.

The same (or John of Constantinople, who lived under Justinian) in his Epistle to Caesarius: "Through the mediating priest, it is liberated by the Divine sanctifying grace from the appellation of bread, and deemed worthy of the appellation of the Lord's body, though the nature of bread remained in it, and it is proclaimed not two bodies, but one body of the Son."

Origen, on Leviticus, Chapter 2, Homily 7, expounding those words "Unless ye eat the flesh", speaks thus: "Recognize that the things written in the Divine volumes are figures, and therefore as spiritual, not as carnal, examine and understand what is said."

LXXIII. But now let us proceed to the vindication of the same argument just brought up. It was furnished to us from the well-known dissent of the School concerning either the possibility or the actual mode of Christ's body being present circumscriptively. For that sect of the School called from the shadows, namely the Scotists, maintains that Christ's body either is actually present circumscriptively or can be present circumscriptively. There is no great difficulty here. When the potential is denied, the act is simultaneously denied.

The other party of the Thomists interposes, asserting that any body whatsoever, and so also Christ's, can be and is present not circumscriptively, but penetratively and indivisibly - not after the manner of dimensive quantity, but of substance. Moreover, from that dissent we construct the following syllogism:

In whatsoever places Christ's body can be bodily, substantially, penetratively and indivisibly present at once by a miracle, in the same places it can be present circumscriptively by a miracle.

But Christ's body cannot by a miracle be at once present in several places circumscriptively.

Therefore Christ's body cannot by a miracle be at once present in several places bodily, substantially, penetratively and indivisibly.

The major premise the Scotists and their followers prove from this, that where God can make a natural substance to exist in an unnatural and opposite mode to its own, there he can make the same substance to exist in its natural mode congruous to its nature, since this is equally easy, indeed easier, than that, and for that two miracles must concur - one in causing the presence of one body at once in several places, the other in separating it from its natural mode; but for this only one miracle, namely in causing the presence of one body at once in several places.

The Thomists and their followers demonstrate the minor premise by invincible arguments, which we will touch on below.

LXXIV. The Reverend Parish Minister doubtless sensed no small force in the argument drawn from the domestic quiver. For before all else he displays indignation, imputing to me either ignorance or malice for so boldly ascribing a false doctrine to certain Scholastic Doctors. Conscience abundantly frees me from malice. If anyone is ignorant of Scholastic subtleties and shadows, every good man will interpret him as laboring under a pious and learned ignorance rather than an unlearned one. Nor if some error has crept in by praeterition in citing the Scholastics, does it deserve so atrocious a note, especially since the force of the argument does not turn on this.

Meanwhile, I still cannot understand Scotus's view otherwise. For in the 4th book of Sentences, dist. 10, qu. 1, he asserts that by Divine power the same body, and so also Christ's, can circumscriptively exist in different places. Shortly after, in qu. 5, he determines that the conclusion "that Christ's body can be at once in heaven and in the Eucharist" is certain for every believer; but one mode is to be posited such that by the conversion of something else into it, that body can exist elsewhere than in its natural place. Therefore it cannot be locally in several places, because to exist locally would include a contradiction. Whether he excludes the circumscriptive sacramental mode, I know not. For he excludes that which implies a contradiction. But in his judgment the circumscriptive mode does not imply a contradiction.

LXXV. But however that may be, the Reverend Parish Minister should certainly know that the strength of our argument consists in no way in the authority of those asserting it, but in the reasons proving each premise of the syllogism, produced both by the Scotists and the Thomists; indeed, the argument can be no less rightly constructed thus: No body can exist in two places at once, whether by miracle, whether in one it is posited penetratively or circumscriptively, or in both circumscriptively. Therefore neither can Christ's body exist at once in heaven and in the Eucharist by miracle, whether in one it is posited as existing penetratively, or circumscriptively, or in both circumscriptively. For the argument tends to this. Here is Rhodes, here is the dance!

Supposing therefore that this syllogism emanates not from the Scholastics but from us, it should be seen what its weight is. Let cause contend with cause, reason with reason. The major premise then is: "In whatsoever places Christ's body can be at once bodily or substantially, that is, penetratively and indivisibly, by a miracle, in the same places it can be present at once circumscriptively by a miracle." I have stated the reason for the consequence from Scotus. Let the Adversary inspect Scotus in the 4th book of the Sentences, dist. 10, qu. 2, no. 9, and qu. 5, nos. 3 and 4, if he wishes. And if he confesses that I have constructed the arguments from there, let him cease to calumniate and at the same time to sell smoke to the ignorant.

Indeed, lest he think me deserted either by reason or authority, I will also give another no less evident and invincible reason for the consequence, in the words of Philip Faber of Faenza, in the 4th book of the Sentences, dist. 10, disput. 57, ch. 2, no. 13. It is thus: "Because the sacramental presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament is an equally real and true presence as the natural presence of the same Christ in heaven, and as was that by which he was visibly conversant in the world, therefore there is an equal ground of local proximity and distance, as of the natural presence. Whence Christ's body existing in this Sacrament is as distant from the place in which it is not sacramentally present, as a body existing in a place naturally is distant from the place in which it is not naturally present; if it is so defined or concluded in that place, just as a body which would be there naturally would be concluded in the same, if it were present there. Therefore, if to the multiplication of local natural presences there necessarily follows the division or numerical multiplication of the body, it follows also that in the multiplication of sacramental presences the same body is multiplied numerically."

"Moreover, the natural and sacramental presence differ only in this, that the natural has a quantitative mode, the sacramental by no means. But this difference makes nothing to the possibility of one being multiplied and not the other, because the reason of the repugnance that two natural presences cannot inhere in the same body is that those presences are distinct and discrete. Whence according to the Adversaries they cannot be multiplied unless the numerically same body is multiplied. And by these things the response of Capreolus is impugned, who says that there is not the same reason concerning sacramental and natural presence. For he says that it implies a contradiction for two or more natural presences to inhere at once in the same body, but not two sacramental ones. But it is evident that the same reason applies to each."

"Whence if two natural presences with respect to the same body were formally opposed, neither could a sacramental and a natural presence exist at once in the same body, because they agree in this, that the reason of the repugnance seems to be this: that each presence defines and circumscribes the body in one determinate place. For Christ's body in the Eucharist is so under those accidents that it is in no way found outside them. Therefore it has a determinate place there. Therefore the sacramental presence is as determinate and definite as the natural presence, though they differ in the quantitative and natural mode of being in place, because that is extended to the parts of place and is commensurable with place, this is not. This does not make this presence indefinite and unlimited, that not, because in the sacramental presence too Christ's body is situated in the place of the accidents, not elsewhere where the Sacrament is not."

"Will you also cry out, Reverend Parish Minister, that these words have been fabricated by me? Meanwhile in them you see both our syllogism's major premise solidly confirmed, and at the same time your own response refuted and thoroughly exploded - that according to St. Thomas it implies a contradiction for one body to be able to exist at once in two places circumscriptively, so that this could not happen even by a thousand miracles - though you have learnedly and truly discussed it."

"I certainly grant that it implies a contradiction for one body to exist circumscriptively in several places, nor would even those thousands of miracles suffice for this. But that one body should exist in several places, in one circumscriptively, in the other penetratively or, as they say, sacramentally - this no less, indeed more, and for two reasons, implies a contradiction, so that not even several thousands of miracles could suffice for it. For first, it implies a contradiction for the same body according to its whole self to be in two or more places. The reason of the repugnance is that the two presences are distinct and discrete, which multiply the body itself by removing its unity, and so make it numerically the same and not the same by reason of the discrete and distinct presence. This reason of repugnance is evident, whether the two presences are posited as circumscriptive, or one circumscriptive and the other penetrative."

"Secondly, it implies a contradiction for a true, natural body having flesh and bones to be in place penetratively and indivisibly. For such a body would be both a body and not a body, but a spirit, since it does not have flesh and bones with parts distinct by position. Therefore the major premise remains bound by more than an adamantine bond, which for the reasons adduced we make our own: 'In whatsoever places Christ's body can be at once bodily, substantially, or penetratively and indivisibly by a miracle, in those places it can be present at once circumscriptively by a miracle.' For in the latter there is a simple reason of repugnance, which in the former is twofold."

"He who does not see this will be blinder than a mole. Certainly that which a body cannot be in another place by its natural mode, namely circumscriptively, even by a miracle, much less can it be in another place at once by miracle in an unnatural mode, penetratively and indivisibly. The natural mode is even more easily preserved without a miracle than the mode contrary to nature, or at least supernatural, is induced even by a miracle."

LXXVI. Now therefore let us come to the minor premise, which is thus: "But Christ's body cannot by miracle exist at once in several places circumscriptively." But whatever may be made of the reasons for proving this minor premise adduced in that place (concerning which I will not contend, since it must be ingenuously confessed that they pertain elsewhere - for Durandus in the 4th book of the Sentences, dist. 10, qu. 1, adduces those arguments against the view of those who posit that Christ's body is in the Sacrament with its whole proper dimensive quantity, yet not according to the proper mode of quantity, not dimensively but indivisibly; but whence they have crept into this place, I do not even have to say), it is certainly so certain that this proposition rests not only on Thomas's authority but also on the most firm supports of reasons,

that the Adversary himself, having in other respects tragically overstepped all the bounds of modesty in caviling at the proofs, did not dare to deny it.

And indeed Thomas in Quodlibet 1, article 1, and Quodlibet 3, article 1, asserts the repugnance of the circumscriptive presence of one body in two commensurate places from this, that for a body to be locally in a place is nothing other than to be circumscribed and comprehended by the whole place according to the commensuration of its own dimensions. But that which is comprehended by some place is so in that place that nothing of it is outside that place. Whence to posit that it is locally in this place, and yet is in another place, is to posit contradictories.

The feeble little reasons and exceptions of the Scotists can be seen solidly discussed by John Forbes a Corse in his Historical-Theological Instruction, Book 11, Ch. 6, §§14-15, and in Augustine Reding's Scholastic Theology, Vol. 4, article 1, qu. 19, controversy 7. Since therefore the major premise rests on the fortification of most solid reasons which the Adversary can never overthrow, and is held as certain even by the Scotists themselves, and the minor premise shines with its own light and is admitted by the Thomist School also as most firm, and is not impugned by our Adversary subdued by the force of truth, the following conclusion therefore results immovably from it:

"Therefore Christ's body cannot by miracle exist at once in several places, in one circumscriptively, in the other bodily, penetratively and indivisibly." And so the syllogism constructed most evidently from the argumentative assertions of differing Scholastic Doctors persists firmly and steadfastly. May God grant his grace!

The End.

HISTORICAL DISPUTATIONS Concerning THE ORIGIN OF PAPAL ERRORS ABOUT HOLY SCRIPTURE

The First

Public Disputation

Presided over by

The Reverend, Most Distinguished and Learned Man

Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH HOTTINGER

Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oriental Languages, and Logic at the Zurich Lyceum, a most celebrated host and esteemed teacher.

Will be undertaken by

NATHANAEL) MITTELHOLZER) German
MELCHIOR) Brothers
CASPAR SCHLUMPF) From St. Gallen
JACOB MARTIUS)
LAURENCE REINSPERG)

On the 25th day of August

1654

At the usual place and time.

ZURICH

Printed by Johann Heinrich Hamberger

To the most magnificent, pious, virtuous, prudent, and most excellent men experienced in affairs:

Mr. SYLVESTER HILLER) Most esteemed Councilors of
Mr. DAVID CUNTSIUS) the Republic of St. Gallen,
Mr. CASPAR FREDERICK) greatest patrons of studies

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW SCHOBINGER, Most Excellent Doctor of Medicine, most Prudent Senator and Aedile

Mr. GEORGE ZWIKER, most worthy Senator and Quaestor

Mr. HECTOR ZOLLIKOFER, Most Experienced Doctor of Medicine, most deserving Head Clerk

As well as the Reverend, Most Distinguished and Learned Men:

Mr. JOHN JACOB HULDRIC, Antistes of the Church of Zurich

Mr. JOHN RUDOLPH STUCKIUS, Professor of Sacred Theology and for the time being Head of the School

Mr. JACOB HOFFMANN) Dean and

Mr. CHRISTOPHER MITTELHOLZER) Most Vigilant Ministers
Mr. HERMANN FINSTERLING) of the Father Church

Mr. LEONARD SCHOPFER
Mr. BARTHOLOMEW WEGELIN

Mr. SEBASTIAN HOGGER, Most Faithful Rector of the St. Gallen Gymnasium

To the ever-venerable Fathers of the Fatherland, Patrons and Benefactors,
The Respondents dedicate and inscribe these firstfruits of their studies as a token of due gratitude.

I.
To the vigorous young men, defenders of the theses, making their way to the temple of Praise and Renown, when others were preparing to depart for the universities, a wish granted from the storehouse of desires.

So you migrate to lands warmed by another sun? And do the swift Muses seek a pleasanter abode, the thresholds of a lovely haven? Truly, these mute benches mourn for you, Pallas mourns, she who reclines by the Thur River, that you are leaving this sweet bosom and embrace.

And although you flee these regions, swelling songs will forever sing your praises; lyres and lutes will resound your verses. Go, cull the flowers of learning, go, prepare the baskets of learning; a lasting renown awaits you, on wings that fear not failing.

Go, may the streams of favor from all-generating Phoebus and the shower of blessing rain upon you! May he guard these young hearts with the shield of his complete favor!

Thus Johann Heinrich Heidegger attests his friendship without evil intent, student of Sacred Theology at Zurich.

II.
The learned throng of Phoebus, young hearts of the Pegasides, seems to me a cause for rejoicing. The Sisyphian citadel of labors has almost been surmounted by you; your efforts proclaim it, all things joined bear witness. Thus proceed onward to honor the Muses and Phoebus, I pray that the Thunderer on high may be present three times over.

Thus Johann Caspar Fols, student of Philosophy at Zurich, applauds his most faithful roommates.

III.
Those whom this sacred war concerning the Fount of Error holds in its first battles of these Theses: I too adorn them, as best I can, with verses, which are the small offshoots of my talent.

Proceed diligently and proceed, beloved Brothers: thus praise, thus laurel, thus glory awaits You.

I congratulate you, O Youths, and serenely applaud you: May Jehovah grant that you proceed with the step you have begun!

Johannes Jacob Huldricus, student of Philology, has contributed this with friendship and ardent zeal.

I. As we are about to discuss the errors of the Roman Church in order, and exhibit their origins, we will accomplish four things: 1. We will set forth the error in the words of Councils, or Doctors, or both. 2. We will examine its beginning, progress, and circumstances. 3. We will lay bare the impelling cause of the error's defense or acceptance. 4. We will briefly demonstrate the enormity of the error from Scripture, the Fathers, and even the adversaries themselves.

The Apostle to the Gentiles aptly warns about the character of the profane corrupters of religion in 2 Timothy 2:17: "And their word will spread like gangrene." He compares, says Beza, the salted doctrines issuing forth from the crafty arguments of ambitious men to horses from the Trojan horse, depicting the Church, when victorious, as a body; if gangrene invades any of its parts, it is the duty of the pastor, like a skilled surgeon, to take precautions lest it degenerate into a hopeless and complete mortification (which, as the sons of physicians opine, is the supreme stage of this evil and utterly irreparable): so as to circumscribe the limits of the contagion, that it may not invade the sound members. The Syriac translator rendered the term gangrene as chaloditha. The Vulgate translates it as cancer (although those who are precise make a distinction between it and gangrene), as if to say katasledon or katesledon from chelad kathath, or bashenou. Truly a most fitting appellation. For we know that that dread evil does not linger on the surface or remain in the outer skin; but penetrates deeply, so to speak, driving tunnels further into the body, and consuming and corroding the very flesh and inmost parts.

Hence the Arabic simply renders it as akkal, that is brosis or a devouring, which is the very essence of gangraina choados, that is, the way of corrupting or devouring. This Syro-Arabic word occurs elsewhere in Matthew 6:19. I cannot say for certain whether the Syriac translator meant gangrene rather than mole by the word chaloditha, which is itself frequently rendered by chelad among the Arabs, since a mole, by burrowing under everything, gives a similar picture. In either case, the depraved character of the seducers is depicted for us. However, in keeping with the etymology and the example of most others, we will retain the designation of gangrene; so that the contrary idea may be made clearer and more suited to our purpose. For just as the physician's care is never more successful than when the cause and origin of the disease are evident, so too the theological ailments are more certainly corrected when traced back to their sources and origins. And the greater the perseverance of the evil, having grown more serious over a long period of time, the greater the effort required. Whether the method we have decided to follow will be suitable, this present example of ours will make clear.

II. The first error is: The authority of Scripture, as it pertains to us, depends on the testimony of the Church.

A. This is an enormous error which, although it shakes the very foundations of true Christianity, is nevertheless loudly and blasphemously proclaimed everywhere by Pontifical Doctors. Well-known is the statement of a certain Wolfgang Hermann: "The Holy Scripture, deprived of the Church's authority, is no more valuable than the fables of Aesop." Hosius, in his work On the Authority of Scripture p. 271, asserts that this can be said in some manner and pious sense, because unless the Church taught us that Holy Scripture is Canonical, it would carry little weight with us. Bellarmine the Jesuit, in his Summary of Controversies Tract 1, question 11, asks: "To whom does it belong to make determinations concerning the Canonical books?" He responds: "To the Church, without whose authority I would lend no more credence to Matthew than to Livy." Carranza, Controversies 2, Prolegomena to the Summary of Councils: "We believe the Scriptures only because of the testifying Church." Petesius, Hierarchy 1.1 c.2: "It is only because of the Church that we now believe in the entire authority of the Scriptures." And later: "All the authority that the Scriptures now have among us depends necessarily on the authority of the Church; for we could not believe them otherwise, except that we believe the testimony that the Church bears to them." Matthias of Aquino, in his Assertion of Catholic Doctrine book 1: "That any Scripture ought to be believed to be the word of God, or Canonical, depends on the common custom of the Church and the consensus of Orthodox Fathers throughout the world, or on the opinion or definition of some plenary Councils." Cusanus, Epistle 2 to Bohemia: "It is not possible for any Scripture, whether containing a precept or counsel, to have more authority to bind or loose the faithful who exist in the Church than the Church itself has willed, or expressed by word or deed." This judgment is commended by some of the Fathers of the Council of Trent. For when the question arose as to what should be thought concerning the exposition of Scripture, and some judged one way and others another, not a few approved this paradox of a Cardinal, as wittily said (these are the words of the History of the Council of Trent, book 1, p. 174): "A saying of the Cardinal of Cusa, a man of outstanding learning and probity, that the understanding of the Scriptures must be adapted to the times and expounded according to accepted practice." What was deliberated in the very Council of Trent itself for the increase of this error, the History of Paul the Venetian does not allow us to be ignorant. It is agreed among all that the Christian faith is contained partly in Sacred Scripture, partly in Tradition; but for some time it was doubted how this material should be treated. Vincentius Lunellus of the Franciscan Order, since the foundations of faith are laid in Sacred Scripture and Traditions, maintained that one should first treat of the Church as the nobler foundation, because the authority of Scripture depends on it, according to that celebrated saying of Augustine: "I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Church moved me," etc. Once this foundation is laid down, that all Christians are bound to believe the Church, one can build on it without danger. Moreover, in this conflict one should especially follow the camp of those who have made the most vigorous assault on the enemy lines, such as Sylvester Prierias and Eckius, whose most keen weapon is the authority of the Church, without which there is nothing sufficiently deadly for vanquishing the Lutherans. It is a matter completely foreign to the design that in laying the foundations of Christian doctrine, that should be omitted which is the principal or almost the sole thing of this kind, without which the rest do not subsist (Hist. Conc., book 2, p. 164). Although Lunellus'

Method did not have supporters, yet we shall make plain with very clear words from Ferdinand de Escalante that his doctrine concerning the authority of the Church over Scripture was stubbornly defended by some. And in my judgment, he proposes this controversy candidly, so that our adversaries will have no cause to reproach us with an itch for calumniating. Thus, then, speaks that Spaniard in his Shield of Councils, book 4, chapter 8: "Since it must be believed with certain and undoubted faith among all the faithful that the Church of Christ cannot depart from the standard of truth in its definitions, some Doctors are accustomed to call into doubt which has the greater impossibility of erring, the Holy Christian Church or Sacred Scripture. And although from what we have said in book 1, chapters 6 and 8, one could easily settle this controversy, nevertheless on account of the diverse opinions of the Doctors we have thought it proper to discuss it here." The Doctors are accustomed to treat this difficulty in other terms, when they inquire which is the greater authority, Sacred Scripture or the Church. We shall set out in this disputation with the aforesaid terms. Abulensis, in his Prologue on Matthew, affirms that the Church is of greater authority than Sacred Scripture, which he persuades himself from the words of St. Augustine against the letter of Manichaeus' Foundation, tome 6: "I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Church moved me." But if that axiom of Aristotle in the Posterior Analytics chapter 2 is true - "That by reason of which any such thing is, that thing is more so," by which words the Philosopher proves that we ought to place more belief in principles than in a conclusion, since we lend credence to the latter on account of the principles or premises - it seems to follow that the Church is of greater authority than the Gospel, since we believe the latter on account of the Church bearing testimony to the truth and certainty of the Gospel and Sacred Scripture. This opinion is followed by Albertus Pighius in his Hierarchy, as well as Eckius in his Refutation of the Response of the Lutherans.

Cajetan, however, in his work On the Authority of the Pope and Councils, chapter 4, and in part 2 of his Apology, chapter 13, as well as Michael de Medina in book 7 of The True Faith in God, chapter 18, think that simply and absolutely Sacred Scripture is of greater authority than the Church. This opinion can be proved by a triple argument:

The first is that in defining matters of faith, the judgment of both the Supreme Pontiff and a General Council representing the entire universal Church is subordinated to Sacred Scripture; whence both the Pope and the Council, before determining a matter of faith, consult Sacred Scripture, in order to define in accordance with what they find therein, "not declining to the right hand or the left." Sacred Scripture, therefore, is of greater authority than the Church.

The second argument: In any field of knowledge, the teacher or master is of greater authority than the disciple or hearer (and indeed Christ the Lord taught that "the disciple is not above his master," Matthew 20). But the Church of Christ is, as it were, a disciple taught by Sacred Scripture, while Sacred Scripture is, as it were, the teacher of the truth. Therefore Sacred Scripture is of greater authority than the Church.

The third argument: Because a king is of greater authority than his messenger; but Sacred Scripture is to the Church as a king to his messenger. Therefore Sacred Scripture is of greater authority than the Church.

The third opinion is that of Driedo, book 2 of Ecclesiastical Dogmas, chapter 3, asserting that Sacred Scripture and the Church containing the sacred writers, the Apostles, are of the same authority. If, however, Sacred Scripture is compared to our Church, it is of greater authority than the Church.

The fourth opinion is that of some moderns, who assert that the authority of the Church and of Sacred Scripture can be considered in two ways, either absolutely in itself, or in relation to us. If considered in the first way, they say that Sacred Scripture is of greater authority than the Church; but if in the second way, on the contrary, they affirm that the Church is to be said of greater authority than Sacred Scripture.

B. This impious and blasphemous dogma crept into the Church little by little, but struck deeper roots as the tyranny of the Pope increased in strength. Pope Nicholas I, around the year 865 A.D., seems to exhibit the first seeds of it, in a letter to Exuperius quoted by Innocent I, Epistle 4, last chapter, where by his authority it is taught that we must receive both Testaments, although neither of them is wholly inserted in the Paternal Canons, as is the canon "Si Romanorum," distinction 19. Hence Nicholas drew two things for the authority of the Roman Pontiff and Decretal Epistles: 1. That the Old and New Testaments are to be received, not because they are wholly annexed to the Code of Canons, but because the opinion of the Holy Pope Innocent appears to have been expressed that they should be received. 2. That the Decretal Epistles of the Roman Pontiffs are to be admitted, even if they are not bound together in the Code of Canons. Observe the craftiness of the Pope: In order that the authority of his Decrees may obtain and be thrust upon us, he pits Innocent against Innocent, and, although it has perhaps not occurred to any of his opponents that both Testaments should be reverently accepted for this reason, because Innocent so decreed, he himself gratuitously fabricates this response, both to intimate tacitly what he wished believed concerning himself, and also to defend the Decretal Epistles with the same authority of Innocent (by whose command all decretal constitutions approved by the Apostolic See are ordered to be kept, so that whoever commits an offense against them knows that pardon will be denied him). By these arts the Pope paved the way for his successors to act more audaciously. Hence, among the sentences of Gregory VII, which they call the Dictates, number 17 is: "That no chapter or canonical book is considered such without his authority" (Baron., year 1076, no. 22). This arrogance lasted until that time when it began to be asked whether the authority of the Pope or of the Church is greater, a controversy which was especially agitated in the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel. Those who fought for the Church mustered their arms from every side. Cardinal Julian, in order to precipitate the Pope from his throne by asserting the authority of the Church above him, lapsed into such impudence that he publicly stated: "The Gospels and all Sacred Scripture receive their authority to be believed from the Church; nothing can be called Catholic which has not been approved by it" (Flav. Blondus, year 1432, no. 7 conc.). And thus from that time the name of the Church was more frequently on the tongues of theologians than that of the Pope, until the Jesuits, about to exhibit a specimen of great temerity and insolence, resolved the Church into either the Pope alone or the Pope and the College of Cardinals, whom they understand by the name of the judging Church. But what changes this very question has

undergone, we have heard at rather greater length from Ferdinand de Escalante. His authority certainly aids our cause in more than one respect, especially against those who have long since complained that an injury is done them on this point. Well-known is the disputation of our Bullinger with Cochlaeus, in which Cochlaeus termed Bullinger's treatise on the authority of the Word of God a curious rather than necessary one, and appearing to proceed from inconsiderate zeal, since neither the Pope nor any Catholic detracts anything from the Word of God or desires its authority to be undermined (Cochlaeus against Bullinger, chapter 2). "We do not say," he declares, "that the authority of the Church is greater and higher than that of the Gospel or Canonical Scripture, but we unanimously believe with you that all Holy Scripture derives its authority, certainty, and infallible truth from Heaven and the Holy Spirit (who is certainly superior and greater than the Church), and we pronounce anathema on all who think otherwise" (Bullinger's Response to Cochlaeus, chapter 1, p. 3). But that the matter is otherwise, Bullinger proved from the words of Eckius, and we too from a dense cloud of witnesses. Nor indeed, while offering no refutation or believing the Pontifical Doctors for the most part to write and think better concerning the divine origin and authority of Scripture, do they disclose impious and wholly un-Christian questions, with which they are most wretchedly consulting their own interests. I shall not repeat what we have brought to light on this point in Part 1, Analysis, p. 27 ff. I shall add a supplement from a letter written in 1642 A.D. by an Italian Capuchin to a reformed proselyte, a pious man. It reads as follows:

"You wish me to argue with you from Scripture alone, for you assume that nothing is to be believed unless it is written. You therefore prescribe limits for me within which you yourself have by no means confined yourself in your writing, nor will you hereafter. Do you not immediately state at the outset that I must always keep before my eyes that every man is a liar, and that God alone is truthful? If this is so, whence do you know that every man is a liar? You will say, from Scripture. But whence do you know that this Scripture is infallibly true and not false? You will say, it is the Word of God. But by what certain argument do you prove that it is the Word of God? For since all Scripture, whether of the Old or New Testament, is written by men, and according to your judgment every man is a liar, who will make you undoubtedly certain that this Scripture or that is not false? Moses was a man, Joshua was a man, David was a man with the rest of the Prophets. Matthew was a man, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, etc. were men. What if they erred? If they wrote falsely? If you say that they were illuminated by the Holy Spirit and guided by the hand, as it were, in their writing, can I not say the same of the Church, that it is directed by the Holy Spirit and Christ in speaking, to which that infallible promise was made: 'I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world' (Matthew 18, last verse)?

"Here is the difficulty, here the problem. Therefore, before all else, you must respond how the credibility of Holy Scripture can be safely maintained, and one rely with infallible certainty on the authority of those who could err or lie, because they were men. Or, if they could not err, it is false what you say, that every man is a liar. Whatever you respond, you will respond against yourself. For you will not be able to prove this from Scripture itself, since the same question will recur infinitely concerning that very Scripture from which you will draw your proof - whence, surely, do you know that that Scripture is the Word of God, from which you prove another, when both are written by a man? Or you will be compelled to admit the same response concerning the

Church, to which Scripture itself ascribes infallibility, since it expressly commands us to believe the Church, and declares that he who does not believe the Church is to be regarded as a heathen and a publican (Matthew 18:17). Therefore, if the Church tells us anything in a matter of faith, it is infallible, and indeed no less so than what Scripture tells us. For God speaks both through Scripture and through the Church. But in whatever way God speaks, He must be believed, because He can in no way lie; and He is as truthful in speaking through the Church as in speaking through Scripture, just as He was truthful when He spoke through the Prophets and Apostles. Especially since the Church does not exist for the sake of Scripture, but Scripture for the sake of the Church; Christ died for the Church, not for Scripture, and He will give the heavenly reward to the Church, not to Scripture. There is therefore no reason why you should lure and restrict me to Scripture alone, as if to a rock, and exclude me from adducing the tradition of the Church in our dispute, especially since you yourself do not observe this rule."

Thus the petty gods of the Capuchins, following the example of the mitred and purple-robed ones. Peter of Ypres, not long ago Bishop of Ypres, in his book On the Truth, chapter 40, says: "The authority of Holy Scripture depends so much on the Church, and these copies of Scripture which we have have no more faith or usefulness in themselves than any apocryphal writings. It is only because of the Church and its authority that we now believe the entire Scripture. All the authority that Scripture has among us depends on and is derived from the authority of the Church, for we could not believe it otherwise except that we believe the testimony borne to it by the Church." Certainly, what Tertullian once objected to the Gentiles in his Apology, chapter 5, pertains to our cause as well: "This too contributes to our case, that among you the divine nature is weighed by human judgment. Unless God has pleased man, He will not be God: man must now propitiate God for himself" - this very thing has a place in this cause. Unless Rome decrees it, the Word of God will be the Koran, it will be Aesop, it will be Livy.

Oh, despisers of the truth!

C. But why does this error so delight the Pontifical party? The reasons are not obscure: Namely, the Roman Church claims dominion over Scripture itself, with the freedom to explain, twist, pervert it, and insult it at will. It is no calumny, but the very reality, attempted in clear words and deeds by our adversaries. Nor are those Pontifical theologians whom we have already quoted, Cusanus and Ferdinand de Escalante, speaking ambiguously here; the former with an example all too manifest proves that the meaning of Scripture, whether of truth or falsehood, depends on the whim of the Church, notwithstanding the perspicuity and clarity of the words and the connection of the passages. The latter, while urging the equivalence of these two statements: "Whether there resides in Sacred Scriptures a greater impossibility of erring than in the Church of Christ," and "Which is the greater authority, Sacred Scripture or the Church?" removes all doubt as to what the assembly of Purple-robed ones intends or strives for. But Stapleton too is quite audacious on this point, according to whom the Church can be preferred to those Scriptures which it preaches, "because this written Word of God is not only preached by the Church but is also written, approved and sealed as the written Word of God by the Church itself" (Ecclesiastical Princ. contro. 4, quaest. 5). And shortly after he denies that the Church, insofar as it signifies Heads and Teachers, is built upon the Apostles and Prophets, that is, upon their

doctrine and preaching (Contro. 5, quaest. 2, art. 1). Is this not indeed to subject God speaking through Scripture to the corrupt judgment of men? It is certainly an error to which the following are opposed:

D. 1. Sacred Scripture itself, which again and again reiterates: "The word of the Lord," "Thus says the Lord," "Jesus said"; to which the Apostle Paul himself applies the epithet that, according to Peter (2 Peter 1), its writers were "borne along by the Holy Spirit."

2. The practice of the Apostolic Church, which treated the Apostolic writings as "the word of the Lord" (as was received by them), "the truth which has been confirmed among you" (1 Thess. 2:13).

3. The verdict of the Fathers, who especially in ardent disputations with philosophers and poets took great pains to demonstrate the dignity, majesty, power and divine efficacy of Scripture, compared to which the writings of the Gentiles are as nothing. You have the testimony of Justin Martyr, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius in Part 1, Analysis, p. 20-21. An excellent passage occurs in Gregory of Nyssa, On the Soul, tome 2: "Be persuaded that whatever the divine oracles have delivered is infallibly true, being pronounced not by private judgment but by the Holy Spirit." Clement of Alexandria, Stromata book 4: "We who have had faith committed to us by the blessed instruction derived from the holy Scriptures, show that they are truly divine." Athanasius, Dialogue 3 on the Holy Trinity, tome 2: "The prophets and writers did not speak of their own accord, but it was the Spirit of the Father speaking in them." Salvian of Marseilles, On Government, book 3: "While all human sayings need arguments and witnesses, the word of God is itself its own witness, because necessarily whatever the incorrupt truth speaks is the incorrupt testimony of truth."

4. The testimony even of our adversaries themselves. We have here the witness: a. Of Cochlaeus, as we have just heard. b. Of Gregory de Valentia, Analysis of Faith 1.1 c.25: "Although there are many things in Christian doctrine which can procure faith and authority for themselves, yet that seems to me the greatest (as was observed by Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, and others) that with a certain admirable power it affects the minds of men in a truly divine manner and impels virtue. It is written in simple words and is almost devoid of rhetorical art and ornaments. Nevertheless, it moves the mind of the reader so vehemently, more than any other doctrine, which is an argument that its authority is entirely divine, not human; for this power of affecting the impulses of minds without artful language and rhetorical embellishments belongs not to human ability." Even Bellarmine, otherwise quite unfair to Scripture, when comparing the characteristics of the divine nature of Sacred Scripture with the Koran (book 4, On the Word of God, ch.4), nevertheless elsewhere (book 1, ch. 11), about to act against the enthusiasms of Schwenckfeld, writes among other things: "Next to the Sacred Scriptures, which are contained in the Prophetic and Apostolic books, THERE IS NOTHING SURER, NOTHING MORE CERTAIN, so that he must be utterly stupid who denies that they are to be given credence."

III. The second error is: That Sacred Scripture was recorded not by any command of God, but only by chance occasions.

This error issued from the school of the Jesuits. For I do not think that anyone among the Ancients was so brazen as to undermine the authority of Sacred Scriptures by these underground tunnels. Bellarmine broke the ice first, in book 4, On the Word of God, chapter 4, whom others then followed. Bauny the Jesuit, in his Summary of Controversies, Tract 1, question 1, asks: "Do we find that Christ commanded His Apostles and Evangelists to write?" He responds: "We see no express and special command for them to do so, but only that they should preach. It is clear that the Savior did not leave behind a single chapter written by His own hand." Are you surprised what drove the Jesuits into this insanity, that they would call into doubt even the command to write? Bellarmine himself reveals their mask, at the beginning of chapter 4, when he says that he will endeavor to demonstrate three things. The first is that "the Scriptures were neither simply necessary nor sufficient without Traditions." You see the Helen for whose sake these Atlases fight so mightily? Traditions must be vindicated, not without dishonor to Sacred Scripture, as far as lies in them! Namely, because the Apostles thought primarily not of describing but of preaching the Gospel, they wanted provision made more by unwritten traditions than by the written word. Scripture thinks otherwise:

1. For a command to write is found repeatedly in both the Old and New Testaments. In the Old we have Exodus 17:14, 34:27, Deuteronomy 31:19, 2 Chronicles 30:8, Jeremiah 30:2, Habakkuk 2:2. In the New Testament, the command to write is found twelve times in the Apocalypse alone. What? The rabbis even urge that the command to copy was enjoined on each individual Jew, as we have mentioned in the Thesaurus Philologicus, p. 340.

2. Antiquity testifies. For a. The very occasions of the written New Testament which our adversaries adduce not only commend the usefulness but even the necessity of writing, as Rivetus amply demonstrates in his Sacred Scripture, chapter 24, p. 400. b. The Apostles were the HANDS of Christ, to whom He commanded to perform this duty. Hence Augustine, in his Work on the Harmony of the Evangelists, book 1, chapter 7, in response to the objection of the Pagans asking why the Lord Himself wrote nothing, so that we are compelled to believe those writing about Him, says: "Since they wrote what He manifested and said, it should by no means be said that He did not write, seeing that His members did this, which they grasped from their Head." And in his Treatise to Liberius he says that "Christ composed the Old and New Testaments."

3. Not even our adversaries themselves, when not engaged in controversy, deny us their assent. Ferdinand de Escalante, in his entire book 4 of the Shield of Councils, On the Causes of Scripture, deals with this in such a way that no one can be obscure as to his view on this point. He proves in chapter 21 that God is the principal cause of the Old Testament against the Manichees, and in chapter 38 he asserts that the New Testament is from God, which is most clearly asserted by the words of Augustine against the Adamantine heresy... After this, in Selected Readings book 2, chapter 21: "Supernatural things were proposed through the divine Scriptures." Lorinus on Acts 22:23: "The very Law itself is called the Scripture of God. And every

sacred writer is as it were the pen of God Himself, writing swiftly." Gregory de Valentia, Analysis of Faith book 8, chapter 5: "For we say that the Canonical authors wrote while being dictated to by the Holy Spirit, for this very reason, that in committing doctrine to writing the Holy Spirit made such use of their service in that work that they did not so much act as be acted upon by the Holy Spirit, being used simply as the pen is used by the writer. And the tongue of David refers to this when he says, 'My tongue is the pen of a swift writer.' For in this place he signifies no other Writer than God Himself. Furthermore, we assert that the sacred writer was acted upon by the Holy Spirit for this cause also, that although he uttered the words, yet he wrote altogether by necessity, so that (the Holy Spirit thus efficaciously willing it) it was by no means within his power to refuse to write, or to write in another way, at another time, or other words. And this is properly what it means for an author to be sacred, namely, to be the pen of the Holy Spirit, plainly in whose power it does not lie that the writer should use it or use it in another way."

IV. The third error is: That the books of Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus and the two books of Maccabees, the book of Baruch, the Prayer of Manasseh, and the Epistle of Jeremiah, along with the additions to Daniel and Esther, are Canonical. If anyone does not accept these books in their entirety with all their parts, let him be anathema.

A. That we should be concerned to prove this error from the writings of the Pontificals is not necessary. The Council of Trent itself has so decreed, after which, as Becanus says, it is by no means permissible to think otherwise. We shall therefore inquire instead into the origin of this error, and say:

1. That the books in question were never included in the Canon of the Jews, concerning which we have treated at length in book 1, Analysis, p. 310 ff.

2. Yet that these same books were highly esteemed by the Hellenistic Jews, both for their admonitions and examples of piety and constancy, and also for the historical sequence which connects the New Testament with the Old, and were gradually annexed to the Canonical books.

Hence Andrew Rivetus, in his Introduction to Sacred Scripture, chapter 7, p. 76, says: "But it is well known to all sensible persons that all those books about which there is controversy crept in gradually among the Hellenists and were joined with the versions of the Scriptures which prevailed among them at various times. This annexation therefore occurred not in the Hebrew Church but among the Jews of the Dispersion, through the efforts of men attaching this or that under the guise of religion and forging a divine name for their own dreams, or at least in some measure equating human things with divine. But these books did not have currency in the Hebrew Church. The fact that their reputation nonetheless spread even to the Rabbinical Jews can easily be gathered from what we have extracted from Jewish records concerning the Apocryphal books" (Thesaurus Philologicus 1.8).

3. That Christ the Savior, and the contemporaneous Church, simply acquiesced in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Luke 24:44), that is, the Hagiographa (Thesaurus Philologicus 3.10).

4. That the Primitive Church of the New Testament, and its Latin and Greek Teachers, adorned the Old Testament Apocryphal books with praises and encomiums clear enough. Pope Calixtus calls the book of Tobit "Sacred Scripture" in his 2nd Epistle. Ambrose, in his book on Tobit, chapter 9, terms it a "Prophecy." The book of Baruch is called "Scripture" by Clement of Alexandria in book 2 of the Pedagogue, chapter 3, and by Theodoret in his exposition of it. Cyprian, in his Sermon on the Lapsed, indicates that the History of Susanna is "Divine Scripture." Ambrose, in his work On the Holy Spirit, book 7, chapter 7, does the same. Cyprian, in his work On the Dress of Virgins, and Cyril in book 3 against Julian, call the book of Wisdom an "Ecclesiastical Scripture." Thus the Fathers regard those appendices annexed to the Canon and Scripture, not expressly undertaking to compile a catalog of truly Canonical books. For what reason would the Ancients have too liberally bestowed such epithets even on other writings, manifestly spurious, which not even the Roman Church itself receives? Hence even Origen, in book 10 on Romans, pronounces the book of Hermes to be "divinely inspired," and Ambrose calls the 4th book of Ezra, everywhere teeming with Talmudic fables, "Scripture" (in his work On Good Conduct and in book 2 on Luke). We mention this so that novices may learn that this lax and broad nomenclature of the Fathers does not assert or establish Canonical authority for the cited books - matters which we saw in Part 1 of the Analysis, p. 370.

5. When the discussion was about the Canon itself, we do not deny:

I. That indeed there were various judgments and decrees of both the Fathers and Councils. For first, let us grant (which some Pontificals nevertheless admit with difficulty, Rivetus Introduction p. 86) that the Third Council of Carthage (for they are suspicious of a Canon of Divine Scriptures having been issued by the Council of Nicaea that rejected the little book of Judith, according to Baron's testimony in the year 325, no. 157; see Rivetus' Introduction, chapter 7, p. 79) and Augustine himself, who was present at the Council, included Tobit among the Canonical Scriptures, as well as Judith, the Maccabees, etc. - a practice unheard of in the four preceding centuries. This nevertheless does not give more support to the Catalogue of the Tridentines than to ours. For the Pontificals do not dare to adjudge to the 3rd book of Ezra that which Augustine did and the Council of Carthage.

Let us also grant that, II. By some of the Fathers and Councils most of the books we call Apocryphal were received into the Canon, yet the anathematizing curse of the Council on those who depart a nail's breadth from its decree is rash and novel. Each person enjoyed their own judgment and discretion, without dominion over the consciences of others.

III. It is certain, meanwhile, that the best and most learned, both Greeks and Latins, acknowledged the same Canon as we do. Hence Rivetus, Introduction 2.7: "It therefore remains most certain that neither the Hebrews who lived before Christ or during His time on earth and presided over the Synagogue, nor the early Christian Church, acknowledged the disputed books as Canonical." And 8.2.8: "The matter is certain that there is no ancient author up to Augustine, no Council, not even a provincial one, that has woven a Catalogue of Canonical books such as is now approved by the Roman Church."

IV. As purer doctrine gradually flourished through the disputatious theology of the Scholastics, although the oft-established authority of the Canon was frequently called into doubt and increased by fringes (for the Fathers of Florence too, and the public Doctors of the Universities, venerating the footsteps of the Council of Carthage, changed the limits of the Ancients), yet Truth still had her outspoken champions even in the Papacy itself, as we shall hear. And lest they give offense to the Ancients, convenient distinctions were employed, such as that of Cajetan at the end of his Commentary on the Historical Books of the Old and New Testaments: "Nor be disturbed, novice reader, if you find these books enumerated among the Canonical books anywhere in the Councils or Doctors of the Church. For the words of both Councils and Doctors must be reduced to the standard of Jerome. And according to his opinion in the Epistle to Chromatius and Heliodorus the Bishops, these books, and any others that may be outside the Canon of the Bible, are not Canonical, that is, not normative for confirming matters of faith. They can, however, be called Canonical, that is, normative for the edification of the faithful, having been received into the Canon of the Bible for this purpose and accredited." The same ambiguity occurs among the Hebrews in the word Ketuvim, which the Greeks render by Hagiographa; in which sense some Jews are considered to have called Ecclesiasticus, as we mentioned in the Thesaurus Philologicus 3.17. Lest this appear to be our fiction, here is the support of a celebrated Doctor among the Pontificals, Driedo, in book 1 of his Catalogue of Sacred Scripture, chapter 4, p. 21: "We shall say that there are two kinds of Hagiographa among the Hebrews, just as in the preceding we have said that there are two kinds of Apocrypha. Some Hagiographa, that is, writings of the Saints, have sufficient authority to corroborate matters of faith. Hagiographa of this kind are those in the Canon of the Bible. But there are other Hagiographa, that is, holy writings of Saints, whose authority is not sufficient to corroborate assertions of faith, although they are considered true and holy."

V. What was done in the very Council of Trent itself, and with what diverse conflicts of opinion there was contention, the History of the matter makes abundantly clear in book 2, p. 167: "Concerning the method of compiling a Catalogue of Canonical books, there were four opinions. Some wanted two lists to be made: one containing only those always held without controversy to be Canonical, the other those which had at some time been rejected or about which there had been doubt. And these said that, even if this had not been done by any higher Council or Pope, yet this had been the intent of all. For Augustine uses this very distinction, whose authority is confirmed in the Canon 'In Canonicis' (Of Canonical Writings), where it treats of Pope Gelasius. And St. Gregory, who came after Gelasius, says on Job that the books of the Maccabees were written for edification, though they are not Canonical." Aloisi Cataneus, a Dominican friar, affirmed that this distinction was made by St. Jerome, accepted as the norm and rule of the Church for establishing the Canon of Scripture, citing to this end Cardinal Cajetan, who himself had distinguished the books in that manner, following St. Jerome as the surest norm left to us by the Church; and even when he wrote to Pope Clement VII, he sent him this exposition of his on the Historical Books of the Old Testament.

"Others were constituting a threefold list of books: the first of those always considered divine; the second of those formerly controversial but which had obtained Canonical authority by the usage of the Church, in which number were the six books of the New Testament, the Epistles

and the Apocalypse, and certain portions of the Evangelists; the third of those about which nothing certain had been defined, namely the seven books of the Old Testament and certain chapters of Daniel and Esther.

"Others thought it far better to make no distinction at all, but following the example of the Council of Carthage and others, to set forth a catalogue of books without adding anything further.

"Another opinion was that all the books, with all their parts, just as they are found in the Latin Bibles, should be demonstrated to be of equal and divine authority.

"The book of Baruch, however, was more troubling, since it is not listed among the books of either the Councils of Laodicea or Carthage, or in the Catalogues of the Roman Pontiffs; and for this reason, as well as because its beginning is not found, it seemed it ought to be eliminated, had it not been opposed by the fact that in the Church a reading is occasionally taken from it, which reason was sufficient to sway the congregation in its favor, with many affirming from ancient times that it was a part of Jeremiah and should be appended to him. And thus this new series of the Canon, composed and approved at Trent, thereafter found defenders among all who received those Tridentine oracles."

D. But that this last opinion of the disputants prevailed, I think was done for more than one cause:

1. Among the articles of Luther concerning Scripture was this: That among the books of the Old Testament, none should be enumerated except those in the Canon of the Jews. This had to be condemned and marked with the black theta, lest we seem to have learned anything from Luther.

2. The Roman Church wished to take this occasion to exhibit its power over Scripture itself, as if it lay in its authority to constitute, increase, diminish the Canon, to mint Canonical books from non-Canonical ones, etc.

3. The Jesuit Bauny not obscurely reveals the hidden reason for the decree. "Why," asks the Jesuit Doctor in his Summary of Controversies, Tract 1, question 13, "are certain books rejected by our opponents?" He responds: "All those which contradict their doctrine. Among others, Baruch, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and above all the two books of Maccabees, their capital enemies. Good men therefore seek support in these books, and adorn them with Canonical authority, and imprudently betray their cause. For if we reject only those books which are not favorable to us, the rest must certainly side with us - those we admit and venerate." Are they ignorant that this is a petitio principii to which Scripture itself objects?

1. Which assigns to the Jews the logion, that is, the "oracles of God" (Romans 3:2), as opposed to the mythos or "profane and old wives' fables" (1 Timothy 4:7).

2. Which in Matthew 23:37, Luke 16:16, comprises the entire Old Testament in the familiar distinction known in the Jewish schools of "Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms" (i.e. the Hagiographa, Thesaurus Philologicus 3.10).

If those whom ignorance of the Holy Language compelled to acquiesce in the Greek or Latin versions, in which by long custom the Canonical writings were already associated with the Apocrypha, had considered this argument more carefully, they would never have given us so varied a Canon. For whence, I ask, has it happened that there appears everywhere such discrepancy in designating the Canon? Why do some of the Ancients come closer, others more remotely, to both our position and the Tridentine decree? Clearly, it was not observed with sufficient diligence by all alike what those "oracles" were which were consigned to the Jewish Synagogue alone in the prophetic style. And that for this reason the Old Testament Canon of Christians could not be different from that of the Jews. I do not know what could be said in opposition to this by a sober intellect not laboring under an itch for contradicting. For why should that which was rejected from the Old Testament as human and filled with fables, and excluded from the Canon, now in the New obtain the axiom of Canonicity, with no other acceding characteristics of an Ecclesiastical Canon? But more on this elsewhere.:

II. Councils. The Council of Laodicea, held towards the end of the papacy of Liberius, was indeed a provincial council, but was confirmed in the Sixth General Council, called the Council in Trullo, held in the presence of Constantine, as Carranza attests in his Summary of Councils, chapter 59. Its canon states: "That it is not permissible that psalms composed by private individuals and non-canonical books be read in churches, but only the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments." And then it specifies: "What books are to be read and received as authoritative are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 4 books of Kingdoms, 2 of Chronicles, 2 of Ezra, the book of 150 Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, Esther, 12 books of the Prophets: Hosea, Amos, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel." Then it lists the books of the New Testament. What could be clearer than this public decree? What more solid testimony from antiquity in defense of the truth?

III. Fathers.
A. Greek Fathers. Melito, Bishop of Sardis, a contemporary of Polycarp around the year 170 A.D., undertook a journey to the East in order to be more certain about the number of the canonical books of the Old Testament. Yet he found that the Eastern churches acknowledged no other than what we defend today. We have mentioned in Part 1, Analysis p. 43, why he did not expressly name the book of Esther. Origen exhibits for us the Canon of the Alexandrian Church in his Ecclesiastical History, book 6, chapter 25. Nor do Cyril in his 4th Catechesis, Gregory Nazianzen in his metrical work on the genuine books and portions, Epiphanius in his work On Measures and Weights, Amphilochius of Iconium in his metrical address to Seleucus on the sacred books, Basil in book 4 of his metrical work against Marcion chapter 7, Jerome in his Preface to the Psalms, Ruffinus in his Exposition of the Creed, and, the equivalent of them all, Jerome (to whose standard, as Cajetan says, the words of both Councils and Doctors must be reduced) think otherwise - no one having examined the original text, and hence the Old

Testament Canon, more diligently than he. And lest what the great Father has in his Prologue to the Books of Samuel concerning the number of canonical books seem to pertain only to the Jews, hear what he discloses in his Preface to the books of Solomon: "As then the Church reads Judith, Tobit, and the books of Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, so too it reads these two volumes (Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus son of Sirach) for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas." The same judgment on the books of Maccabees is passed by Gregory in book 19, Moralia, chapter 17.

IV. Canonists and Scholastics. From the author of the Ordinary Gloss in the Preface to the Bible, as well as from the Glossator on Canon Law, distinction 15, chapter "Canones," it is evident that the opinion of Jerome was almost everywhere received. That it also prevailed in the English Church is attested by John of Salisbury around the year 1177, Epistle 172 to Count Henry: "When I read the various and manifold opinions of the Fathers concerning the number of the books, following the Catholic Church and its teacher Jerome, the most reliable authority in establishing this foundation, I undoubtedly believe, just as there are 22 letters of the Hebrews, so there are 22 books of the Old Testament in three distinct orders. But the book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, and the Shepherd, as the same writer asserts, are not reckoned in the Canon. Nor is the book of Maccabees, which is divided into two volumes, the first of which breathes Hebrew eloquence, the second Greek, as the style itself shows. The book of Wisdom was written by Philo, and is called Pseudepigraphic, not because he wrote badly, but because he ascribed it wrongly." To Jerome's Canon others also add their voices, such as Hugh the Cardinal and Hugh of St. Cher in the year 1244 in his Prologue to Joshua; Hugh and Richard of St. Victor around 1130, the former indeed in Part 1 of his work The Elucidate Way concerning the Sacred Books, the latter in his Exceptional Cases book 1, chapter 9; Radulphus of Flaviacum, Preface to book 14 of his Commentary on Leviticus, around 1150; Peter of Cluny around 1150 in his work Against Petrobrusians; Nicholas of Lyra, his contemporary, in the Preface to the book of Tobit; William of Ockham, Dialogue 1, tract 1, chapter 9, question 16; John Jannesius the Dominican around 1380 in his work Catholic under the word "Apocrypha."

The End.

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION, ON CHAPTER X OF THE HELVETIC CONFESSION, LATTER PART, CONCERNING THE PREDESTINATION OF GOD, AND THE ELECTION OF THE SAINTS.

Assisted by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the One and Supreme God, under the Presidency of the most excellent, most celebrated man:

JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER
Doctor of Sacred Theology, solidly holding the same faculty in the Illustrious University of the Swiss, which is at Zurich - in the very cradle of the Reformation; his most revered Patron and most desired (as most venerable) Preceptor:

THOMAS VERES-EGYHAZI, a Hungarian,
Author and Defender, publicly submits this.

On the __ day of November, at the usual time and place

ZURICH
In the year 1673

To the Most Reverend, Most Illustrious, Most Excellent Men:

Mr. JOHANN CASPAR WASER, Most Vigilant and Most Deserving Antistes of the Church of Zurich.

Mr. JOHANN RUDOLF HOSPINIAN, Most Worthy Moderator of the Caroline School and Provost of the Caroline College.

Mr. JOHANN CASPAR SULCER, the Supreme Greek Scholar of Europe, Professor of Languages and Most Magnificent Rector of the School, his most grateful Preceptor.

Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH LAVATER, Most Experienced Doctor of Medicine and Most Discerning Professor of Natural Philosophy.

Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER, Doctor of Sacred Theology and Most Celebrated Professor of the Same, his most revered Preceptor.

Mr. JOHANN LAVATER, Most Acute Professor of Rhetorical and Logical Arts, as well as Metaphysics.

Mr. CONRAD BURCKHARD, Most Eloquent Preacher of the Church of the Holy Spirit.

Mr. JOHANN JACOB MULLER, Most Fluent Archdeacon of the Church of Zurich.

Mr. JOHANN MULLER, Most Solid Professor of Sacred Theology.

Mr. JOHANN ULRICH BULLOD, Most Zealous Archdeacon of the Great Church.
Canons of the Church of Zurich, Great Assertors and Vindicators of the Orthodox Religion, his Lords and Patrons to be regarded with the highest honor.

And also to the Most Illustrious and Most Learned Man,

Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH HOTTINGER, Professor of the Sacred Language, his Host, Mess-mate, and Most Industriously Revered Preceptor in the Oriental Languages.

This Theological Dissertation is inscribed and offered in the token of due gratitude and observance with befitting candor by
THOMAS VERES-EGYHAZI, a Hungarian

SCRIPTURAL PART OF THE DISPUTATION ON THE HELVETIC CONFESSION

I.
In the previous disputation, the Confession explained the nature of election as founded in Scripture; now it proceeds to confute the errors devised for overturning the salvation obtained through election, which they call "diabolical arguments." But we, before descending with the Confession to reject those errors and (as they call them) diabolical arguments, having presupposed what we said in the preceding disputation, will contemplate the doctrine of predestination with as much diligence as we can, aiming at brevity and guided by Scripture. We will urge the words of the Confession "in Christ and for the sake of Christ," as we promised, and we will draw out what is virtually contained in them, and we will demonstrate that those errors can neither agree with nor consist with Predestination.

II. We posit, first, that from eternity, by His most free counsel and good pleasure, God chose some in Christ, to whom He bequeathed the kingdom by testament, Luke 22:29: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." This Testament is the free disposition of God the Savior concerning His own goods, to be possessed by His heir Christ according to the voluntary generation and designation, without danger of alienation (Gal. 3:15): "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto," and verses 16-17, where this matter or testament is handed down by God in such a way that it can be explained in human words and compared to a human transaction. For God accommodated Himself to the understanding of men and to their customs, that is, what He says is "after the manner of men," which phrase we wish to have explained here (Luke 22:29). God's Testament is the plan or proposal about giving the inheritance to Christ, by which the Father promises the Son satisfaction for sins, seed, and a sure possession of the inheritance. Thus the Father says to the Son: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Psalm 2:8). In which there is posited an accommodation of the Father's will to the will of the Son, that He might seek His inheritance and possession, that is, that He might will to love and care for those whom the Father gave Him, who by His wisdom are to become partakers of salvation through His offering as a sacrifice - which offering procures for Him the right to ask the inheritance from God.

The Arab has aptly expressed this: "Ask of me and I will give thee the peoples for thine inheritance, and thy dominion over the ends of the earth." Again the Son to the Father: "Behold,

I and the children whom the Lord hath given me" (Isaiah 8:18). The Syriac: "Behold, I and the sons whom the Lord hath given me," that is, "The Father hath given me the kingdom by testament." This Testament of the Father in Christ is ratified, that is, it is an immutable plan, because a testament or last will excludes repentance or change of action concerning the heirs and the inheritance, and indeed first concerning Christ's inheritance, then concerning the inheritance of those who have been given to Him. A human testament, although while the testator lives it is not binding and can be changed, yet upon death intervening it is ratified, and no one rejects or changes it by making a different disposition. Much less can the Testament of God either be rejected or varied by adding conditions, after it has been ratified.

III. Second: This Testament involves a covenant on which its firmness rests. Namely, the covenant of God the Father with the Mediator, which is the will of the Father giving the Son as the Head and Author of Redemption for the foreknown people, and the will of the Son presenting Himself for procuring this salvation. Hence arises the agreement, when according to that ineffable economy of our salvation the Father is considered as stipulating the obedience of the Son even unto death, and in return promising Him a kingdom and spiritual seed; but the Son presents Himself to do the will of God, and restipulates or extrinsically asks from the Father the salvation of the people given to Him from the world, that is, that "counsel of peace between the Shoot and the Lord" (Zechariah 6:13). The Chaldee has: "The good counsel of peace between them both." That is, the pledge between the Father and the Son to save sinners from eternity.

IV. This pledge is most magnificently proclaimed throughout Scripture. First and foremost, the most excellent Prophet Isaiah, towering like an eagle among the rest in explaining it in chapter 53:10, where he introduces the Father speaking thus: "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand." The Syriac renders this passage thus: "The sin of his soul was imposed, that he might see seed and prolong days, and the will of the Lord should prosper by his hand." The Chaldee, Septuagint, and Arab perversely and too Judaically corrupt this illustrious passage. But as for the Hebrew text, in it I do not translate aven as "guilt" or "for guilt," 1. Because thus the sense is most simple and most lucid. 2. Because to translate it as "guilt" is to add something to the most simple text and sense, which I dare not do. But it signifies 1. Guilt or just obligation and penalty to be sustained on account of sin. 2. The cause of guilt, that is, sin itself. 3. The satisfaction for guilt, the penalty or fine imposed on account of guilt. Now Christ the Surety did not place, give, or exhibit guilt, that is, obligation to punishment, for He did not come to make men guilty or that the world might be condemned through Him, but that it might be saved (John 3:17). Nor did He place sin, which entered into the world through Adam, for that is the work of the devil, which He came to destroy, not to establish. It remains, then, that His soul, loving the Father and sinful brethren, is acknowledged to have voluntarily laid down life, placing a satisfaction for sin unto the discharge of guilt. Hear here the sweet Psalmist of Israel, David, introducing Christ the Surety, presenting and offering Himself as surety, and speaking thus to the Father: "Mine ears hast thou opened" (Psalm 40:6), that is, Thou hast made me a willing servant to Thee, to do Thy will and make the wicked righteous. "Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God" (v. 7-8). That is, "Here I am present, I who in the book of God from the beginning am named the Surety, the author of righteousness

and peace - I will neglect nothing that Thy law demands, I will fulfill all righteousness, and that with delight and willingness, out of love for glorifying Thee and saving my brethren."

V. Third: This covenant of the Father with the Son includes the union of the elect with Christ the Surety, and thus that they are His brethren - a relationship that can be formed by no other bond and degree of consanguinity than faith. Hence the covenant of the Son with the Father includes the bestowing of faith on those for whom the suretyship was made. "Behold my servant...he shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at thee...so shall he sprinkle many nations" (Isaiah 52:13-15). That is, "The holy man having the command to redeem the people shall justify many by the knowledge of himself, that is, by faith." But that this our union with Christ our Surety, our Head and Brother, comes about by faith and in no other way, is evident: 1. Without union with Him through faith, it cannot be understood how the Father made the iniquity of us all to fall upon Him, how He was made sin and a curse for us, how He condemned sin in His flesh (that is, overcame sin accusing us), and by a judicial sentence according to the demand of the law for perfect righteousness, caused that accusation to be abolished (Romans 8:3,33). 2. Our union with our Surety by faith is the only reason why He is compared with Adam (Romans 5:12-19), because just as Adam was the source of all created and lost men, in that they all descended from him by natural descent, so Christ the second Adam is the Head of all those who believe in Him and thereby have union with Him. And just as Adam was the source only of those created and lost who descended naturally from him and were thus in him by that mode, so Christ became the Surety only of those who are in Him by faith, that is, just as Adam could not ruin any except those who were naturally in him, so Christ cannot make alive any except those who are in Him by faith. Therefore, God's reason for making a covenant of works with Adam is the strongest argument declaring that the covenant of the Father with the Son required from Him full satisfaction for His inheritance, as it required perfect obedience from Adam.

VI. Fourth: This suretyship of the Father with the Son for the elect, or Christ's inheritance, not only as has been demonstrated in Scripture but also in the hearts of the elect, comes in time to be manifested, that is, that Christ by virtue of the testamentary suretyship belongs to the elect, and the elect to Christ. For Christ the Surety, in time, betroths to Himself those whom the Father gave Him to redeem, and places the golden chain of salvation on the neck of the Church, by which the Church may know that it is the elect Bride of Christ the Surety, and be assured of the eternal suretyship of the Father with Christ on her behalf - just as a Bridegroom in time betroths to himself the virgin designated for him from among the daughters of men from eternity. This is the reason why the daughter of the King is all glorious within, because she is betrothed to righteousness, judgment, grace, mercy, and faith, and knows the Lord, that is, Christ, God and man, her Surety and Bridegroom (Psalm 45:13-14). She is betrothed to righteousness, and endowed with the innocence of Christ along with the remission of sins. To judgment, and her sin is judged in Christ, while through His obedience God demonstrated Himself simultaneously as the hater of sin and as justifying the one who justifies the ungodly in the Son (Romans 3:26). To grace, that is, to the purpose and good pleasure by which she is not only justified but also sanctified, preserved, and glorified; for Christ the Surety gave Himself for her, that He might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that He might present

the Church to Himself glorious, having no spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish (Ephesians 5:25-27). To mercy, because in her afflictions brought on by her sins He comforts her. To faith, because He has united her to Himself as a bride. For the Church's union with Christ through faith is like the union of spouses in marriage, while by an ineffable mystery the elect soul is united to Him and enters into the communion of blessings, and rears children for God.

VII. This assurance of Election, as the highest good, has been acknowledged and possessed thus far solely by the Reformed Church. And we give thanks to God, who has not yet willed to lavish this gift of His Bride on harlots and those who dower another. And whence would the Reformed Church know that it alone is the Bride of Jesus Christ, if harlots also enjoyed this privilege? But here we also acknowledge the modesty of all heretics, who in this matter do not raise their crests of arrogance, and do not boast of having what they do not possess. And so far so good; for nothing is easier for anyone to deny than that which they do not have. The Reformed Church ought not to be amazed if it almost alone acknowledges this grace, because it alone knows that it alone possesses it - for she acknowledges it who has it, and we are not anxious about the guest whom we do not host. Nor ought she to be amazed if the world boasts of its works and nature; nay, if it even transmutes grace itself into nature, because it has nothing else, being flesh and dust, since it has remained just as it was born. Only may heretics not deprive others, like robbers, of this assurance, and may they not impute impossibility to those on whom it has been bestowed by the Lord.

VIII. But the Reformed Church teaches the certainty of election, not only that which God knows - how many and who will be saved - which even good Lutherans, together with the Socinians, deny, while making God subject to human indifference, mutability, nay even giddiness; but also that by which the predestined person is certain of being elected unto eternal life, and that not before but after the dispensation of grace. For when it comes, "A vain man will get a heart, the wild ass's colt is born a man" (Job 11:12). That is, a man destitute of the spirit of wisdom and prudence, obeying his lusts, cunning in pursuit of bodily things, brutish and wild, becomes prudent and is born anew from heaven. And it is not a conjectural certainty, but a most firm one, derived from infallible signs, such as calling, regeneration, faith, justification, adoption, sanctification, glorification. So that here it proceeds by the analytic method, from effects to cause, not the reverse from cause to effects; for it seeks the cause of election in heaven, and its signs on earth. But by a perverse method the Pontificals, the Lutherans, and even the Socinians themselves - if indeed those deceitful men acknowledge any certainty of salvation by election - seek the causes of salvation on earth and its signs in heaven, while they suspend it on foreseen faith and works, and require a special revelation from God.

IX. Moreover, our election is perceived and made certain to us: 1. By a spiritual sense, by which the grace of God, already present, renders its presence manifest and evident to the elect. For just as one sitting by the fire is warmed, one who eats honey tastes its sweetness, so one to whom the grace of God is present necessarily feels its operation. Nor is it necessary that we believe we have the grace of God, but this experiential knowledge suffices, from which we can know that we have the grace of God. And this experiential knowledge is caused by these

experiences: light, peace, joy - when these three things are in the holy soul, it is the true and certain experience that the soul has grace. A well-disposed sense of taste cannot be ignorant of the sweetness united to it; therefore, a well-disposed soul cannot but feel the divine sweetness united to it. But the sense of divine sweetness is through grace; therefore, the well-disposed soul cannot be ignorant that it has grace. 2. By the gift of discernment, by which the elect distinguishes true grace from its shadowy appearance. For although the reprobate also are enlightened, that is, they know the doctrine of repentance from dead works and faith in God, they taste the heavenly gift, they hear the Son of God from heaven and are convinced that He came in the flesh and rose from the dead, they partake of the Holy Spirit, that is, of the gifts which are granted for the edification of the Church and were given in the primitive Church for the confirmation of the doctrine of truth; nay, they even taste the good word of God, that is, the word of the Gospel, which is the word of righteousness and liberty, and the powers of the age to come, that is, the joy of the righteousness and liberty given to believers in the New Testament, in which believers here on earth, having been made perfect, communicate with the blessed citizens of heaven, rejoicing in the same joy of justification, the accusation of the law having ceased on earth as in heaven (Ephesians 1:10). Yet they are destitute of true grace, because they feel no joy of the soul; and if they do feel any, it only differs from the joy of the elect soul as much as the joy of fantasy or of dreaming differs from the joy of wakefulness (Isaiah 29:8). For the world does not partake of the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete and pledge, but only as the convictor (John 16:8) - "for the world cannot receive Him" (John 14:17). 3. By the discourse and testimony of conscience, by reasoning, by which grace and salvation are no less sealed to the elect than sin and death to the reprobate. In this way: "Whoever is called by the Word to the Church and to eternal life, and is gifted with faith in Christ, that is, believes that his sins are remitted on account of the merit of Christ's divine-human nature, and moreover worships God with a sincere and unfeigned zeal according to the prescription of the Word, and loves his neighbor - that person is elected unto eternal life. But I am called by the Word to the Church and to eternal life, and am gifted with faith in Christ, that is, I believe that my sins are remitted on account of the merit of Christ's divine-human nature, and moreover I worship God with a sincere and unfeigned zeal according to the prescription of the Word, and I love my neighbor. Therefore, I am elected unto eternal life." This syllogism is called practical. Its major premise rests on that unbreakable chain of salvation which Paul links together in Romans 8:30: "Whom He predestined, them He also called, and whom He called, them He also justified, and whom He justified, them He also glorified." Hence it is evident that the elect's own callings are an effectual calling by which the darkened mind of man is illuminated through the Word, and his stubborn will is bent to obedience; and justification, by which on account of Christ apprehended by faith, the sinner is absolved from sin and death and accounted righteous unto life. These are the elect's own gifts, because they are inseparably linked with glorification - for whoever is justified is also sanctified, etc., and also glorified. The minor premise contains the examination of conscience, which rests on experience and consequently on faith. Bellarmine is therefore perverse when he says that the minor premise of this syllogism is not only false but even impossible unless there is a revelation, though no such particular revelation concerning it is found anywhere in Scripture. "This is plainly a theological demonstration. But if this theological demonstration were worth anything, it would do away with the whole use of Theology. Why? Because in no Scripture is there found a particular testimony concerning Muhammad or his Koran, that they must be

damned. Can we not then be certain with the certainty of faith that these abominations are to be detested? In no Scripture is it found that this or that pagan or Muslim cannot be saved without conversion and faith; can certain faith therefore not be had concerning the necessity of faith for the salvation of any particular person? In no Scripture, indeed in no Council or even Papal pronouncement, is it found that that very codex which Bellarmine used when citing Scripture to destroy the certainty of election and justification contained the Word of God. Could Bellarmine then be uncertain whether those things he alleged were the Word of God or not?" Moreover, Bellarmine ought not to be ignorant that such particular testimonies of our conscience are evidently known to us by sense, observation, and experience. And the conclusion which is rightly deduced from premises one of which is a matter of faith and the other has certain evidence, is certain with the certainty of faith. Therefore, this "theological demonstration" (as he himself boasts) devised by Bellarmine has not even as much force in this matter as the slightest dust has in a great balance. 4. By the testimony of the Holy Spirit, as the principal cause of certainty, by which we cry, "Abba, Father" - for the Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God (Romans 8:16).

X. These errors, then, cannot at all consist with the sober doctrine of election. Namely, "The elect are few, and since it is not evident to me that I am among that small number, I will not defraud my genius, that is, I will live freely and not exchange my joy for sad and irksome piety, but I will eat, drink, etc." Likewise: "If I am predestined or elected by God, nothing will prevent me from the salvation now certainly defined, whatever I may undertake. But if I am of the number of the reprobate, no faith or repentance will help me, since God's decree cannot be changed. Therefore doctrines and admonitions are useless." For the Confession says: "Therefore we do not approve the impious utterances of some." By the word "therefore" it indicates that these do not agree with the doctrine of Predestination previously explained, and that the responses to these errors must be drawn from what precedes. Namely, God elected us 1. In Christ, in the Head, glorified with Whom the members ought also to be glorified; but we must not neglect the means to glorification, because Christ did not neglect them, but as a hero cheerfully accomplished all things, and on His account the Father most bountifully exhibits to us the means conducing to our glorification. 2. For Christ's sake, our Surety and Pledge; but not that we might live ungratefully in sin, but rather that we might die to sin and Christ Himself might live in us unto eternal life. Considered in election, Christ our Surety is our Head, our Bridegroom; we are the members and the Bride. Will the members then be heterogeneous? Or will not the Bride whom Christ the Bridegroom loved, love her Bridegroom in return? And will she not strive to please Him in all things and to be like Him? (1 John 4:17). 3. We are elected unto this end, that we should be holy and blameless (Ephesians 1:4). That is, we ought not so indulge presumption about election as to think nothing of obtaining or preserving holiness. For "If men when they elect, elect the best things, much more so God. For He has certainly elected the upright, since He Himself made us holy, but we ought to remain holy." He elected the upright from the fact that they would be such, that is, made so by God, and indeed from the fact that they were not so in themselves, but in the disposition of God. And so whoever glories in election and thinks nothing of holiness regards God as more foolish than men, who elect the best of each thing. For a man who is careless about holiness, if he considers himself elect, necessarily establishes that God either elected the defiled to remain as they then were, or that having been

somewhat freed from the defilements of the world, they would become entangled in them again, and thus elected the wicked, criminal, and ungrateful. But God has prepared good works for the elect to walk in (Ephesians 2:10). Therefore, just as those are most wicked who wish to remain in their defilements, so it was fitting for the divine wisdom to elect those in whom He would effect holiness. 4. Even if the elect are few, it can and ought to be evident to every elect person, indeed it is the duty of all the elect, that they render this certain and firm to themselves through faith. For concerning the Testament of the Father about giving the inheritance to the Son, and the suretyship of the Son for His inheritance, no one is certain except through faith, for the suretyship of the Son includes union with the brethren, which can happen in no other way than through faith. But to those who are united to Christ through faith, such thoughts cannot come to mind as those who love Christ, who meditate on His law day and night, whence their conscience is joyful, tranquil, confident, absolving them from the condemnation of the divine law, absolving, comforting, cheering, uplifting them. 5. Even if it is not evident to you whether you are of that small number, yet you ought not to omit those pious duties, because they are good in themselves, they prevent the increase of sin and the punishments of sins, and are often repaid with manifold benefits from the abounding and hidden kindness of God. 6. You ought to defraud your genius, afflict your body, and bring it into subjection, lest you become reprobate. 7. Even if you are predestined or elected by God unto life, yet you will certainly be prevented from that now certainly defined salvation, because you were elected that you should believe and have eternal life (John 16:36). Unless therefore you believe, you will perish - for he who believes does not perish unless he does not believe.

XI. Therefore, the certainty of election follows from the perception of faith, love, and repentance, where the eternal Testament of God with the Suretyship, or the gratuitous covenant of God, is rightly understood. If either of these is absent, that certainty is removed with respect to perception, so that one who rightly understands the eternal Testament of God and the Suretyship cannot be certain of his election unless he also perceives true faith, love, and repentance in himself, from which a tranquil conscience arises. Nor can one who feels that he truly believes, loves God, and repents be certain of his election unless he understands that by the eternal Testament by which He gave the inheritance to the Son, and the Suretyship by which the Son offered Himself as a sacrifice, God will powerfully preserve the elect seed, that is, believers and the repentant, to the end.

XII. Therefore it follows: 1. That Hugo Grotius, speaking thus in his Plea for Peace (p. 115), blasphemes the true religion with calumny: "Indeed it is said that in all the justified repentance always follows, which I do not think is true. And then, what is that repentance? To live as they please, then at the approach of death to say to the ministers, 'I wish it had not been done,' and 'I believe the righteousness of Christ is imputed to me,' and that this is true because I believe it. With this viaticum that person immediately wings his way to heaven, and to doubt it is Stygian impiety." II. That the Pontificals and Lutherans, in denying the perseverance of the elect in faith and repentance, deny the eternal Testament of God and the covenant of the Father with the Son, or if they do not deny it in words, yet they make very little of it, namely they render the Son undergoing death uncertain whether anyone will be saved through Him or not, and they also make the whole fruit of this mystery depend on the choice of men. III. That the Pontificals,

Lutherans, and Socinians ought to be in perpetual grief and fear - for they have election without certainty, indeed the Socinians even one made in time and suspended on nature, which is not sincere and secure felicity; for they are uncertain about their election, to be retained by their own powers, by the fear of losing which they must always be tormented. Certainly, those who wish to rest in themselves and their own works can never find solid tranquility for their consciences, both on account of various falls and those manifold imperfections which always cling even to the best efforts of the best of men while they are in this life. And hence it is that the Pontificals necessarily must be agitated by perpetual doubts both in life and in death, on account of that opinion they hold concerning the uncertainty of the righteousness and merits of works from their own confession. IV. That the certainty of election is not perceived by others, nor others than those who retain a good conscience along with faith, and that while they retain it without any grievous wound inflicted by those sins which are accustomed to lay waste the conscience. V. That whoever glories in their election without any sense of faith and repentance presumes concerning it, and thus by presumption they hope for and by hoping perish in their salvation.

XIII. Nor VI. are doctrines and admonitions useless, as the Confession proves by the testimony: 1. Of the Apostle Paul, 2 Timothy 2:24-26: "And a servant of the Lord must not quarrel but be gentle to all, able to teach, patient, in humility correcting those who are in opposition, if God perhaps will grant them repentance leading to a knowledge of the truth, and that they may come to their senses out of the snare of the devil, having been taken captive by him to do his will." That is, if God grants repentance unto the knowledge of the truth, yet He proposes the truth through His servants, with demonstration and manifestation to the conscience, that they may acknowledge it, and through doctrines and admonitions be bent to obedience, and thus from disobedient ones become obedient, circumcising the heart in this way so that they put away vain thoughts and lusts, quickening them that they may arise and live, and for a sinner know the truth, that is, the love or will on account of which all things that exist, even the elect and heirs of God, exist - this finally is to know the truth, namely, to love the Lover. 2. That through doctrines and admonitions repentance from the snares of the devil is given. The snare of the devil is false wisdom, on account of which the wisdom of God seems to erring ones to be foolishness; indeed, every opinion and persuasion, every lust, which prevents one from attending to the word of truth, by which the man held by it is led captive, as it were, to do the will of the devil - that is, just as the devil calumniates the truth, blasphemes God and His works, so he himself may blaspheme the truth, and not bear those who speak it and wish to live piously according to it, nay, if he should kill them, may think he offers a sacrifice to God. From these snares of the devil, then, doctrines and admonitions drawn from Scripture deliver. For to whomever God then opens the heart, he turns from error and lust, returns to himself from the alienation of his mind, and he who formerly did not know what he was saying or doing now clearly and distinctly knows all and distinctly discerns the true from the false, righteousness from unrighteousness, piety from superstition, wisdom from fallacy and deception, prudence from rashness, love from evil zeal and lust. But to add effectively: Doctrines and admonitions are useful that men may be humbled by a sense of their defects, that those who are elect among them may perfect by grace what is commanded to nature, and finally, that excuse may be taken away from the rest.

XIV. 2. Augustine, in his work On the Gift of Perseverance, chapter 14 and following, shows that both the free grace of election and predestination, and salutary doctrines and admonitions, ought to be preached. "For," he says, "the definition of predestination is not opposed to the utility of preaching, because it did not oppose the Apostle when preaching. Did not that teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth repeatedly commend predestination, and not cease to preach the word of God? (Philippians 2:13). Because he said, 'It is God who works in us both to will and to do for His good pleasure,' did he not for that reason exhort us to will what is pleasing to God and to work? Or because he said, 'He who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Christ Jesus' (Philippians 1:6), did he not for that reason persuade men both to begin and to persevere to the end? Surely the Lord Himself commanded men to believe, and said, 'Believe in God, believe also in me' (John 14:1); nor for that reason is His statement false, nor His definition vain, where He says, 'No one can come to me, that is, no one can believe in me, unless it has been given to him by my Father' (John 6:65). Nor again, because this definition is true, is that precept therefore vain. Why then should we think the preaching, the precept, the exhortation, the rebuke, all of which Divine Scripture frequently employs, is made useless by the definition of predestination which that same Divine Scripture commends? Neither, therefore, should the preaching of predestination hinder the preaching of faith that profits and perseveres to the end, so that what ought to be heard may be heard, and those to whom it is given may obey. 'How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?' (Romans 10:14). Nor again should the preaching of the faith that profits and perseveres to the end hinder the preaching of predestination, so that he who lives faithfully and obediently may not be lifted up by that very obedience as if it were not a gift received, but may glory in the Lord. For there is no ground for glorying, since nothing is ours." Rightly indeed - a sufficient argument is: Scripture preaches both. Therefore, we must preach both the free grace of election and salutary doctrines and admonitions. And who has such authority as to prohibit us from preaching what we preach led by the Apostle? But if we are silent, we shall hear the very stones preach it (Luke 19:40). Certainly the Apostle preaches the free grace of election or predestination in Romans 9:21-23: "Does not the potter have power over the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel for honor and another for dishonor? What if God, wanting to show His wrath and to make His power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath prepared for destruction, and that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had prepared beforehand for glory?" We confess this passage to be quite difficult and inscrutable to all. Yet no one will blame us if in this parable of the potter and the clay, in which heretofore most have opened veins of terror but we also of sweetest consolation, we set forth the following:

XV. There is indeed consolation in this parable for those who humble themselves, who take refuge in God and look to Him alone. For: 1. Since God our Maker is most wise, most powerful, and most good, if you consider His wisdom, His work cannot displease Him as if it were not well-made according to His art and design, so that novices are accustomed to be angry at an unfortunate first attempt, either to make something better by a second effort, or that the work itself, if it exists, may not reprove their lack of skill. If you consider His goodness, which as Maker He willed to demonstrate by creating, since He is immutable in His purpose, He will never nullify it by destroying it. 2. If our Maker God has not caused some work to be done by others,

but His own hands have labored on it, His own care has sweated over it, then many great things must have been procured by Him for its sake. How tenderly we love the final touch and culmination of all our works, if perchance by subtle skill, exquisite art, immense labor, heavy expense, and arduous, immense effort, we have accomplished something well and to our satisfaction! How far we are from willing to destroy that without cause and for no great good! Thus we must firmly believe that God will never change His foresight, His purpose, concerning those in whom He forms the image of His Son. 4. Just as the potter most carefully guards the Samian work fashioned skillfully and to his satisfaction although fragile, so let us know that God will guard the vessels of mercy which He has formed for glory as the apple of His eye. We neglect the whole body in order to preserve the pupil of the eye; thus God, neglecting even the whole world if it could be so, will nevertheless preserve His elect and will promptly pardon their sins when they humble themselves before Him, mindful of our creation. "He knows our frame, He remembers that we are dust" (Psalm 103:14). The Chaldee has: "In remembrance before Him that we are of dust." The Syriac: "He recalled that we are dust."

XVI. But you will say: Does not the potter have power over the clay? What certainty then do you gather from that which is free? For what is free seems to be uncertain. I reply: You see, but I say more. I affirm that if He wills, He can do with man what He wills. But 1. His will is most good, known even from man's very creation, in that He made man with a kind of deliberation, greater effort, and singular labor, as is also evident from His remaining governance, but especially through Christ, in Whom and through Whom He gives life to whom He wills (John 5:21). And He wills that whatever He gave to the Son, that is, whatever He freely assigned and elected in Him for an inheritance, should come to Him, that He should not cast out the one coming to Him (John 6:37), and that of all that was given to Him, He should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day; nay, that everyone who sees the Son and believes in Him should have eternal life, and that He Himself should raise him up on the last day (John 6:39-40). Therefore, those who come to Christ have the most certain consolation that the Father has given them to Him, that Christ will not cast them out of His house in anger but will establish them in it like pillars, that He will not destroy them through neglect or impotence but will preserve them, and that He will not only raise them up on the last day, but that even now they have eternal life. But to those who do not come to Him but love darkness, just as they cannot lay claim to this consolation, so it ought to be a terror to them that God can cast them into hell, that there they may humble themselves, although He has the power to determine concerning what He has made as He wills. Nevertheless, He wills to deal with them in such a way that nothing may be left to them by which they can either excuse themselves or accuse God, because being self-willed and resisting manifold allurements and impulsions, they did not come to Christ. 2. Man is the apex and goal of all things and labors, made not merely to exist like other bodily creatures, but to be the image of his Creator, in whom He formed not only His own image but also that of His Son. What agreement is there then with such condescension, to regard it rashly and as nothing? I gather this further certainty, that our Maker is also our Father, we are His sons, therefore also heirs. Certainly the prophet Isaiah, in the person of the faithful Jews lamenting the common degeneration of the whole nation from Abraham and Israel, prays thus: "But now, O Lord, You are our Father; we are the clay, and You our potter; and all we are the work of Your hand" (Isaiah 64:8).

XVII. Therefore most rightly the undisciplined questions of those who seek outside of Christ - 1. Whether they are elected from eternity? What did God decree concerning them before all eternity? - are disapproved by the Confession in §7. For the Apostle taught above that we are elected in Christ, that we should be holy and blameless. Nor is it our duty to inquire into the secrets of God, but: 1. It is the common duty of all the faithful to hear the preaching of the Gospel, and to believe it; then if you believe you are in Christ, you must undoubtedly consider yourself elect, for the Father has revealed to us the eternal sentence of His predestination in Christ. That the preaching of the Gospel must be heard, the Confession proves from Mark 11:28: "Come unto me, all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." For in the Gospel the elect are called by Christ to Himself. "Come," He says, "but who? You who labor and are burdened, who are broken and contrite in heart, for you alone are worthy of me; for this reason God has anointed me, that I might preach good tidings to the meek, He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to those who are bound, to console those who mourn, to give them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness" (Isaiah 61:1-3). II. It is the special duty of ministers: Above all, to teach and consider at the same time with the hearers how great the Father's love toward us revealed in Christ is. The Confession wills that the greatness of this love be preached and considered from that notable passage, John 3:16: "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." On the consideration of this passage we will dwell a little here. First, we will explain what is meant by "the world" here. Second, we will show the greatness of God's love.

XVII. First: That by "the world" cannot be meant all and every human being is evident: 1. Because by that great love of God by which He is here said to have loved the world, nothing else can be understood than that will of God by which He willed that whoever sees the Son and believes in Him should have eternal life, and that the Son should raise him up on the last day. But not all and every human being believes and has eternal life. 2. Because if by "the world" we understand all and every human being, then we can in no way think here of love which is truly love, and we are compelled to wrest the very word "love" from its genuine signification. The love of God by which He loved the world is a love of saving, by which He gave His only begotten Son for the world, by which He willed that it should be conformed to the image of His Son, a signification which does not apply to all and every human being. 3. Because if by "the world" we understand all and every human being, then God loved the Gentiles with that great love when He rejected them, and Pharaoh when He willed to harden him - for the Gentiles were of that world no less than Pharaoh, and Pharaoh no less than the Gentiles. 4. Because this love pertains only to that world to which, as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, so the Son of Man is shown (v. 14-15). But He is not shown to all and every human being. It remains therefore without doubt that the love of God which pertains to the world does not yet pertain to all and every human being, that is, God willed to have a kingdom in the world and a people from the Jews and Gentiles, that the blessing might overflow not only to the Jews but also to the Gentiles. By this reckoning the kingdom of God, the Church militant on earth, is most rightly called the world which God so greatly loved. For in this phrase "God so loved the world," and in

others similar to it, such as "God reconciled the world to Himself" (2 Cor. 5:19), and "Christ died for all" (2 Cor. 5:15), reference is made to the promise given to Abraham in Genesis 22:18, 26:4, that in his seed, who is Christ (Galatians 3:16), all the nations, that is, all the families of the earth, would receive the blessing, so that "all nations," "all the nations," "all the families of the earth" signify the same thing as "all" and "the world." This is not an unusual synecdoche. For what the promise made to Abraham calls "nations" and "Israel," the Apostle Paul interprets as "those whom God calls from the Jews and Gentiles" (Romans 9:24). And this synecdoche the chorus of the prophets, together with Paul, teaches when he inculcates the "remnant."

XVIII. Nor is this synecdoche lacking in emphasis, when it teaches that those whom God loves and for whom He exhibited His only begotten Son are in the world, that is, are flesh and grass like the rest, who, precisely because they remain children of wrath in relation to those who are given to Christ and assumed into the kingdom of grace, are called "the world" (John 17:9). Thus also the seed of Abraham, that is, the Jews and Gentiles called to the Church, constitute a peculiar world distinct from the reprobate world.

XIX. Second: The greatness of the love which the Confession urges to be taught is greater than can be sufficiently explained by us. 1. Because it is a great love to give the only begotten Son, and to give Him not only as the Son of Man but also under the law, nay to make Him sin and a curse - without which economy of salvation the sinner would perish and not attain to eternal life. For He who was given that the believer should not perish but have eternal life - outside of Him and without Him there is no deliverance nor right to seek eternal life. Just as those bitten by the serpents in the wilderness could not but die unless they looked upon the serpent, so those whom that ancient Serpent has reduced to his power cannot but die unless they believe in the only begotten Son of God, the same Son of Man exalted like the serpent, that is, crucified. 2. Because He willed to give the Son to the world with this consequence and fruit, that those who believed should have the certain hope of eternal life without fear of death and destruction, that is, Christ is so set forth as the cause of salvation to the believing sinner that the sinner cannot believe in Him in vain. For salvation necessarily follows from faith in Him, because: 1. He who flees to Him, that is, believes in Him to be found in Him, cannot flee in vain but is blessed (Psalm 2:12). 2. Because by faith he becomes a partaker of the blessings of Christ just as the Bride, accepting the love of the Bridegroom and committing herself to Him, becomes one flesh with the Bridegroom and mistress of all His goods (John 3:29, Ephesians 5:22) - for by faith God betroths us to Himself (Hosea 2:19). 3. Because that love is immutable: "I will betroth you to Me forever" (Hosea 2:19), that is, these children are given to Christ (Isaiah 8:18), as the Brother closely related seizes them with His hand extended over them, as it were, and apprehends them as His own.

XX. The Confession, wishing to teach and demonstrate in §9 the summary and concise way to the certainty of election, mindful of that saying, "There is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12), directs us to Christ, for it says: "Christ, therefore, is the mirror in which we must contemplate our predestination." That is, the economy and care of Christ concerning the elect exhibits for us the image of the eternal love of God the Father. For Christ, as the effulgence, the express image of the Father, presents the Father

Himself, that is, His will, all His virtues, and especially His eternal love, to be contemplated by us. His will, that is, the doctrine of Christ or the words of eternal life which He taught us, and the life which He proposed for us to imitate, are the image, the mirror of the Father's will regarding the obedience to be required of the heirs of salvation. For Christ as the Son could not do or teach anything except what He saw the Father doing or teaching; indeed, He could do nothing of Himself (John 5:19). If He had done anything of Himself which He did not see the Father doing, He would have sinned, just as the angels and men sinned by doing what they did not see God doing. All His virtues, because in Christ the Father became the "Justifier and Sanctifier of sinners," in which statement all the virtues of God, especially His holiness and mercy or the riches of His grace, are contained. His holiness, by which He cannot have union and communion with the sinner, is set forth to be contemplated and imitated in Christ as the effulgence of glory, that is, the glory of the Father vindicating and seeking holiness. His mercy - for if He gave us His own only begotten Son, what is it in which He will not gratify us?

Moreover, the Apostle in Hebrews 3:1 exhorts us to contemplate our election in the mirror of Christ: "Therefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Christ Jesus." Here the Apostle refers to the words of the prophet Isaiah 45:22: "Look unto me." And Isaiah refers to the bronze serpent, which those bitten by the serpent were commanded to look upon in order to be healed. Christ took on the name and form of the serpent because He intercedes for the serpent's seed, undertaking its cause that it may become the seed of God. Therefore, bitten by that serpent impersonating the Wicked One or the Devil, who wishes to invade and prostrate our hearts with great force, wishing to insinuate himself by cunning and slippery steps little by little, let us look to Christ as the mirror of predestination, that is, let us fix our gaze on considering the Apostle and Prince of the stipulation, lest being turned away from that mirror, we should look elsewhere. Then we shall have a clear and firm testimony that we are inscribed in the Book of Life by the Lamb, if we have communion with Christ, and He is truly ours by faith. That is, the doctrine of Christ received by true faith and love, His life as the most resplendent mirror of sincere obedience set before the eyes of faith to be imitated according to the measure of grace suited to this state of pilgrimage - this is the pledge of righteousness and the seal of enrollment in the number of pupils of the Heavenly Academy, whose names once inscribed by the Lamb are never blotted out. I say inscribed by the Lamb, because Scripture recognizes a twofold inscription in the Book of the Lamb. One is the inscription of Christ the Lamb, and that is from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:8), and the names of those so inscribed are not blotted out (Revelation 3:5). The other is the inscription of one's own hand (Isaiah 44:5): "One shall say, 'I am the Lord's'; another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; another shall subscribe with his hand to the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." The Syriac has: "And he shall write his handwriting to the Lord." Now this inscription by one's own hand belongs especially to the time of the New Testament. The Gentiles began to nourish the Church, but also to enter and tread the holy city (hence the origin of the Beast), though they were certainly unworthy while falsely pretending to believe in Christ and bearing His name. Then they inscribed themselves in the register of the living, and thus obtained the name of the living, although they were dead; and when they depart from this profession of Christ's name, they blot out their names, which were written not by God's authority but by their own.

XXI. This is necessary, that we contemplate Christ as the mirror of our predestination; for otherwise the dangerous temptation concerning predestination mentioned in §10 will easily overwhelm us. This temptation concerning predestination is dangerous because if you do not look to the Sun of Righteousness, what darkness will overwhelm you! If you admit the dung of your lusts into your heart, God will answer you according to the dung of your heart in His righteous judgment. Do not consider that by an eternal testament God gave Christ an inheritance to be certainly obtained, but consider Him as making no certain decree about our salvation, His love not immutable but suspended and wavering, His eye most keen, His hand mighty indeed but retaining no more than our flesh wills - it will follow that we shall be surrounded by the ambushes and smitten by the blows and cuffs of Satan. If we do not fix our eyes on Christ, certainly for us who are destitute of wisdom, frail, immersed in sin, born and raised in a most corrupt world, amid frequent, sudden, hidden, specious temptations with the Tempter himself transforming into an angel of light, there must be utter despair of salvation at every moment. And no torments, no racks, no wheels, no hooks, no flames, no chains, no scaffolds, no fires can equal that despair. Therefore the inheritance joined to predestination in Christ, eternal life, the holy Jerusalem with all its delights to be possessed - the hope of this, though joined with the greatest difficulties, labor, and struggles, yet must be hoped for, however it may delay; let us wait for it, and let not our soul despair, for it will surely come, it will not delay beyond the time. Thus it will be that after the turbulent sea, placid waves will receive us sailing, our faith will annex peace to our wars, and our victory will end under better auspices than it began.

XXII. But our hope in the dangerous temptation concerning predestination: 1. Must be raised up by the promises of God revealed in Scripture, and by petitions directed according to those promises. "Everyone who asks receives" - that is, whoever seeks anything from God according to His promises certainly finds that very thing which he seeks; for the truth of God does not allow anyone to seek Him in vain, nor can He will that He be sought in vain. For God cannot show Himself impotent and poor when the sinner acknowledges Him as powerful and rich for the remission of sins. But what our petitions ought to be, the Savior taught in the Lord's Prayer, namely such that we address God as our Father, putting on the affection not of servants or hirelings but of sons, coming to Him with confidence and freedom. 2. It must be confirmed by the sacraments, for the promises revealed in Scripture, though universal, yet when they are read and applied by faith, are so many letters written from heaven by God the Father to our souls, sent to us through His Son Jesus Christ, the Apostle and Legate of the covenant, inscribed on our hearts by the Holy Spirit, the finger of God, confirmed and sealed by the sacraments, namely Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as by so many seals of letters, sworn by God's oath swearing by His own life.

XXIII. Being thus confirmed in our election, what duty must we continue throughout our whole life? The Confession says: "That we may work out our own salvation with fear and trembling" (Philippians 2:12). That is, as if in constant dread, holding the sword always drawn, we must put on the whole armor of God, that is, the word of God as the two-edged sword piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, joints and marrow (Hebrews 4:12), we must vibrate it with

upraised and outstretched hand like those skilled in spiritual warfare, having our senses exercised in Scripture to discern good and evil (Hebrews 5:14), adroit at making the manifestation of the truth known to the conscience, not beating the air but striking our enemies with sure and decisive blows (1 Corinthians 9:26). This fear commended by the Apostle and called to remembrance by the Confession does not diminish confidence or boasting, but rather increases and establishes it. For it is not joined with trepidation by which we flee from God, but by which we turn to God, seek the Lord our God, and hasten tremblingly to His goodness, that is, we run swiftly and tremblingly to the grace revealed in the Gospel. For this fear is the caution and solicitude of love and hope, and its motion and operation in hearts affirming the sense of faith, hope, and love. It is a fear by no means tormenting but exhilarating, a fear as necessary as useful, and the very extension of delight to its goal, and the sweet trembling of the soul unwilling to lose the thing beloved. A good conscience must be preserved; therefore, we must pursue our salvation with fear and trembling. For there are many things we must fear: unexpected occasions of sinning, whether through anger or lust or weakness of spirit. Our very fear by which we work out our salvation is something to be feared, that is, we ought to be suspicious of ourselves, lest perchance our spirit may not be strong enough in us, if time and circumstance require confidence. O God, grant this fear to our hearts by which they may tremble and be enlivened! Grant that we may ardently kiss Your Son, the Surety of the eternal Testament, that we may hasten tremblingly to His goodness, that finally by faith and hope as on triumphal wings we may soar to heaven!

The End.

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION, In Which THE FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLE OF THE PAPIST RELIGION, THE INFALLIBLE VICARIATE OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF, IS DEMONSTRATED TO BE IRRATIONAL.

Which,
Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit into truth,
Presided over by
JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER, Doctor of Sacred Theology and its Professor at the Illustrious Arnoldin School in Steinfurt,

Will be defended to the best of his ability by
JOHANN JACOB GROB, Candidate in Sacred Theology.

On June 6, 1660, in the Aquatic Church, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

To the Most Revered, Most Illustrious, Most Prudent, Most Noble Men:
Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH RHAN, Consul of the Illustrious Republic of Zurich.
Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH WASER, Consul of the same.
Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER, Pro-Consul of the same.
Mr. JOHANN CONRAD WERDMULLER, Senator.
Mr. JOHANN JACOB HAB, Senator.
Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH MULLER, Chief Financial Officer.
Mr. JOHANN ULRICH of the HULDRICS, Senator of the Republic of Zurich, now Prefect of Locarno.
Mr. JOHANN CONRAD RHAN, Tribune and Overseer of Grain Supplies.
Mr. JOHANN CONRAD GREBEL, Late Tribune, Transalpine Legate, and Prefect of Wadischwyl.
Mr. JOHANN TESCHER, Senator, Recently Scholasticus, Late Prefect of Wadischwyl.
Mr. JOHANN CONRAD HEIDEGGER, Tribune of the People.
Mr. JOHANN ULRICH ASCHER, Prefect of the Barony of Alto-Saxen and Frischenberg in Voristeg.

Likewise to the Revered, Most Illustrious, Most Learned Men:
Mr. JOHANN JACOB HULDRIC, Chief Antistes of the Church of Zurich.
Mr. JOHANN HEINRICH ZELLER, Professor of Sacred Theology, Superintendent of the Caroline College.
Mr. JOHANN CASPAR WASER, Preacher of the Great Church, Steward of the Caroline College, and Superintendent of the Higher School.
Mr. JOHANN WILHELM SIMLER, Inspector of the Convent College.
Mr. JODOCUS GROB, Pastor of the Zurich Assembly at Wadischwyl on the Lake.
His great Patrons, Supporters, Benefactors, Well-wishers, Host, Kinsmen, and Father,

This present Disputation, as a humble token of due honor and grateful mind, is humbly offered by
JOHANN JACOB GROB

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION
In Which
THE FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLE
OF THE ROMAN PAPIST RELIGION
IS DEMONSTRATED TO BE IRRATIONAL

I. The Christian faith, which is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes, rests on the authority of an infallible revelation. In this matter it is certain and well-established that an infallible revelation cannot proceed from any mortal man. For by daily experience of events, and by the authority of the Scriptures, we detect in them no less the influence of the Deceiver than of the Holy Spirit. Not to mention that since that sad point in time when man fell into apostasy in

Adam, no human soul has been able to attain such wisdom as to dictate the way of salvation and that second plank after shipwreck, made firm in the covenant of grace.

II. And indeed the Romanists themselves, with whom we now contend, are not so shameless and absurd as to dare to deny this. Hence they generally deny that the Church possesses the privilege of infallibility insofar as it is an assembly of men under the imperative or directive rule of Christ's Vicar on these earthly shores. And on the contrary, they assert that the Church is infallible insofar as the Spirit of God, who searches the deep things, is always present with it, so that all its decrees concerning faith and religion, whether affirmative or negative, implicit or explicit, ought to be received without wavering.

III. As for us, we have always judged with great reason that heavenly wisdom cannot be revealed by anyone except the Son of God, and whomever He wills to reveal it to. He alone has seen the Father. To Him alone the Father's secrets lie open. He was in the bosom of the Father and has declared Him to us. Moreover, He granted this dignity to the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, that being inspired by His Spirit, they spoke and wrote as from His own mouth, and that too most faithfully, without any fear of error, setting forth the salutary precepts of faith and conduct. To these alone, therefore, with Augustine, have we learned to attribute the pre-eminence of canonical authority. From these alone do we receive whatever is sacred and holy. Nor do we seek the meaning from anywhere else than from the authors themselves, keeping in view the instruments of legitimate interpretation. "To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isaiah 8:20).

IV. Nor in this matter, as far as it pertains to the authority and power of the Church concerning the sacred will of God, do we transgress in any way. For if the subject is the Church truly so called, that is, not the one that is considered the Church of God by human judgment, but that people whom God gave to His Son to be redeemed and sanctified from all nations, we profess plainly that from it proceeds the infallible revelation of fundamental truth necessary for salvation, and this insofar as it is the Church of God, and therefore necessarily hears the voice of God, sees His face, and has His word abiding in it, and believes Him whom God has sent (John 5:37-38). Hence it is certainly clear that the pronouncements of the true Church are the pronouncements of God, and so far infallible, in that they proceed from such an assembly which is commended by the due marks of the Church. In this sense we receive what the Fathers frequently say concerning the perpetuity and infallibility of the Church, which Cardinal Torquemada interprets orthodoxly in these words: "According to the doctrine of the Fathers, this is to be understood as what we say, that the Church cannot err in faith and conduct - namely, that God will so assist the Church unto the consummation of the age that the true faith will never fail in it." But we rightly forbid believing that the Church which calls itself true is the true Church, when nevertheless it does not manifest itself with the virtues befitting it before all good conscience. Therefore, in order to provide security for the soul, we are taught to aspire unfailingly to the first and infallible revelation which is contained in the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures.

V. Here the Romanists go in an entirely different direction, and in this denial of the foundation they so betray their apostasy from Christ as if they were writing it with a ray of the sun. For they contend that the first and infallible revelation must be sought from the Church, and that its judgment and definitive sentence precedes the judgment of the Scriptures. And it tends to no other end than alleviating the odium of their rashness when they say that they grant primacy to the Scriptures, but require the public interpretation of the Church in other matters. For what else is Scripture interpreted by the Church and subjected to its infallible judgment, than the judgment of the Church preceding the sense of Scripture contained by the Holy Spirit? Scripture itself has no authority for them, but the interpretation of the Church which renders the sense of the Scriptures. Moreover, that interpretation is, as they wish, the Church's. Therefore, they make the judgment of the Church prior and more ancient.

Here is a translation of the text into English:

VI. But this very thing which they say, that the Church is infallible in the interpretation of the sacred will of God, they entangle with such winding subtleties that there is nothing more so. They play with words, not expressing sincerely and faithfully what they wish to be understood. For by "the Church" they mean the particular Roman Church, whether that one is truly the Church being greatly disputed. But why do I say they mean the Roman Church, when it is quite clear that they wish this power to be claimed for the Roman Bishop alone, the idol of the Roman Church?

VII. For what has the Roman Church, according to not only the common perception but even of the theologians in her communion, who like the flatterers of Dionysius lick up the spittle of the Pope, that is infallible if you depart from the one Roman Pontiff? To such an extent that Suarez did not hesitate to assert that in his time all Catholic doctors taught this (Disputation 5 on Faith, Section 8, no. 4). Those who with Gerson, a man otherwise of most illustrious name, maintain that the Roman Pontiff is liable to judgment by the Church, they denounce as bordering on heresy. But this is even more apparent from the facts themselves. For properly speaking, that Roman Church which is assembled in the city of Rome consists of the Pope as Bishop, the clergy, and finally the remaining people. But it can easily happen that both the clergy and the people dissent from the Pope. For example, when the Emperor Louis IV, that great ornament of the Bavarian family, caused a Roman Council to be convened with the Roman people, in which Pope John was declared a heretic in the year 1338, and Peter of Corbara was substituted in his place. No one at all devoted to Roman authority would grant that on that occasion the Roman clergy and people were immune from error. Therefore, at that time the infallible Church was solely the Roman Pontiff. What of the fact that they both see and profess that particular Churches, Councils, Bishops, and Doctors can fail and become heretical? So that it is most clear that at least most of those devoted to the Roman Curia and the Canonists make this gift of infallibility to belong solely to a General Council, convened and governed under the presidency of the Roman Bishop. But He by whose sole presiding authority and rigid nod matters stand or fall, while the rest flit about like shadows, must alone possess such great power.

VIII. Yet it is right to confess that a certain necessity has befallen the Papacy similar to that of worldly empires which, if we believe the panegyrist Pliny, are held together by fear and terror, an unfaithful teacher of duty. Thus there has been such wavering until now concerning a matter of such great importance; with continual dissensions the edifice of their iniquitous dominion has labored. You may rightly wonder that the Gloss itself, on Chapter 1, as Silvester Prierias also observes in his Summa under the word "Church," writes: "The Church which cannot err is said to be not the Pope, but the congregation of the faithful, namely that which holds the faith which Peter taught along with the other peoples. And for this reason it is called the Roman Church and the faith of the Roman Church, whether they be at Rome or elsewhere." Indeed, that Pope John XXII himself, in his Extravagant "Quia Quorundam," when some Franciscans advocating certain definitions of previous Popes in support of their cause, broke forth in these words: "But that which is promised in the aforesaid argument (namely, that the successors of the Supreme Pontiffs are not permitted to call into doubt or affirm the contrary of those things which have once been defined by them through the key of knowledge in matters of faith and conduct, although the opposite may be the case, as they say, in those matters which the Supreme Pontiffs ordain through the key of power), is utterly contrary to the truth, as is evident from the following..." And then he subjoins arguments not to be despised.

IX. What those who rule in this world today and outwardly participate in the rites of the Popes think in their heart, I certainly do not have clearly to say. It is not for me to penetrate into the secret chambers of the faith of Emperors, Kings, and Princes. Yet there are many indications that not all have believed or do now believe in that infallible vicariate of the Pope. Certainly all those who have taken exception to this faith, who prohibited the promulgation of the Council of Trent, in which the errors of the Papacy previously formed were confirmed with horrendous incantations. But it is well known that the Kings of France did this, although the clergy gnashed their teeth, and in the fifteenth year of this century endeavored to innovate. How much scruple those things which one who recently defended the practice of the Belgians concerning the reception of Papal Bulls most accurately related about the events surrounding the promulgation and reception of the Council of Trent in Belgium have injected into somewhat more prudent persons concerning the opinion of the Kings of Spain, I do not know. Whoever has weighed with right estimation what the same by far most learned man disputed in chapter 11 of the same little book in favor of the ancient Belgian institution of not admitting Papal Bulls without letters of permission or consent of the Prince, will be far from believing that the infallibility of the Pope was entirely pleasing to the Kings of Spain. Perhaps even the Emperor Charles V of most praiseworthy memory did not firmly persuade himself of it, since he did not hesitate to appeal from the Pope to a Council, "the authority of the Pontifical name having been deleted throughout all Spain," as Thuanus says. I will say nothing of Ferdinand I and Maximilian II, of whom the one commanded Casiander, the other Wicelius, after the Council was already finished, to lead the way of Royal truth. Nothing of the Princes of Italy, nothing of the Venetian Senate, who with illustrious documents proved that they did not wish to be deceived by such foolish credulity.

X. Yet the Pontiff arrogates to himself the infallible vicariate of Christ's Spirit; the Canonists everywhere affirm it; the Gregorian Dictates rendered it venerable; the common people adore it; blind superstition worships it; the Jesuits defend it with whatever interdicts; in short, whoever is

a genuine Papist is bound to believe it from the heart. Moreover, in the case of the Roman Pontiff himself, because it has seemed advisable to do so on account of their reproaches or professed heresies, they distinguish the man and private doctor from the public and Catholic doctor, solemnly defining a doctrine of faith from the Chair of Peter. Truly a useful and convenient distinction, if only it were sufficiently explained and expounded. But what if to be a public doctor and to define from the Chair is so obscure and intricate that no one can sufficiently extricate it? For some think it sufficient for the Pope to define something from the Chair if he has previously obtained the opinion of selected Cardinals, while others think the whole assembly of Cardinals must be summoned; still others consider neither necessary, provided only that those familiar with the matter have been consulted; and finally, on such a slippery matter of opinions and endless contentions about so great a matter, scarcely anyone can satisfy himself. Hence it happened recently, when Innocent X defined in the Jansenian cause with the assistance of some selected Cardinals, that some denied those to have been definitions from the Chair, while others adored Innocent's definitions as most sacred. Since neither can they infallibly teach me what it means to define from the Chair, nor do I have the means to learn so great a matter from elsewhere, I shall for now rest in this question: Whether the Roman Pontiff, for example the present Alexander VII, considered as the public doctor and defining from the Chair of Peter, being instructed by the vicarious Spirit of Christ, is infallible in all his decrees concerning the salutary Christian religion? I am pleased to show the irrationality of the affirmative in a few words.

XI. And first of all, I think it must be admitted by all that it cannot be gathered by any human reasoning whether God has instructed the Roman Pontiff with the vicarious Spirit of Christ, who would infallibly judge controversies of Faith. For just as those things which are of mere human choice cannot be known if men have not declared their mind, so even less can those things which are of divine choice be known without a revelation from God. This is evident from the very essence of free will. It is also more forcefully evident from the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 2:11: "For what man knows the things of a man except the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God." And indeed the whole matter of the means of saving man is so mystical that neither the angels nor the archangels can penetrate it by reasoning (Ephesians 3:9-10).

XII. If therefore it was God's purpose to declare the Pope as the infallible Vicar of Christ, He then made this known to those men whose interest it is to know this, either by miracles or by most clear other testimonies. For since that mission is internal and hidden, it could scarcely be demonstrated in any other way. Innocent III seems to have recognized this in book 5 of the Decretals, title 7, chapter 12: "Since the internal mission is hidden," he says, "it is not sufficient for anyone merely to assert that he himself is sent by God, since any heretic could affirm this; but he ought to affirm that infallible mission by the working of a miracle or by a special testimony of Scripture." Nor did the Prophets and Apostles make known their mission to all in any other way, whose authority and power nevertheless rests second after the Pope's.

XIII. But by one or the other mode, whether the present Pontiff or his predecessors have become distinguished and consequently been men commended by divine miracles and powers,

or in any other way have clearly given proof of the truth until now, they have not done so. Concerning divine miracles, the matter indeed requires no proof, since they themselves readily grant that the Pope does not possess the power of miracles. Unless perhaps that illustrious miracle of Innocent IV is to be referred to this category, when he attempted to depart from the First Council of Lyons, which they themselves number among the ecumenical councils - the history of which can be read in the contemporary English writer Matthew Paris, or another who added an appendix to the history of the year 1251. But most clear testimonies confirming this divine authority are equally lacking. For they either contend that they are being given today, or that they were given long ago. That none are being given today is evident from the facts and experience.

XIV. If they were given long ago, they must undoubtedly have been recorded in written documents. For here that very evident saying of Livy applies: "That letters are the one faithful guardian of the memory of deeds" (Ab Urbe Condita 1.1). And the reason is at hand. For a report transmitted by word of mouth is easily corrupted, especially if it must pass through the mouths of many over a long period of time. For to this pertains the saying: "Rumor is an evil thing." But God willed to transmit the means of obtaining salvation, among which they number this infallible vicariate, to the memory of posterity in the most complete form possible. For which reason it could not be done at all without writing. In human affairs, the image of this matter is in a certain way more certain. For in matters of greater importance, no faith is placed in a legate or pro-prince without written documents, unless the Prince can orally confer credibility on the legate. Which was also observed for Boniface VIII in the supplement to the comment on decretals regarding elections: "He who asserts that he has come with the mandates of the Prince is not to be believed unless he proves it in writing. Nor likewise is one claiming to be a legate to be believed. For the Apostolic See has never been accustomed to receive a legation from anywhere without authenticated letters. But he who says he is a delegate of that same See is not believed or heeded unless he furnishes ocular proof of his Apostolic mandate." How much more ought written documents to be demanded in the momentous matter of Religion, in the first principle of faith?

XV. Here, therefore, we bid farewell to the unwritten Tradition which they would wish to be received here with equal pious affection as the Scriptures. For it cannot bear testimony in a matter of such importance. And it is apparent that the principles of salvation must proceed from the Holy Spirit, because they are supernatural things. But how unreliable an instrument is tradition for this purpose, whose origin is for the most part obscure and not very faithfully investigated? And since things of this kind admit of variety, it is agreed that criteria are needed by which the truth or falsehood of traditions is to be judged. But these very criteria are nowhere found reliably outside the Scriptures. Nor is the situation of the doctrines of faith the same as that of other actually existing things. These latter can be more easily preserved. The memory of the former is fleeting and all too perishable, because they exist only through the operation of the mind.

XVI. Therefore, that divine infallible vicariate ought to have been provided for by written documents. But absolutely nothing at all is found which was written under the guidance of the

Holy Spirit, if you depart from the books of the Old and New Testaments. If therefore that infallible vicariate was committed to written booklets, it must be demonstrated in the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures. But here with great fairness all those desiring eternal salvation and a good conscience will demand, since they contend that all must render obedience to this infallible vicar under penalty of eternal condemnation, that this pretended power be shown in such clear and perspicuous words that to anyone whose interest it is to tread the way of salvation, it may be easy to read and understand such a momentous and severe sentence. For any law inducing obligation on the conscience ought to be clear and perspicuous. Hence in Distinction 4 Gratian has included these words of Isidore: "Moreover, a law ought to be honorable, just, possible, according to nature, according to the custom of the country, suitable to place and time, necessary also, lest it contain anything ensnaring through obscurity."

XVII. Although indeed many frankly admit that this infallible vicarious nature from written documents, setting aside the infallibility of Tradition, cannot be demonstrated, as was recently done by Valeriano M. a Capuchin: nevertheless, others, who have more shame, labor at this, that by adducing a few testimonies they may give credence to their cause. But those that speak of Peter are most celebrated, Matt. XVI.18, John XXI.15,16, those concerning the Church Matt.XVIII.17, 1 Tim.III.15. As regards the former, before I proceed to render their understanding, I would call upon all who are free from party zeal, whether they find anything clearly and expressly written in those passages concerning the Roman Pontiff? Whether they think that a legate would sufficiently provide for implicit faith by such documents? Whether any one, knowing and prudent, who would not wish to be deceived on purpose, would, under fear of eternal punishment, venerate him, who obtrudes himself by use of documents of trust or laws?

The ambiguity has devolved upon the universal Church, as to which part the true Roman See was, unless perchance God had revealed it to some one; or unless the judgment of Solomon concerning the dividing of the child between the true and false mother should persuade this. And indeed, since in a schism the Pontificate is with one party only, but the rest are Anti-Popes, their successors too will not be true Popes, and so not the heirs of Peter's virtues. Now the seventh and eighth are numbered from Urban VI: from that Anti-Pope Clement VI, Clement VII and VIII. The third, fourth, and fifteenth of that name from Gregory XII: the sixth, Alexander, the successors of that Anti-Pope Alexander V, professed themselves to be. If therefore Urban VI and Gregory XII were legitimate Popes, it is necessary that Clement VI, VII, VIII, and also Alexander VI, were pseudo-Pontiffs. But if perchance Urban VI, VII, VIII too, and in like manner Gregory XII, XIII, XIV, and XV deserve to be excluded from the number of Pontiffs; it appears how great a gap there is in the Pontifical succession.

(Not sure why there is a skip in numbering)

XXII. What shall I say of the truth of the Papal doctrine? In which most disgraceful and fundamental errors, most foul idolatry, most iniquitous tyranny and shameless domination widely prevail. Peter indeed constantly adhered to that most steadfast prophetic word, and (went) towards the faith delivered by the holy (ones); the Roman Pontiff has confounded the highest with the lowest. He has occupied Christ's place in these lands, and thence lays down laws with

authority over the consciences of men, over Kings, Kingdoms and States, and stalks with edicts. As for us, he suspends the authority of the divine Word on the testimony of the Church, and thus, to use Tertullian's words, he weighs the divinity by his own judgment. What God willed to be loosed, he binds, and looses what is bound. Hence indulgences, dispensations. At his discretion, he appoints a reward for good works. He admits whomsoever he pleases to Heaven by the golden ladder of canonization, a new matter distinguished by a new name. With wonderful rashness he has erected a tribunal in the Church, whence either he himself, or his legates, may pronounce the remission of sins, or retain them, not by any certain law, but by plenitude of power. He arrogates to himself infinite power, whereby he may lord it over the living and the dead. He shuts or opens Heaven: he frees souls severed from the body from Purgatory: Finally, he enslaves to himself the whole Church, wherever it extends, in Heaven as on Earth, the very Angels themselves, as the Papal Bulls clamor. These and the like are most alien from that prophetic word which Peter willed to be kept, and from the doctrine of the faith once delivered.

XXIII. The case is the same with sanctity and innocence of manners; which indeed the Gregorian dictates themselves have handed down as being by virtue of the merits of the blessed Peter, joined to that holy Apostolic throne. On which point there is no need that we add a word to what in France the Archbishop of Aix, Genebrard; in Italy, and in the very Roman Court itself, the great Cardinal Caesar Baronius, have left to be known to posterity concerning those apostate, arrogant, monstrous men, of most disgraceful life, of most abandoned manners, monsters horrid to look upon, paramours of harlots. In Spain, too, Bartolomé Carranza, after he had in his Summary of the Councils spoken of Christopher and Sergius, who filled the throne at the beginning of the tenth century, added: You may see how far the Pontiffs have degenerated from their ancestors, that it is no wonder if some abuses and perverse opinions have crept into the Church.

XXIV. You will in vain, too, require dexterity in the conduct of affairs in this man. Nothing were more fair than that the infallible Vicar of Christ in Religion should be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and convict the gainsayers. Nothing of the kind in the Roman Pontiff. For it is evident that scarce one or two within almost a thousand years have spoken to the people on a Sacred Subject. And not histories alone testify to this, but at that very time Marsilius of Padua complained that for the most part they were pettifoggers who scaled that most holy chair. Alphonso de Castro, a Spaniard, did not hesitate to assert, as it were before the world as witness: That most Popes are so illiterate as to be utterly ignorant of Grammar. And of Clement VII, Paul Jovius (says): "Almost totally untinctured with letters, but with a mind so debased and sticking to the meanest mechanical arts and sumptuary devices, that he pried with excessive and almost disgraceful curiosity into the mysteries and niceties of workmanship": Book 21. I shall omit now to commemorate what on these matters, everywhere, and after his wont, gravely and truly, Francesco Guicciardini, an Italian, on whom Leo X himself conferred a benefit, and whose army he commanded, has related.

XXV. We shall undoubtedly consider that dexterity in the conduct of affairs pertains also to immunity from fundamental error. And indeed before Albertus Pighius, Bellarmine, and other

parasites, no one doubted that the Pope could become a heretic. So much so, that Melchior Canus, in book 4, chapter 8 of the Loci Communes, did not hesitate to write: "The contrary opinion is entirely new in the Church." And Dominicus Bannes, the most celebrated Master of Theology of Salamanca, disproves this opinion in many ways, as false, rash, and welling indeed from piety, but not according to knowledge: Commentary 1, tome 9, p.141 of the Venice edition. Nor could Bellarmine cite anyone older than Pighius in support of his opinion. And we have testimonies of facts: namely, that Felix and Liberius assented to the Arians; Vigilius to the Eutychians; Honorius to the Monothelites. And therefore in former times Gerhardus Odo, when he defended the cause of John XXII against Michael of Cesena, frankly confessed: "That Liberius was a heretic": as may be seen in Bzovius' Annals under the year 1341.

XXVI. Whoever shall weigh aright those things which have now been adduced by us, will at the same time undoubtedly observe how absurd is the argumentation from a succession of this kind to the privilege of an infallible vicariate in common with the Apostle Peter. And therefore, if either Peter or the Church has anything of a vicarious infallibility, no part of that inheritance redounds to the Pope. For is it compatible with the Divine Wisdom, and goodness, nay, even the justice of God towards His Church, that he should be designated to us as the Vicar of Christ by so obscure a law, who has turned his mind so much for the worse from the Apostolic virtues? Since this is utterly repugnant to reason, I still insist, and demand over and over again, that they show us the written documents of God, in which this very thing is clearly set down: That it is God's will to impose an obscure law on Christ's Church, accredited only on this condition, that he sit at Rome, and magnificently put himself forward, and triumph in God's Church with a sort of imperial sway, although he depart from the Spirit of Christ and the faithful, and go on to stain and defile with almost countless defilements the pretended Apostolic dignity. What canonical Scripture is witness here? What trustworthy tradition of the Church? But now we will inspect more deeply and familiarly those very passages which our opponents have adduced above for themselves.

XXVII. First then, in that passage which our opponents have perpetually on their lips, Christ thus addresses Peter: "Thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my Church" (Matt. XVI. 19). Whatever grace the Lord here repaid to Peter confessing Him the Son of God, the Pope thence derives and carves out nothing for himself, as we have seen above. Thus far indeed I profess that Peter was furnished with the infallible vicarious Spirit of Christ, because he had to consign a part of the canon. For thus he truly wrote, not being acted by human will, but "borne along by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. I. 21). "Divinely inspired" (1 Tim. III. 16). Nor did he himself speak, but "the Spirit of the Father spoke in him" (Matt. X. 20). And he had this singular gift of God in common with the other Apostles. But in Christ's words under controversy, what do they breathe of an infallible vicariate bestowed upon Peter alone, a sort of spiritual imperial sovereignty? Do these words, "Thou art Peter," (import this)? And yet the name Peter had been imposed upon Simon Bar-Jonah by the Lord before this. What then is the new force of these words? Namely, Christ, purposing to commit to Peter together with the other Apostles the charge of tending His spiritual edifice, purposely recalls to his memory his new name, that He may rouse his mind by this appellation, as Chrysostom often speaks. Therefore he was called Peter, that this name might be as it were a symbol and pledge of the Divine aid, by which in the administration of the

greatest matters he should be firm, constant, and undaunted like some rock. Christ was the Rock, in whom spiritual fortitude resides. From this spiritual Rock, which the Greeks would call ὀμοπέτρα, Simon was called Peter, as from Christ is derived Christian, and of old Tullius from cicer, Cicero: Calpurnius from piso, Piso. But this spiritual fortitude from Christ the Rock was conferred on Simon no more than on the rest of the Apostles, to whom Roman Pontiffs would not have this infallible and Monarchical vicariate imposed.

XXVIII. Or do the following words rather, "Upon this rock I will build my Church," promise so great power? So let them judge. Is it then because (he was) a rock, or because the Church was built upon him? They contend vainly for either. And as to the former, what will they answer Origen in his first Tract on Matthew; Gregory of Nyssa in his book "On Perfection"; Thomas in the "Golden Chain," who will have every believer designated by the name Peter? What (will they say) to those who, with Chrysostom on this passage, with Augustine in his Tract 10 on the 1st Epistle of John, with Basil of Seleucia in his Sermon on this pericope of Matthew, understood by the rock the faith of Peter? What to those who, with Augustine and other Fathers, nay, with the Apostle of the Gentiles himself (1 Cor. III.11), understood Christ Himself to be the Rock? But granting that the Lord distinguished Peter as the rock, can they thus make out that the infallible vicariate of Christ rested on Peter's shoulders alone? And yet the word rock, where by a sort of metaphor it is predicated of creatures, signifies nothing of the kind. Chrysostom excellently indeed, in the Homily delivered after the taking of Eutropius, (declares) that such titles, which God does not disdain to communicate to His mortal servants, when attributed to God declare the reality: when to men, the honor of the name. This appellation therefore in Peter's case was rather κατὰ μετοχὴν than κατὰ φύσιν. By a similar figure the Apostles were called "the light of the world" (Matt. V.14) when Christ alone is the true light (John I.). So Christ alone is truly the Teacher of the Church (Matt. XXIII.8): yet His Ministers are continually in Scripture called Teachers and Instructors. The case is similar in our cause. Christ equally with the Father and the Holy Spirit is the Rock, partly to indicate the origin and cause of existence: partly in relation to the Church, which He Himself constituted and redeemed with His blood, to which therefore He gives being and permanence, συνέχει καὶ κρατεῖ. Which predicates, since they belong to God alone, it appears that the infallible vicariate of Christ in Peter is preposterously concluded from the similitude of the appellation.

XXIX. Nor from the latter (part) is the conclusion valid, that Peter was (what they would have him), because Christ was about to build His Church upon him. We indeed readily, with Augustine and the other Fathers just praised, refer this complex of words to Christ. But then, they say, why did Christ not use οἰκοδομῆσαι but οἰκοδομήσω? Had not Christ first built His Church? Was He not just then building it, when He spoke these words? Certainly Christ was, is, and will be the Rock and Foundation of the Church to all eternity, from whom alone it borrows that strength and those powers by which it stands unconquered and impregnable against every force. But because, after the advent, and especially after the exaltation of Christ, so great a light of the Gospel shone forth that it obscures the light of all past time, therefore this is said comparatively, not absolutely. Next, this is said in respect of the Gentiles, who were to be called to Christ by the preaching of the Gospel. But let us grant that the Church was built upon Peter, so that Peter was the foundation of the Church, in the same way as those are called pillars of

the Church (Gal. II.), by whose labor the structure of the Church is sustained: they will make no progress towards the sum of the matter. For the Church also is built upon the Apostles (Apoc. XXI. 14, Eph. II. 19), whom yet they would not bless with this infallible vicariate. And this interpretation indeed has been pursued by Tertullian no less diffusely than excellently in his book "On Modesty," ch. 21.

XXX. The next passage much vaunted by the opponents for Peter's vicariate is John XXI, 15, 16: "Feed my sheep." But what has the office of feeding in common with the gift of a vicarious infallibility? with the charge of powerful might? with the office a benefice? He who has the parts of a feeder should undoubtedly set before the sheep entrusted to him the pure and limpid streams, as Basil rightly calls them, and take care that they nowhere go headlong. But indeed, though we piously believe that Peter discharged the mandate of Christ, who would dare to aver that the Roman Pontiff does this? Moreover, nothing was added to Peter above his associates. For the whole pastoral charge, in the name of every creature, was granted to all the Apostles (Matt. XXVIII). And by general words Christ, "Whosesoever sins ye remit," etc., in the powers themselves given them when He sent them, as the Father had sent Himself (John XX. 12, 23), enjoined the offices of feeding upon all the Apostles. Did Christ then make all the Apostles equal by the lot of this vicarious infallibility? And yet the Lord addressed Peter in particular, and three times. I grant it. But that He might confirm him in that calling from which he had fallen by his threefold denial, if he had been treated according to his deserts. Cyril beautifully and clearly (says): "The triple confession of Peter was therefore made to do away the threefold denial. But He said, 'Feed my sheep,' renewing to him the dignity of the Apostleship, lest it should seem shaken by the denial which happened through human infirmity." (On John, Book 12, ch. 64). If the Apostleship alone was renewed to him, what then did he receive which the other Apostles had not? But perhaps Bellarmine's criticism, which he uttered in these words, will have place: "The Lord committed to Peter the care of the lambs, that is, of the Jewish people: and of the sheep, that is, of the Gentile people: and of the sheep, that is, of those who had begotten those lambs in Christ, who are the Apostles and Bishops." Forsooth, so great a burden could not otherwise be sustained than by the frivolous distinction of lambs and sheep, which not even the Greek text, but the Vulgate version supplied. But the Greek text in the second enunciation has not πρόβατα but προβάτια. Nor is it of any consequence what the Cardinal excepts, that the Greek reading is to be corrected, and in the second enunciation προβάτια is to be written, because Ambrose in the last chapter of Luke rendered it "little sheep." For when Ambrose wrote this, he had not the Greek text before his eyes, but the Latin interpreter, whom he slightly modified, so as to write "little sheep" instead of "lambs," which two are not different things.

XXXI. The next passage for this vicarious infallibility is Matt. XVIII. 17: "Tell it unto the Church." A marvelous paraphrase indeed: "Tell it to the Roman Pontiff." What has unity in common with a multitude? If it is to be told to the Church, why to the particular Roman Church? If to the particular Roman Church, why to the Pontiff, who lords it without legitimate title? Next, it is clear that the question here is not about the abdicating of a sentence concerning controversies of faith, but about ἔλεγχος and rebuke, how far, namely, we ought to proceed before we hold him that has sinned as a heathen man. For it does not come down to ἐξήγησις, but to ἔλεγχος. And such a rebuke even two or three, nay, one of the brethren can administer, to whom no power

belongs of defining the doctrines of faith, and that indeed infallibly. For no one person can command another in his own name what he shall believe or do; but even all children might rebuke, by setting forth the certain word of God. For rebuke among Christians is administered either by reasons known to the conscience by nature, or also, and that necessarily in matters of mystery, by the word of God revealing that mystery. "But," say they, "the power of the rebuker in matters of faith is equal to that of one proposing a doctrine of faith." It is so. But since rebuke is administered from the Scriptures, it is necessary that the power also of one proposing a doctrine of faith, as being a limited power, be made subordinate to the judgment of the Scriptures. And therefore, whosoever proposes a doctrine of faith, whether he be the Roman Pontiff or anybody else, holds the position of a subordinate judge, whose sentence stands if it rests on law, does not stand if it is given against the law. Moreover, from this it does not follow, any more than from the other, that the vicarious infallibility of Christ resides in the Papal chancery, than that every private person endowed with saving faith is put in possession of so great a prerogative.

XXXII. The last passage hackneyed in this matter is the Apostolic one, 1 Tim. III. 15, where Paul calls the Church the pillar and ground of the truth. What has this to do with the Pontiff? What with the particular Roman Church, which has defected from the fundamental truth, and from the old and most generous wine has turned into the worst vinegar? The true Church of Christ is indeed a pillar, inasmuch as it is a stronghold, a stable and firm thing, a thing well and again and again founded (Ps. VIII. 3, Isa. XXVIII. 16). It is also the ground of the truth: in both ways, passively and actively. Passively indeed, because it is founded in the truth, and by it is made firm. For as all believers are grounded and settled, so also the Church. If it have not the fundamental truth, as a basis it will not be a thing made firm and fixed. But actively, in so far as it ministers to God for making known and preserving the truth in the world. For thus it sets forth the principle of belief, which is Scripture, from which it shows the foundation of saving doctrine, the doctrine, that is, of faith and repentance. But since the Roman Church, and the Pope, the Dictator of the Roman faith of today, hands down another word as the law of God, lays another foundation, it has therefore neither the name nor the properties of the true Church, and is the pillar and ground of falsehood rather than of truth. Nor is the Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, infallible by reason of this office. It does not indeed err, in so far as it is such in fundamental truth. Not therefore can it not err, because any particular Church can also deflect from its office. To not err denies the act: to be infallible, denies the capability.

XXXIII. And these are the principal texts which the Champions of the Papal power insist upon. Since these attain neither heaven nor earth, it appears that the principle of the Papistical faith concerning the infallible vicariate of the Pope is to be regarded as not written, and therefore as rash, false, impious, finally such as overthrows fundamental truth in that body, and kills the Church. Moreover, we add not a word, since it is altogether manifest that the opponents have failed in proving the affirmative dogma. But that the burden of proof lies on the affirmant both the laws cry out, and the Sophists themselves frequently have on their lips.

THEOLOGICAL EXAMINATION THE ONE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH

In which the pamphlets of an emissary, published under a royal name, extolling the Roman Church with the title of that One, Catholic and Apostolic Church which we profess in the Creeds, are brought to the test.

With JEHOVAH as Guide and Patron;

UNDER THE PRESIDENCY OF
JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, D.D. in Sacred Theology and Primary Professor

THE RESPONDENT BEING
JAMES STEINBRUCHELIUS, Preacher of the Divine Word

THE ASSISTANT
FELIX BALBERUS, Candidate in Sacred Theology

The Day before the Synod, at the Accustomed Hour and Place.

ZURICH
Printed by the Gesners
1687

I. For some time now two quite recent pamphlets concerning religion have been circulating through the Christian world, prepared, if we may believe it, by some Serene Prince of Europe, not long since deceased, and translated from English into various languages - French, Dutch, German - with Jesuits acting as midwives. The subject is the examination of the One, Catholic, Apostolic Church, which we profess especially in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, according to a certain rule of faith. The aim of the undertaking is to demonstrate that the axiom of the One, Catholic, Apostolic Church belongs to none other than the Roman Church. Moreover, since both have the same subject and aim, after we have brought the one, and therefore the earlier, to the test for the sake of confirming and asserting the Heavenly Truth, fair judges of this matter will judge that satisfaction has been given to both.

II. Thus the former pamphlet, composed in the form of a letter, runs as follows: "I certainly hope that the conversation lately exchanged with you fully satisfied you as regards that chief point, that Christ can have but one Church on earth. But as it is most true that some Scripture has been adduced, so I truly believe that no other true Church can exist except that which is called Roman Catholic. Nor do I think it worth while to enter into the ocean of particular questions, since the principal, nay the only question is: Where is to be found that Church which in those two Creeds we profess to believe? We confess there that we believe in one Catholic, Apostolic

Church. Nor is anyone here free to believe according to his own fancy what seems good to him; but we are bound to the Church, to which Christ has granted authority on earth to direct us in matters of faith, and which has itself also composed those Creeds for our guidance..." And so on.

III. Whether the author of the writing was that Serene Prince of glorious memory whose name is prefixed, or rather, as someone seems to have asserted not without plausible indications, some emissary of the Pope's, about to make a great proselyte and draw him into the Roman Fisherman's net, and plant a new Paradise for the Pope (for the Pontiffs themselves have proclaimed Antichrist to have been their Paradise) - this indeed I care little about. Those who declare the Prince to be the author, I fear lest while minding other matters they may seem to brand him, who was never such, with the indelible stigma of a βλακα μελανηφόρος or soothsayer, he who, placed in a lofty position, was far removed from the causes of grace and fear, since they thus represent him seriously reasoning from the inmost marrow of his soul, and sounding the praises of the Roman Church with a keen pipe, though to his death he had commerce with our sacred rites, but none whatever with those of the Romans.

IV. But be he the author of the writing. Laying aside the prejudice induced by the splendor of the person, I shall meet him not with my own words, but those of Tertullian. Thus he writes in his book "On Prescriptions against Heretics" ch. 3: "Some of those proselytes or unstable folk are wont, if persons of eminence have been overtaken from the Church by heresy, to be forthwith rebuilt (by their example) to their ruin. 'How is it that men of so great faith, so great wisdom, so great experience, have gone over to that opinion?' Everyone opposes to himself the same answer, that 'they will not be proved to have been wise, faithful, understanding, whom heresies have been able to pervert.'...Let a bishop, a deacon, a widow, a virgin, a doctor, ay and even a martyr, have fallen from the rule - will heresies, on the ground of this default on the part of persons of eminence, be thought to have got the truth on their side? Do we prove faith by persons, or persons by faith? No one is wise but the faithful; no one is really noble but a Christian; no one a Christian but he who shall persevere to the end...You regard but the outward man; God sees the inner heart; and therefore He knows those that are His, and from them He removes that plant which His Heavenly Father never planted...So far let them disport themselves as they please with the lightness of the wind and wandering blasts, with the shifting marquee of their fragile faith; every breeze of temptation will speedily scatter and disperse them. The more the chaff is winnowed away, the more the grain is rescued for the Lord's granary..." He subjoins much more exceedingly beautiful to the same effect. But St. James in chapter 2:1 has comprehended many things in a few words, forbidding us to hold the faith of our glorious Lord Jesus Christ with respect of persons. We must cease therefore from man, in whose nostrils is breath. For what reputation has he in faith, says Isaiah 2:22? Let cause contend with cause, reason with reason.

V. The Author sets forth beforehand that Jesus Christ can have no other than one Church on earth. Thus it is. For there is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all. Ephesians 4:4-6. Each of these testifies to the unity of the Church. As

there is one Shepherd, so there is one flock, John 10:16. Jesus Christ himself testifies that his beloved Spouse and Dove is one, Song of Songs 6:8: "My dove, my perfect one, is the only one, the only one of her mother, pure of her who gave her birth." For every form of government instituted by Christ tends toward the unity of the faith, Ephesians 4:13, which makes those who possess it disciples of God and Christ, the Spouse and body of the same. Concerning this unity of the Church, Cyprian left to posterity a little book worthy of cedar wood, commonly called "On the Simplicity of Prelates," but better entitled "On the Unity of the Church" in Pammelius's edition, where among other things he says thus: "Concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, it is written: 'And these three are one'; and if anyone believes that this unity, which comes from the Divine immutability and coheres in the heavenly Sacraments, can be rent asunder in the Church and separated by conflicting wills?"

He who does not hold to this unity does not hold to the law of God, does not hold to the faith of the Father and the Son, does not hold to life and salvation. This Sacrament of unity, this bond of inseparably cohering concord, is shown when in the Gospel the tunic of Jesus Christ is not divided or torn at all, but after the soldiers had cast lots for Christ's garment to determine who would put it on, the tunic itself is acquired whole and undivided, and the unrent and unseparated tunic is possessed. He cannot possess the garment of Christ who rends and divides the Church of God.

VI. Yet the one Church of Christ is not like a worldly kingdom, which is contained within one external society and communion of ruling and obeying men, confined to certain places and limits, and governed by human, not Divine counsels. The Author certainly did not understand such a cathedral or communion with a particular chair and the spirit of the Pope, which must be submitted to by necessity for salvation. But rather in a spiritual and Catholic manner, whereby under Christ alone as the Head residing in Heaven at the right hand of Majesty, all the faithful, as members of one body, having their commonwealth not on earth though sojourning on earth (Philippians 3:20), compacted together by the same Spirit of faith and love, coalesce into one, wherever on earth they may dwell, without any relation in the New Testament to communion with this or that illustrious and particular chair, whose name, power and authority may be necessary for salvation. For the Kingdom of Christ is not of this world, John 18:36, nor does it come with outward display, Luke 17:20. This is the perpetual nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ. It is not a human, visible kingdom; not a people gathered by a human name to say and do what men command; nor to be estimated by those records about which men judge. Such a Kingdom is called in the Scriptures the Kingdom of the Beast, the Great City, Babylon, Egypt, Tyre. And since in this way the Church is one in the New Testament, as also Catholic, that is, universally one, it is no longer bound to any one place or people as formerly; not dedicated in the families of the Patriarchs, not located in the sacred Jewish nation, not finally allotted to and enslaved to any one nation. It is spread over the whole world, as far as it extends. Now the whole world is Zion, because in the whole world the Church can be spread, bound to no chair.

VII. We therefore maintain the true unity of the Church: the Romans rend it asunder and oppose it as much as they can. For what unity can there be among those who miserably rend the Church by introducing a false Head and human laws? This is evident both in the whole Eastern

Church, which they therefore regard as schismatic because it has always refused to subject and devote itself in bondage to this spurious Head (that is, the Enemy of Christ, the Hairy Head, to which many peoples cling like hair and tresses, Psalm 68:21); and also in many Western groups, to whom, though believing all things concerning God and Christ and His Kingdom and Covenant and Righteousness and Repentance and Sacraments in accordance with the Word of God, they have nevertheless denounced anathema, which they themselves, if they would listen to their own conscience, would not dare to deny. For formerly the Inquisitor Raynerius testified that the Waldenses believed rightly concerning religion, except for the authority of the Pope. And yet the Popes most cruelly condemned and persecuted them. Nor can any unity have a place where there is no agreement with the "mind of the just" (Luke 1:17) who were before them, whose judgment and opinion on controversial questions they will not be able to prove, unless the authority of the Pope is presupposed. What is more, the very faith of the Romans, split into so many totally different religions, differing not only in the color of their garments but even in their capital tenets, has long since lost all unity. Let them see for themselves what kind of unity their Church has. Distracted by their Heads, they are perhaps most united by their tails, that is, by the vows of blind obedience, like Samson's foxes.

VIII. St. Cyprian excellently describes the unity of the Church in On the Simplicity of Prelates, or On the Unity of the Church, page 110, as follows: "We ought to hold fast to this unity firmly and vindicate it, especially we who preside over the Church, so that we may approve the Episcopate itself to be one and undivided. Let no one deceive the brotherhood by lies, let no one corrupt the truth of the faith by wicked prevarication. The Episcopate is one, of which each partakes fully. The Church also is one, which is further extended with increase of fruitfulness into a multitude: as the sun has many rays, yet one light, etc. Break a ray of the sun from its body, its unity allows no division of light; tear a branch from the tree, once broken, it can bear no fruit. Thus the Church, flooded with the light of the Lord, puts forth her rays over the whole world, yet with one light alone; in the widespread luxuriant vineyard, she likewise puts forth her branches of copious fruitfulness, yet her origin is one... We are born from her womb, nourished by her milk, quickened by her breath. The Spouse of Christ cannot be defiled; she is chaste and pure. She knows but one home; she guards with modest reserve the sanctity of one bridal chamber. This and similar things Cyprian says in unison." If the Roman Church with this holy Martyr would incline the unity in brotherhood, in one truth, from one Head and Bridegroom, and the animation of one Spirit; and would direct the unity of the Episcopate, as he speaks above, by sharing the bond of honor and power in mutual agreement and reverence and unanimous worship of God, no pious Christian would scorn that unity. Yet in that way, no faithful person would hold unity any more in the Pope, or through him, than the Pope by the faith of Christ and love toward all saints would be excluded by the right of brotherhood.

IX. For how is unity established or able to be established in the Pope or through the Pope? For the unity of the Church resides in one faith: one faith in one Head, and through one Head. But we do not believe in the Pope or through the Pope. Nor is the unity of faith procured by the ministries of the Pope, whether he is considered as a Secular Prince, or as a particular Bishop, or as a universal Bishop. For insofar as he is a Secular Prince, having secular dominion, he cannot unite the Church to one faith, because in that case he does not preside over the whole

Church, but over certain regions and peoples, whose Prince he has become, by what right or injustice I will not say; and whom he is bound to lead to the true faith by those means and methods which God has commanded for Princes. Thus he will do no more for the unity of the Church than any other Prince or Magistrate zealous for the glory of God and the salvation of the people, namely, he will be an edifier of the Church according to that part which he governs. The same Pope, insofar as he is the Bishop or Minister of a particular Church, if he wishes to discharge the office of a good Pastor, will likewise do nothing more than any other Bishop and Teacher of the Church, faithfully feeding and teaching the Church in his respective part according to the measure of his gift and ministry. Finally, the same Pope, passing himself off as the universal Bishop of the Church, claiming for himself a general magisterium over all Churches and the privilege of not erring, and obtruding his actions, teachings, and definitions upon consciences as the rule of faith, has been found by the experience of former times to have not united the Church, but rather rent it asunder; and not to have procured the true faith, but rather extinguished it. And as long as those dogmas prevail on which Papal tyranny rests and superstition is nourished, all hope of moderation and sincerity from the Popes will fail. For what can we expect from the successors of those who, without groan, without tears, without any testimony of displeasure; and very often even instigating and applauding, behold the horrible calamities of so many years, by enduring which this one thing is effected, that men, even against the judgment of their own minds and with their consciences crying out and shrinking back, call themselves Papists, and sacrifice outwardly to that idol which the great city adores? Would that the Pope himself and his adherents would preserve the unity of the Head, guard the sincerity of doctrine and faith, and not tear asunder the unity of the body by their anathemas and persecutions; and finally, not disturb overmuch that "brotherly love" (by which word Cyprian describes the unity of the Church, which is the communion of brethren, not of lords and servants) by lording it over the clergy! Thus there would be no faithful person who would scorn their communion; nor would anything stand in the way for the Evangelicals to associate with them in friendship and make covenants.

But I recount the words of the Sibyl. Indeed, unless the Pope would separate himself from unity, and prefer to play the lord rather than the brother, he would not be the Pope, and would have unity with us.

X. To such a degree have all things been turned for the worse: nor does the modern Roman Church have anything in common with the ancient, truly Catholic and Apostolic Rome, the truest example of sincerity of faith and humility. Whatever the Author may confidently assert, no Scripture has truly been published stating that he truly believes no other Church can exist than that which is called Roman Catholic. What the Author believes is not the question, but how rightly he believes. For it has been foretold that God will send a powerful delusion to those not receiving the love of the truth, so that they will believe the lie, 2 Thessalonians 2:10-11. Perhaps others believe more rightly than how truly some Scripture exists, and how true and Divine its word is; both that by which the saving faith and religion is described, and also that by which the apostasy in the Church of the last times, the reign of Antichrist and of the Great Babylon, is foretold. As truly as that, so truly has the modern Roman Church, especially the dominating Hierarchy or Clergy in it, suffered shipwreck of the true faith, and moreover become idolatrous in

worship and tyrannical, not Apostolic but Apostate, in government, and has existed and does exist more and more so from many centuries ago.

Here is a translation of the text into English:

XI. This was the faith of innumerable Witnesses of the truth both before and after the times of the Reformation, not only from the lowest ranks and dregs of men (although God has chosen especially the foolish things of the world, so that no flesh may boast before Him, 1 Corinthians 1:26-29), but even from the highest and royal dignity. I will not mention that there was a King of France who, distressed with the Pope, had struck on a coin the words: "I will destroy the name of Babylon." The greatest and wisest King of England, Scotland and Ireland, most learned in both sacred and human letters, who took unique and profound care to read and understand the Scriptures, endowed with a spiritual genius, James I of Glorious Memory, not only in his Monitory Preface addressed to His Most Sacred Imperial Majesty Rudolph II and the other Most Serene Monarchs and Kings of the Christian World, page 307 etc., convicted the modern Roman Church of Antichristian and Babylonian impiety; but also in his most learned Paraphrase on the Apocalypse (most worthy of so great a King, to whom in the understanding of that book God shone with His wisdom beyond other mortals, as James Montacutius, Bishop of Winchester, most truly declared in the Preface to the King's Works, wisely observing moreover that it is of greater interest to Kings than to others to understand this book, and that its prophecies are more rightly expounded by those by whose right hand all things are truly accomplished), he most dexterously, and without any distortion, applies to the Roman Hierarchy whatever prophecies in Revelation 17, 18, 19 are recorded concerning the Great Babylon and her judgment. Summarizing the argument of the whole Apocalypse in the Preface, among other things he writes thus: "And because between the first and second coming of Christ (the Lord) there will occur no graver temptation than the Papal tyranny and superstition, it (the Apocalypse) depicts this more copiously and manifestly in the vision of the Woman in the Wilderness, and of the Beasts emerging from the sea and the earth in chapters 12, 13, and 14. But lest it leave in despair those whom the fear was that they might succumb to so great a temptation, in the subsequent vision of the Vials, which indicates what punishments await the Pope and his followers (chapters 17 and 18, where the mystery of the Great Babylon is revealed), it depicts the Pope much more clearly than before, and his downfall together with the mourning of the earth and the rejoicing of Heaven."

XII. St. Paul commends the faith of ancient Rome, most celebrated throughout the world, in Romans 1:8, saying: "Your faith is being reported all over the world." St. Cyprian in Book I, Epistle 2 praises the constancy of the Roman Church thus: "They dare to make the voyage to the Chair of Peter and the principal Church, etc., nor do they consider that they are Romans, whose faith was praised by the voice of the Apostle, to whom faithlessness can have no access." St. Jerome confirms this with hyperbolic words in Book III of his Apology against Rufinus, where he says: "Know that the Roman faith, praised by an Apostolic voice, does not admit trickery; even if an angel should announce anything contrary to what has been preached, fortified by the authority of Paul, it cannot be changed." Rigaltius corrects this rather crude saying of Jerome's in his Notes on Cyprian's Epistle 54, stating that St. Paul does not mean that

the faith of the Romans is more correct and firm than that of others, but only that he is giving thanks to God that the fame has spread everywhere, even that the Roman rulers have embraced the Christian faith; which indeed, he says, owing to the dignity of the city as Mistress of the World, greatly aided the propagation of the Christian faith. So it is. Nor do Jerome's words have more force than can be drawn from the words of St. Paul.

XIII. But however that may be, certainly there is a great difference between the flower and Flora, the ancient and the new Rome. St. Peter in 1 Peter 3:1-7 describes the ideal and exemplar of an excellent matron, presenting there a woman not priding herself on outward adornment of clothing, but excelling in the inward qualities of humility, modesty, and tranquility of soul - such as Sarah was, whom he commends as an outstanding example of wifely virtues. But this matron's ideal, this exemplar answering to the ideal - what has it in common with some impure Flora, or unchaste Thais? So what does the modern Roman Church, drunken with the blood of the saints, have in common with the true Church, whose form or ideal she has wickedly cast off? What commerce with the primitive, Apostolic Roman Church, from whose faith she has long since departed?

XIV. If those holy adherents of the ancient Roman Church, the other saints, and the Apostles themselves were to return and behold the present face and state of the Roman Church, and ponder all more deeply, what, I ask, would they say? With the Prophet, they would cry out in wondering dismay: "How has the faithful city become a harlot?" Comparing the threats and prophecies of their own times with our present condition, they would say: "Truly we formerly feared and mournfully foretold all the evils which we now see. The star which ought to have shone forth with the brightness of the Church's faith, weighed down by too great a care for worldly splendor and power, has fallen from Heaven into the mire. We see the living fountains of Israel obstructed, the pit of the abyss opened, from which that smoke of superstitions arises, obscuring the Sun of Righteousness and excluding the air of Gospel consolation. Hence have sprung forth those monastic swarms of locusts, concerning which one may rightly doubt whether they exercise greater hypocrisy or tyranny." If moreover they were to perceive that there are some who commend the Apostolic See for never varying from the sincerity of Apostolic doctrine, who call evil good and darkness light, truly they would acknowledge with reverence the judgment of God, and affirm that those deserve to be blinded by the smoke of the abyss and intoxicated by drinking Babylon's cup, who are led not by any zeal for the truth but solely by love of the world and the things in the world. Finally, they would commend those witnesses of the truth who, scorning ambitious cowls and hating square caps, clad in sackcloth, take up the defense of the Holy City, alas too long trampled by idolatry. According to Lyra, they would say that the Church consists in those who possess the knowledge and true confession of faith and truth. For wherever two or three are gathered in Christ's name, there Christ is in their midst, Matthew 18:20.

XV. A person's own testimony from within, at least in hateful matters, is usually taken as firm evidence. Come then, let us demonstrate the apostasy of the Roman Church by the very testimonies of her adversaries. Baronius, that great admirer of the Roman Church, writes thus under the year 900 A.D.: "Behold, the year of our Redemption 900 begins, with which also a

new century commences, which by reason of its roughness and barrenness of good is commonly called the Iron Age, the Leaden Age because of the overflowing of evil, and the Dark Age from the scarcity of writers. Standing at its threshold, because of the shamelessly flagitious deeds which have recently occurred before our eyes, before we proceed further we have thought it necessary to forewarn the reader here, lest his soul suffer any offense whenever he may happen to see the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION IN THE TEMPLE; rather let him be astonished, and acknowledge that the Divine Power watches over its custody, since not now, as of old, has such an abomination been followed by the desolation of the Temple." Thus, deploring the abomination of desolation in the Temple in scarcely obscure Scriptural phrase (Daniel 9:27, Matthew 24:15), he sets before our eyes the overthrow of true religion, with which the infallibility and constancy in the faith of the Roman See cannot be reconciled. But Baronius was greatly mistaken in denying that this abomination was soon followed by the desolation of the Temple. For we have shown elsewhere how great a desolation, truly a Babylonian captivity, followed for the Roman Church. The same Baronius, under the year 1012, section 8, thus describes the ghastly face of the Roman Church: "What was then the appearance of the Holy (for it did not cease to be Holy, however ugly and filthy) Roman Church? How utterly foul, when the most powerful and sordid harlots ruled at Rome, at whose beck the officiating clergy were changed, bishops were given, and - a horrible and infamous thing to hear - false popes, their paramours, were thrust into the Chair of Peter, who are recorded in the Catalogue of Roman Pontiffs solely to mark the course of time!" And a little later: "The other Pilot (Christ, it appears) was then truly sleeping in the ship, when it was being overwhelmed by the violent waves, while He, dissembling that He did not see these things, permitted them to occur, and did not rise up as an avenger. And what seemed worse, there were lacking disciples to rouse the Lord as He slept with their clamors, for all were snoring. What sort of presbyters and deacons, think you, could have been chosen by these monsters as cardinals, since nature allows nothing else than for each to beget its own likeness?

XVI. Gilbert Genebrard writes similar things in his Chronicle, Book IV, at the beginning of the 10th Century. "This century is called unhappy," he says, "exhausted of men distinguished by genius and learning, or even of illustrious Princes and Pontiffs; so that scarcely anything worthy of being recorded by posterity was accomplished. Hence they say that there then appeared a monster with a dog's head and human members in other respects, which admirably represented the condition of those times. But it was unhappy (he adds later) in this one respect, that for about 150 years the Pontiffs, nearly fifty of them, completely departed from the virtues of their predecessors, being APOSTATICAL or rather APOSTATES, than Apostolical." Bellarmine, following Genebrard in his own Chronicle, although treating his Most Holy Lords a little more gently, says: "Behold here an unhappy age, in which there were no illustrious writers, no Councils, bad Emperors, not very good Pontiffs." Where, although he places the Pontiffs before the Emperors to some extent, he pronounces quite differently from Wernerus, a Carthusian monk, who in his Chronicle of the Times, year 944, did not hesitate to say: "In this time, as is clearly apparent, the Pope's Holiness had descended and come to the Emperors." The same Wernerus, at the year 1000, thus laments the rise of a new kind of men with the eleventh century: "An effeminate time began around the year of the Lord 1000, in which (N.B.) the Christian faith greatly began to fail and decline from its pristine vigor, as is evident in the

Prophecy of St. Hildegard and in many Christian regions, nor were the rites of the Church observed. And they were attending to auguries and sorceries; and the priest was like the people."

XVII. Alvarus Pelagius, Bishop of Silves in Portugal, in his Lament for the Church, Book II, Article 2, says that Italy was so overwhelmed by every species of unspeakable crime, that there remained no remedy, neither preaching nor fear of temporal punishment, unless the sulfurous fire from Heaven in the wrath of God, for the correction of others, should again descend violently upon these most wicked ones worthy of a double death, and consume them, just as it consumed and exterminated the most wicked Sodomites. "But what," you may ask, "does this lament of Pelagius have to do with the religion of the Italians?" Let Franciscus Sonnius, Bishop of 's-Hertogenbosch, respond in his Demonstration of Religion, Book III, Tract 4, Chapter 3, where along with a certain most celebrated and ancient author he establishes that a man or nation cannot be forsaken by God to such infamy, unless it first began to apostatize so far in the folly and insipidity of its heart as to feel and live as if there were no God. "Where there is faithlessness, where there is apostasy, where there is idolatry, there this crime against nature is accustomed to reign. And the farther a nation has strayed from God, the more it becomes involved in this unspeakable evil," as the Apostle quite clearly sets forth. Thus far Sonnius.

XVIII. What was the state of the Church around the year 1090 can be learned from Aventinus. In the Annals of Bavaria, Book V, he thus depicts those unhappy times: "Then false prophets, false apostles, and false priests emerged, who deceived the people by pretending to religion, performed great signs and wonders, and sat in the Temple of God, and began to exalt themselves above all that is worshiped; and while they were endeavoring to establish their power and domination, they had extinguished Christian charity and simplicity, etc. Whoever has made a covenant will not escape, and the perjured will not possess the Kingdom of God. Nearly all the good, the frank, the just, the ingenuous, the simple, have recorded in the memorials of literature that the empire of Antichrist then began, because they saw that those things which our Savior Christ foretold for us so many years before had come to pass at that time."

XIX. The chief supports of the Papal empire up to the time of the Reformation were the mendicant monks, new creatures of the Pope, whose hypocrisy, impiety, frauds and impostures, equal to upholding Antichristian iniquity, are severely censured by Nicholas de Clemangis, Doctor of Paris and Archdeacon of Bayeux. In Book 2, Chapter 22 of his work On the Corrupt State of the Church, among other things he writes thus: "But also Paul, the Doctor of the Gentiles, foreseeing in the spirit the entrance of such subverters toward the latter times, and that the Church would suffer many evils through them, and writing to his Timothy, exhorts him to avoid them with the utmost care: 'But know this, that in the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of self, covetous, boastful, arrogant, revilers,' and he adds many things not foreign to these seducers; finally, which is proper to them, he subjoins: 'Holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof; and from these turn away. For of these are they that creep into houses, and take captive silly women laden with sins, led away by divers lusts, ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, men corrupted in mind, reprobate concerning the faith.' Again also the same Apostle, speaking to the same disciple of

his, says: 'The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, and having their conscience seared with a hot iron.' Which no one ought to doubt are written concerning these new Pharisees." Thus far that Doctor of Paris, who, by the testimony of the Abbot Trithemius, flourished around the time of the Council of Constance.

XX. But why say more? Where is the assembly which, agreeing in some respects with ancient Chaldean Babylon, obtains dominion in the Great Religious City over the Great People professing the name of Christ though subject to the dominating Clergy, distinguished into seven hills or as many Provinces, and supported by the power of many Kings; and suffers itself to be religiously worshiped with immense pride and swelling pomp, as a Deity partaking of Divinity? And thus by all means seduces the people subject to it from the true worship of God to the worship of creatures and a false religion; cruelly persecutes the true worshipers of God; pollutes itself monstrously with blasphemies, carnal luxury and impurity, sorceries, avarice and spiritual trafficking; and by provoking the most severe judgment of God, has already undergone it in some measure, and will further undergo that final and decreed judgment? This, in the Holy Scriptures, especially in the Apocalypse, comes under no other name than that of the Great Babylon, branded by the Holy Spirit with so many ignominious stigmas, not of the Church of Christ, that Standard-bearing Lamb, not of the Catholic Apostolic Church. But that the Hierarchy of the Roman Church is such an assembly, our arguments have shown to the full.

XXI. It pertains to the singular craft and cunning of the Emissary, that he has labored to persuade the King that it is not worth entering into particular questions, because the hinge of the whole matter turns on this one question: Where is that Church to be found which we profess to believe in the two Creeds (the Apostles' and Nicene)? The Methodist did not consider the most wise saying of the Wisest King in Proverbs 25:2: "It is the glory of God to conceal a matter, and the glory of kings is to search out a matter." It is glorious for the Supreme King in Heaven to conceal the word, namely that by which the matter of salvation is revealed, so far indeed that it cannot be understood without attention, scrutiny, and spiritual discernment. Thus the Son of God is called in Isaiah 45:15 "a God who hides Himself." For it pertains to the glory of God that His word and the whole Kingdom of Grace, which Christ Himself compares to a treasure hidden in a field and to goodly pearls to be redeemed at any price (Matthew 13:44-46), are so highly esteemed by men that they consider it something to be searched out, to be dug out from its inmost recesses, and brought forth into open light. And this is the glory of the Heavenly King. But what is the glory of earthly kings? "To search out a matter," says Solomon, so that by that searching they may become wise both for themselves and for the people, to whom they ought to be guides not only to earthly but also to heavenly felicity. For nothing is more shameful than a foolish king, ignorant of the true way to blessedness, who is like an ape dressed in human fashion; nay, like a beast which can harm yet knows not where to employ its strength. It is fitting for a city in which there are men created in the image of God and for the glory of God, that those so created should celebrate God among themselves, and thus lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and dignity (1 Timothy 2:2). Therefore kings ought to be leaders to true wisdom, which is obtained by no other means than searching the word. But especially kings ought to search out

the word, lest they hand over their power to the Harlot and the Beast (Revelation 17:13). Those who have done so have hitherto involved the Christian world in innumerable evils.

XXII. Moreover, the Emissary maliciously interprets this entrance into the ocean of doubtful questions, in which of course there is danger of shipwreck, as follows: namely, to search piously in the word of God and inquire whether, besides Christ the Head, King and Lord of the Church, there is another head, king and lord in the world, exercising absolute power in temporals and spirituals under pretext of the mystery; whether the saints, angels and men, and their images and relics ought to be religiously worshiped; whether there is one or more than one Mediator between God and men; whether there is one Priest, one sacrifice once offered to God on the cross, or many; whether the Host is to be adored or not; whether a sinful man is justified by the grace of God through the sole merit of Christ, or through an infused habit of righteousness; whether the Eucharist is to be celebrated under both kinds or under one; and other such questions, the necessity of inquiring into which has been imposed by the corruption of doctrine introduced by the Roman Church itself - he says that to inquire into these will be to enter the ocean of questions, not without danger of shipwreck! And lest we strike on the infamous rocks, that is, of the Divine Word, this one thing is preferable: to inquire where is the One Catholic Apostolic Church which we profess in the Creeds! So that the conclusion may come out that it is in the Shrine of the Pope, as a new Apollo uttering his oracles at his pleasure and thrusting them upon our consciences to be received without question, while we are all held by a kind of brutish necessity of assenting and submitting. So that we may thus abjure obedience to God speaking in His word, and become servants of men, and receive the mark of the Beast on our foreheads and hands. This, indeed, is the hidden intention of the Emissary's assertion.

XXIII. Moreover, he cannot thus decline the necessity of entering this imaginary ocean (for according to that celebrated saying of Gregory in his Epistle to Leander, "Scripture is indeed a river, in which both the lamb may walk and the elephant may swim"). Rather, if he would avoid that Charybdian whirlpool, he runs into Scylla. For in truth that question, where is the One Apostolic Catholic Church which we profess in the Creeds, is itself the weightiest, most wide-ranging, and most difficult of all questions; and at the same time it drags after it the whole train of all the remaining questions. For since the Church of God, and consequently that One Apostolic and Catholic Church, is begotten, constituted and known by the word of God, which is the incorruptible seed of believers, its true identity as the Church of God can be made known only by examining its doctrine and comparing it with the word of God as the principle of the Church. For we must not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God (1 John 4:1). And what is the rule of testing? "By this," says St. John, "you will know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God" (v. 2). But where is the doctrine concerning the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh contained according to the whole scope and import of this tenet? Either in the written word of God alone, by which every revelation of God is comprised today, or nowhere. "The one who knows God listens to us," the same St. John testifies in v. 6. But where do we hear St. John and the other Apostles speaking, except in the monuments of the Scriptures they have left behind? For others cannot be substituted for the Apostles, much less the Pope with his associated clients of the Chair, who set aside the authority of the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures and deliver,

command, and by employing external force even obtrude on reluctant consciences the things to be believed and done out of their carnal minds serving their own lusts. Rather, all doctrine ought to be evaluated according to the rule of the word written by St. John, the Prophets and Apostles, as the most exact standard, and it must be judged that the One Catholic and Apostolic Church is there where conformity and kinship of doctrine and faith with the Prophetic and Apostolic word of God is found. For the true Church is there where the true faith revealed by the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles is found. That true faith is there where the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, which is found nowhere outside the written word, is received with a pious heart and also confessed outwardly and preached. Whoever scorns this Royal Way, which the Emissary by the calumny of the "ocean of questions" endeavors to render odious, displays nothing but his own despair, and by circuitous byways must at length necessarily lapse into atheism, as is easy to demonstrate.

XXIV. But here the Emissary, turning us aside from that Royal Way to the paths of an adulteress, objects: "In the Creeds we profess the Catholic and Apostolic Church. But it is not free for every private person to believe what he will, but he must believe what the Church approves." We, however, were of the opinion that each person, both individually and all together, both private persons and the Church, ought to believe what is pleasing to God; and that what God has revealed in His indubitable word to be believed for salvation is pleasing to God. "Now therefore, O Israel, listen to the statutes and the judgments which I am teaching you, that you may live... You shall not add to the word which I am commanding you, nor take away from it" (Deuteronomy 4:1-2). "All your sons will be taught of the Lord" (Isaiah 54:13), not taught by any man or whole body of men, which is what the Church is and which cannot so teach that its word is nXripoefopicu, or full assurance (Isaiah 54:12). All are bound to believe what each person believes. If then it is not free for individuals and private persons to believe what they will (as is indeed the case), then neither will it be permissible for all together, that is, for the Church, to believe what it will. These too must demonstrate their statements from elsewhere, before they can be received and believed as divine and salutary by each individual. For whether few or many, whether individuals or all together, they are not auiooruaTOL, self-authenticating; and unless they demonstrate their statements from the infallible word to the conscience of men, they are of the earth and speak from the earth (John 3:31), no less than some Jupiter of Hammon, or of Dodona, or Apollo, or Python, or Muhammad, or the spirit of Antichrist. "How is it they say to you, 'Consult the ghostly mediums and the soothsayers who chirp and mutter'? Should not a people consult their God? Should they consult the dead on behalf of the living? To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because they have no dawn" (Isaiah 8:19-20). You see, Emissary, you return again to that very ocean of questions which you had shown your King as a kind of Gorgon's head, and from which your souls, not without reason, recoil so greatly; that is, that both your own statements and all the oracles of your Church must be clearly demonstrated from the word of God, and consequently compared with it, and unless so demonstrated that their exact conformity with the Divine word as the pattern of all saving doctrine (Romans 6:17) can be seen and acknowledged by the conscience of the one seeking salvation, they are not to be received.

XXV. But how great is that spirit of vertigo with which you labor, Emissary! For as you are about to inquire concerning the Church, before you have found it conspicuous by evident marks, you appeal to it, and severely assert that what it approves, not what private individuals think, must be believed. But you ought to demonstrate that Church whose faith and dictate must be adhered to, and only then employ it for your purpose, as you should have done. But how foolish it was to thus drag in the not-yet-demonstrated, not-yet-found Church to the support of your leaning cause! And it is equally rash and outrageous that you suppose and imagine that the Church whose authority you are defending is none other than the Roman, the Papal. For in Papal dialect, the name "Church" signifies the Papacy, that is, the dominion of the Pope and his supreme principality in both temporal and spiritual matters, and therefore Supremacy in both of those realms. Thus when Julius II was once engaged in arms and waging war with nations, either to recover lost territories or to extend the bounds of his empire, it was said that the Church was occupied with these affairs. This is quite evident from the Italian history written by Guicciardini concerning those affairs, where (Book VI) Faenza and those cities which he demanded be restored to him by the Venetians are called "cities of the Church"; and (Books VI and VII) when he occupies these by arms or some composition, they "return to the obedience of the Church"; and whenever his military stratagems have an unsuccessful outcome (Books VII and IX), Julius says, "Although affairs are at a stand, yet God will come to the aid of His Church"; all the means by which he proposes to prosecute the war usefully and all the ends he sets for himself in waging it are clothed with the title of "the Church" - "the generals of the Church, the army of the Church, the enemies of the Church, and the rebels against the Church, the cavalry of the Church, the infantry of the Church, the subjects of the Church, and the vassals of the Church"; finally, all that the Pope possesses are called "the states of the Church" (Book VI). It is said that "the state of the Church comes into danger and hazard" when he seemed about to suffer some loss (Book IX); he imposed on the Spaniard to maintain three hundred soldiers for him each year "for the defense of the state of the Church" (Book VII); he sends to various Princes to announce to them that "the Frenchman would come with mighty forces to oppress the state of the Church" (Book IX); the Frenchman promises the Emperor that "he will assist him with arms to occupy Rome and the whole state of the Church, as belonging by right to the Empire." Thus to them the Church is really nothing other than the Pope or the Papal Kingdom. But our Emissary inquires concerning the Catholic Church. Yet some particular state alone, covered by the name "Church" and segregated from all the rest, can no more be the Catholic Church than Caiaphas the High Priest with his faction was the Catholic Church.

XXVI. For even the Muhammadans, Pagans, Jews, Nestorians, Eutychians, Greeks, Armenians, Abyssinians and others have their own churches or religious assemblies associated by certain laws; and we Evangelicals have ours too. If then we must believe what the Church approves, he ought first to have demonstrated by his own effective arguments that that Church is rather the Papacy than the religious assembly of the Muhammadans, Pagans, Jews, Heretics, Greeks, not to mention the Evangelicals - that is, he ought first to have entered his own ocean. Unless perhaps we must believe what each of those groups approves and what is received by the clients and subjects of each, so that religion becomes an empty name by which subjects are kept in obedience by a kind of common assent, which was pleasing to Machiavelli and similar atheistic monsters.

XXVII. This is rather to be called a conspiracy than a Church - a conspiracy of men against men, cruelly raging against the honors, fortunes and lives of all those who cannot obey their commands, under the pretext of religion and an unproven but merely asserted and boasted infallibility. And I shall not hesitate to propose a tragic emblem of this matter, which the Emissary could narrate to his King from a certain very celebrated English theologian. Let us suppose a numerous flock of men, distinguished by a peculiar dress and, for the appearance of greater sanctity, calling themselves by some fanciful name, say the Knights of the Sacred Grove or the Infallible Spirit of Priests; and resolving with most stubborn purpose unanimously that in all matters which they shall be pleased to define without demonstrating from any other infallible principle, they are just as infallible as the Spirit of God itself, so much so indeed that for the sake of making a profit they do not hesitate to boast of the power of certain words pronounced by them, by use of which power one from their order, having received authority from the Prince of the Order, can by the mere utterance of those words produce a living eagle from round white pebbles commonly found in any river, without changing their color, shape, size or anything else, so that those same pebbles, remaining outwardly of the same form, are then called Aetites or Eagle-stones. Let us further imagine these Infallible Knights declaring this wondrous power of their Order to any travelers they meet, and perhaps encountering someone sensible and truth-loving who dares to deny the feat, contending that the pebble enchanted by that formula of words is not an eagle but remains, as before, a stone. Yet these Sacred Grove Knights will puff out their cheeks, produce whole regiments of their Sacred Order to make solemn protestation concerning the Dignity and this infallibility of their Most Holy Order, and stoutly assert that by their miracle the pebble has been changed into an eagle, the bird of Jove. But the generous breast of their opponent will persist, unable to be induced to believe that the pebble is an eagle, since in it he sees no beak, no claws, no head, wings, tail, no mouth or flesh in short; nor is he finally convinced by any other demonstration or testimony above all exception that the matter is so, as they have merely pronounced it. But what will these Sacred Knights do? They will not try to teach further what they cannot teach, but regarding as enemies those refusing to listen to their undemonstrated dictum, lest their profit be endangered, they will assault them, kill them, and despoil their money, clothes and horses. Would anyone consider these Sacred Knights or Infallible Spirits of Priests, or rather a society of impostors and a band of robbers?

XXVIII. What then shall we judge concerning that numerous band of men who advertise themselves under the name of the Infallible Church, yet demonstrate by no sufficient reason that they are the Church of God, but are accustomed merely to assume this and obtrude it on consciences? And moreover they are prepared to assault, kill, and strip of all possessions any Christian traveler on this his pilgrimage through the wilderness of this world, if he sustains to call into doubt, on account of the reclamation of his senses and faith, their boasted infallibility and Transubstantiation - that is, the conversion of a white round loaf by force of a few words into a perfect man, the basis of their spiritual traffic. Is this the Catholic Apostolic Church, or rather an irreligious assembly of conspired enemies of the human race, who dare to oppress, martyr, subjugate, enslave in body and soul, and in short exercise a more cruel tyranny than any man over brute beasts against the very best who do not consent to their fraud?

XXIX. The Emissary inquires whether we are bound to that Church to which Christ granted power on earth to guide us in matters of faith, and which composed those two Creeds for our direction. But the nature of that power granted by Christ to the Church ought first of all to have been made known. For it is ridiculously supposed again that the power granted by Christ to the Church is that which the Roman Church today arrogates to itself and exercises - a power which, resting on its own testimony concerning its infallibility before demonstrating its conformity with the infallible Divine revelation, no one can be certain of; which suspends the Divinity of Scripture on its own authority; which defines the canonical books of Scripture according to its own judgment; which claims for itself the right to interpret Scripture authentically, so that no one may object or appeal to a demonstration of a sounder sense from Scripture itself; which sets up the arbitrary will of the Pope, under the mask of propounding it as the authentic revelation, as the rule of faith; which usurps the power of enacting laws concerning faith, worship, ceremonies and the government of the Church, and imposing them on consciences; which by the benefit of dispensations against the word of God makes an indifferent matter a necessary part of worship, a non-sin a sin, and vice versa, a sin a non-sin; which, finally, by the instinct of avarice, traffics in the souls of men with feigned words. And this power, which Christ did not give to the Church but Antichrist seized, the Emissary again shamefully supposes, not proves, to belong to the Church for guiding men in the faith, and that the Roman assembly is that Church.

XXX. But whatever power Christ gave the Church for guiding men in the faith (and He gave it not an autocratic domineering power, such as that which, as we have said, the Romans employ, but a ministering power to preach His laws, word, and will, and nothing else, and to preserve outward order and decorum), He gave it to every particular Church. For it was not to the universal Catholic Church dispersed throughout the whole world, which has never yet met in the world in all its members, whether pastors or whole people (for the Councils called Ecumenical were not simply such), and much less will it ever meet hereafter; but every particular Church of Christ (whose truth again ought first to have been demonstrated, not assumed) received the power of guiding men in the faith, according to the will, institution and intention of Him who gave it. But the Emissary has raised the question not concerning a particular Church, but concerning that Catholic Universal Church which we profess in the Creeds. He has therefore quite wandered from the lines of the demonstration he undertook.

XXXI. If we are bound to that Church which composed the two Creeds, are we then bound to the Roman Church and no other? For most of the Papists so severely contend that the Apostles' Creed was written by the Apostles themselves not only as to the doctrine comprehended in it, but even as to the very compacting of the words, that long ago Laurentius Valla, in his book entitled "The Theological Calumny," testified that when he held a separate opinion concerning the composition of the words, a charge of heresy was brought against him before the court of the Inquisition at Naples. Certainly Baronius, under the year 44 A.D. paragraphs 15-16, labors to make that assertion indubitable from Rufinus, Jerome, Augustine, Leo and others, which maintains that the Creed was composed by the Apostles, each contributing his particular article. At least the doctrine is merely Apostolic. If, then, there is any force in the argument, no other Church could have been the true one confessed in that Creed than that which rests on the Apostolic doctrine, wherever on earth it may dwell. Certainly none of the Apostles was an Italian

or a Roman; they were all Jews; and, if we may believe most of the Papists, they composed the Creed at Jerusalem. The Jewish Church, the Church of Jerusalem, would then be the one we profess in that Creed, even today. But to what sane person has that idea occurred? And yet, by the force of this argument, it ought rather to come to mind than that the Church confessed in the Creed is the present Roman Church. The case is almost the same with the Nicene, or rather Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. For by what right can the Roman Church ascribe its authorship to herself? For most learned men have demonstrated that it is an explication of the shorter Nicene Creed, composed by the Nicene Fathers after the Council in the order in which we now read it, and invested with Synodical authority in the following Council of Constantinople, at the same time removing the three clauses and the anathema against Arius.

XXXII. But let it be so; let both those Creeds be ascribed to the ancient Roman Church as their author - which our polyhistor Gerhard John Vossius, in his three Dissertations on the Creed, affirms concerning the Apostles' Creed with nearly this argument: that it is certain that it was not composed by the Apostles or by any Ecumenical Council, but prevailed in the Roman Church and was derived from the same into the other Western Churches. On this ground, if the present Roman Church, to the exclusion of all the rest, is that Apostolic Catholic Church, then by the same reasoning the present Greek Church, to the exclusion of the Roman, will be that Apostolic Catholic Church, because there can be no doubt that the Nicene Creed was composed by the Greek Churches. Moreover, that enormous paralogism again assumes, but does not prove, that the Church which composed the Creeds persisted always the same, and never changed its faith and laws. If this is true of the Roman Church, it will also be true of the Greek, which both the modern Romans concerning the Greeks, and the Greeks concerning the Romans, each most truly denies of the other. Who could endure such reasoning as this: The modern French nation is the same as the ancient one which existed in the time of Pharamond; the English nation is the same as that which existed in the time of the ancient Britons; therefore the laws, customs, and language of the ancient Gauls and Britons agree perfectly with the laws, customs, and language of the modern French and English? Just so, the present Roman Church and its faith agree with that ancient one in whose time both Creeds were compiled, even as a widely spread and muddy stream derived a thousand leagues from its narrow, limpid, and pellucid source agrees with the same.

XXXIII. The Emissary places the hinge of the matter in this, that individuals must believe not what seems good to themselves, but what seems good to the Church. But individuals are members of particular Churches, from which they are immediately to learn what is to be believed. But can particular Churches believe whatever they please? Or are they bound to some other rule of faith? If he denies this, then every particular Church will be the supreme mistress of faith. For just as individual citizens are bound to stand by the decrees of their Magistrate, and the Magistrate himself acts according to his own judgment in enacting laws, it follows that such a Magistrate is autocratic and has the summum jus majestatis. If he affirms it, then it is not to be simply believed, even by particular Churches, whatever may seem good to them; but both they and individuals are equally bound to the rule of faith, that is, to believe what is contained in the rule of faith. And since nothing unknown can be believed, both they and individuals will know both the rule of faith and what is contained in the rule of faith; and consequently both individuals

and all together will bind their faith not to the dictates of any man or of any society or body of men not exactly conformed and carefully examined according to the rule of faith, but solely to the rule of faith and to those things which are known beforehand to be contained in it. But what is that rule of faith? Assuredly the will and dictate of God, who alone can prescribe religion and bind faith, who alone can save or damn (James 4:12). His will and dictate cannot be derived from the mind or spirit of any man, since man himself is subject to examination, but solely from the revelation of God, of which there is none in the world besides the written revelation; and it must then be derived by each individual. For all together cannot make faith by merely issuing edicts, testifying, pronouncing, interpreting, propounding; but they are bound to give to their edict, testimony, proposition, and interpretation evidence and perspicuity from the demonstration of the presented word.

XXXIV. This is indeed the merely ministerial and stewardly office of all together in any particular Church. But as for individuals, they ought surely to be taught, and by certain teachers who preside in the Church of which those individuals are members. The same teachers, moreover, ought to be well-affected and well-disposed toward the Church by which they are taught, and consequently also docile, upright and modest. Yet they will not embrace anything relying solely on the authority, pronouncement, or dictum of those teachers and of the Church, but only on this condition: if the teachers shall have narrated and solidly demonstrated their dicta from the word of God, and they themselves shall have acknowledged these things so demonstrated with full persuasion and certainty of mind. Whoever acts otherwise, simply binding his faith to a man not demonstrating his dicta from elsewhere in matters of faith, will be said, justly, while grasping human authority instead of the Divine, to commit spiritual whoredom after God, nay to deny God Himself.

XXXV. "But it would be unjust," the Emissary excepts, "to enact laws for any region and leave the interpretation of the same free to the inhabitants of that region. For thus each one would be his own judge, and consequently there would be nothing just or unjust." Behold, Emissary, how finely you cut your own throat with your sword! For has not God Himself, and no other, enacted the laws of faith and love for the Church, and thus revealed in His word alone what is to be believed and what done for salvation? For Christ alone is our Teacher and Doctor (Matthew 23:8, 10); and God alone is the Lawgiver (James 4:12). Who enacted the law of works? Who enacted the law of faith? God alone. Who prescribed religion and the worship of Himself, and circumscribed it by certain laws? God. But according to your judgment, it would be unjust to enact laws for any region, and consequently even for the Church (for this is where you are driving), and leave the interpretation of the same free to the inhabitants of that religion, and consequently even to the members of the Church. For thus, you say, each one would be his own judge, and consequently there would be nothing just or unjust. Most truly indeed; and, if you so choose, according to the oracle: The inhabitants of the spiritual region, or members of the Church, of that Heavenly Jerusalem, are not merely those whom you thus reproachfully call the laity - kings, princes, and people - but also the teachers, whom God has bound by the laws of faith, love, and the worship of Himself, as to its necessary parts, equally with kings, princes and people. For the Holy Spirit has not so appointed some as bishops and teachers in the Church that, like gods from the oak as the saying goes, they may enact laws binding the

conscience according to their own pleasure, and from the plenitude of their power, deriving them not from elsewhere but from the repository of their own breasts, to impose them on the people. Rather, He has appointed them that they themselves may first learn those same laws laid upon them equally with the people (for both are subjects of the same Divine Legislator, bound by the same laws), discern spiritual things by spiritual, and then, when they have so learned and discerned, propound, narrate and preach them to the people also, to be learned and discerned by them from the same word, yet without any dictating or lording it over their consciences. The condition of the teachers and the learners is equal here. Both ought to be prudent (for those teaching ought themselves to be prudent, and consequently to discern; and to speak to those who discern prudently, 1 Corinthians 10:15); neither ought to be arational beasts (Jude 10). Both are subjects and disciples of the same King, Lawgiver, and Teacher, bound to submit their reasons to Him, to speak and believe only what has been demonstrated from elsewhere; neither ought to teach with a magisterial authority binding consciences by undemonstrated and unexamined dicta, nor learn or receive dicta swallowed undiscerningly, not examined, not carefully judged. Otherwise, each one would be his own judge, not God; and there would be nothing just or unjust, except insofar as it might please either the teacher in the Church or the learner.

XXXVI. And St. Peter himself most clearly teaches this same thing in 2 Peter 1:20, denying that prophecy is a matter of "private interpretation." "For," he says, "no prophecy was ever brought by the will of man, but men spoke from God, being carried along by the Holy Spirit." Nor, therefore, does the interpretation of the Scriptures and Divine laws proceed from any personal impulse of any mortal; "but holy men of God spoke, being carried along by the Holy Spirit." Moreover, that same Holy Spirit by whose inspiration those holy men of God spoke, speaks to all believing men in and through that same word, so that all of them may understand it by judging, and may equally acknowledge that His words are worthy of God. He is the common Spirit of all believers, because He writes the doctrine of truth in the hearts of all of them, and converts all the faithful by the words He has taught (1 Corinthians 2:13). And so He is the Spirit of faith in all who teaches all the faithful, who convicts the world, who is wise in speaking as is worthy of God and suited to the affairs and consciences of men; who is sincere, and does not leave His disciples in doubt concerning those things which it is to their salvation to know, but rather opens their hearts to attentiveness and reveals their eyes that they may see all the wonders in the law of God.

XXXVII. Those, therefore, who in that passage of St. Peter thus abuse it with the modern Jesuits, so that they say it is denied by him that the interpretation of Holy Scripture and the Divine laws belongs to idiotai, that is (as they wrest it) to private persons or lay people distinct from their teachers - as if, forsooth, St. Peter were teaching that it is by a certain exclusive privilege of bishops, doctors and prelates - not only do violence to the open words of St. Peter (for he does not say the "private interpretation" of idiotai, but idias, one's own, such as belongs to all who speak not from demonstration elsewhere but out of themselves and their own minds, and consequently from the earth), but they also endeavor to derive from his words the contrary of what St. Peter says, namely this: that the interpretation is "private" and one's "own," that is, derived solely from the minds, will, and impulse of certain individuals, not from the common

inspiration of the same Spirit speaking to all from the same word. For because prophecy was not brought by the will of man, does it follow that its resolution and interpretation belongs to certain men speaking from their own impulse and prefacing their words with "It seemed good to us and to the Holy Spirit," so that what seems good to them must be believed to seem good to the Holy Spirit also? And because the holy men of God spoke being carried along by the Holy Spirit, does it therefore follow that the understanding of the word of the Holy Spirit does not belong to those for whom the things which the Holy Spirit spoke have been ministered (1 Peter 1:12)? Are the laity, then, and not the bishops, the partakers of the anointing of Christ, and consequently not Christians? Do they not believe the Scriptures or God, but men only? And have they no Divine revelation? On the other hand, are the bishops to be prophets to us speaking unheard and undemonstrated things, that in the Kingdom of God we may be subject to men, and already the "least in the Kingdom of Heaven" teaches his brother to "know the Lord"? Moreover, how did such authority come to those bishops? By inspiration, or by a revelation which is made daily? Thus we shall be truly remitted to the faith of a private spirit, because a spirit which does not speak to all the faithful is a private one. But if the bishops have received an undemonstrable exposition from their predecessors alone, how is it that it has come to those prelates alone and not to all?

XXXVIII. But will you, Emissary, have me disclose the secret and mystery of your doctrine? To you, the Church is a worldly empire or of this world. For in a worldly empire, supreme rulers have the supreme and autocratic right of governing their subjects by laws enacted according to their own judgment and decrees, which all are bound to obey without any other exception, provided it is first evident that they do not transgress the bounds of human obedience. For the civil laws of supreme powers do not argue but command. Nor is any subject here free to censor or interpret such laws, provided they have been duly perceived by prior promulgation, "because thus," to use your own words, "each one would be his own judge, and consequently there would be nothing just or unjust." Such an empire is the Church to you, in which, namely, the Pope, the supreme Deity on earth, bears sway over all men, the Emperor, Kings, Princes, People, directly in spirituals, indirectly in temporals (thus your theologians, though the canonists contend for the same power of the Pope in both realms, which it is evident the Pope also exercises alike in both, making a distinction to deceive the ignorant); enacts laws binding the conscience, just as if they proceeded immediately from the Spirit of God, or not by means of any other demonstrated word; judges according to his pleasure; punishes even with external and coercive penalties according to his own decision; and in all these things, as the professed Supreme Vice-God in the world, but in reality an independent God, he cannot be judged or censured by anyone. And for the same reason, the interpretation of the Pope's laws is not free to any of his subjects, "because otherwise," again to use your own words, "each one would be his own judge, and consequently there would be nothing just or unjust."

XXXIX. But your argument will utterly vanish if we say, as the truth is, that the Church is not of this world; that it has one King, Lord, Head, Lawgiver, Judge; that all its subjects, be they Trojans or Rutulians, depend on His laws alone demonstrated, promulgated and acknowledged from His word, which is nowhere in the world except in the Scriptures; that it is not permitted to any such subject to attempt the infallible interpretation of those laws and obtrude it unexamined

on consciences; and finally, that God alone will judge, both in the conscience of the subjects and in the universal judgment where the assemblies of all the subjects will be held, concerning the right understanding and obedience of His laws, while in the meantime all faithful subjects strenuously discharge the office Divinely committed to each in his own assembly and strive to approve their faith, religion, conscience, and all obedience to God alone, the Judge of the living and the dead.

XL. Meanwhile, God has granted the Church power also to enact certain laws and to judge according to them. But it is very necessary to know of what sort those laws and judgments can be, and from what authority they have binding force, lest there be a capital error. There are, then, laws by which the inner man, the motions and inclinations of the soul, faith, religion, chief worship, love, hatred, confidence, hope, are governed; there are laws by which the outward man or external actions of man are directed. As to the former, it is most clear that they can only be enacted by God alone, because He alone by right of creation, government and redemption bears rule over the spirit of man, the understanding, will, conscience, faith and religion of man, and has them alone subject to Himself. For no law can be enacted except over him over whom you have authority. Thus in civil matters, a German will never suffer a law to be imposed on him by an Italian, nor an Italian by a German, nor either by a Mussulman or Indian, because neither has authority over the other. He who enacts a law is the judge of him who transgresses it. But God alone is the Judge of spirits, souls, consciences, who alone can coerce, compel, kill them (Matthew 10:28). But as to the outward man, God has communicated his government to men, yet not an absolute government, either in civil or spiritual matters, but for the glory of His name, which He wills to shine forth from the body as well as from the spirit, since both belong solely to God. But the outward man is governed by the eminent civil Power and by the Church in different ways, and by different laws and judgments. For the civil Power enacts laws by the dominion and sovereignty Divinely granted to it, by which it prescribes the duties necessary and useful for the preservation of human society in temporal and spiritual felicity or tranquility with all piety and honesty (1 Timothy 2:2), binds all by the eminent authority Divinely granted, without rendering any reason for the law, to obedience to them, and that with the sole exception of a superior Divine command, coerces the refractory with external punishments. Hence in the Scriptures the civil authorities are called Gods, and oxyerwh, eminent power, xupiothy, dominion, empire, power of the sword, vindication, are ascribed to them (Romans 13:1, etc.). The case of the Church is quite different.

whose laws, insofar as they are distinguished from the Divine laws which the Church preaches, and separated from the sanction which they can derive from the civil power alone, are not properly laws, but free ordinances, constitutions, admonitions, exhortations. For the Church has no dominion, no eminent power from which alone properly so-called laws can proceed. Paul himself clearly testifies that he does not lord it over their faith (2 Corinthians 1:24), that is, their faith does not depend on his empire. Just as in a Republic the citizens do not inquire from elsewhere whether this or that is rightly done, but only from the law which the Magistrate has enacted; they do not dispute, but acquiesce in the mere edict of the Magistrate, not seeking the reason of justice, prudence, or equity in the matter of the command, having enough for obedience if they have known that what is so constituted by the Magistrate is not contrary to

piety. The Church by no means acts thus; it does not lord it over the clergy, nor deal with those whom Christ has redeemed as if they were incapable of comprehending what is religious or irreligious.

XLI. Rather, the Church teaches and admonishes what she has learned from the word of God concerning the obedience due to God, leaving the conscience of each one free to judge for himself by the rule of that same word whether the things admonished are consonant with the Divine oracles. If indeed there were any disobedient and refractory who refused to obey the Church admonishing from the word of God, Christ commands that after the admonition of the Church, such a one is to be held as a heathen and a tax-collector. He permits the exacting of no other punishment than that mild and altogether spiritual one of removing the contumacious from the external communion of the Church and holding him as an alien. But that even this light punishment may not be adjudged to any one merely on the authority and testimony of the Church, He expressly prescribes that the Church, before pronouncing that judgment, first hear the accused in his own defense: "If he will not hear the Church" (Matthew 18:17). Thus the reason is clear why the laws of the Church are not properly laws, but ordinances or constitutions, namely because she has no eminent authority, no dominion, no empire over consciences, from which alone laws properly so-called can proceed. But the civil magistrate, because he possesses such authority and power of administering justice, which the Church does not, therefore not only declares the laws and openly promulgates them, but also coerces the refractory by external severities and vindicates his decrees. The Church declares and exhorts, and if the disobedient do not acquiesce, excludes them from her external communion. This is the whole extent of her power in enacting laws, judging, and punishing.

XLII. Let us apply these considerations to the reality. The Roman assembly enacts laws concerning the faith to be held, the worship of God, the government of the Church, and arrogates to itself the interpretation of these laws, with the right of binding consciences. But this authority is mere impudent usurpation and wicked tyranny. For if the faith is to be bound by the laws of this synagogue, consciences by the interpretation of its laws, and souls brought into obedience and approved by its judgments, then faith will no longer have its certainty from the infallible word of God, but from the arbitrary will of a miserable man who is himself examined by the word of God. Religion and worship will be constituted not by Divine precept but by human laws. The Church's government will depend not on Christ's institution, the only source of its orders, rites and ministries, but on the traditions of men. In short, the Church will be of this world, not of Heaven. For only after first subjecting the Pope's laws and their interpretation to the revealed word of God by careful scrutiny, could they approve the Pope's authority in decreeing or defining anything concerning faith and the worship of God, consciences being otherwise necessarily bound to reject his decrees as those of antichrist rather than of Christ speaking through His word. The Church's admonitions, censures, judgments must, like her laws and constitutions, be compared with the Divine word alone, nor can they have any binding force on conscience except insofar as they agree with that infallible rule.

XLIII. Christ indeed gave authority to the Church, but of what kind? Not that which the Church of Rome claims for itself: to define articles of faith, enact laws of religion and worship, abrogate

and institute sacred rites and mysteries, and bind consciences by the obligation of obedience to her decrees. Authority of this kind was never granted by Christ to the Church, but was impiously usurped by the Antichrist of Rome. The authority which Christ gave to the Church is well described by the words of the Apostle in 2 Corinthians 10:8: "For though I should boast somewhat more concerning our authority, which the Lord gave us for edification and not for your destruction, I shall not be ashamed." So the authority is for edification, not destruction; healthful, not deadly; to build up the Church with the word of God, not pull it down by human laws and bind consciences with them as if Divine oracles. Paul makes this plain when in the same passage he immediately adds: "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." But the true edification of the Church is by the sincere preaching of the word of God alone, as he testifies elsewhere: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Timothy 3:16-17). So no authority was given the Church against the truth, but for the truth; and that the truth is not to be taken from the arbitrary decrees of men, but from the Holy Scriptures alone.

XLIV. The same is evident from what the Apostle affirms concerning his own authority in the same place: "Therefore I write these things being absent, lest being present I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath given me to edification and not to destruction." What can this power be other than the testifying of the word of salvation, rebuking, exhorting, and convincing from the Scriptures, and if necessary, after the Divine rule has been sufficiently propounded, declaring the obstinate and refractory to be separated from outward Church communion? Elsewhere the same Apostle affirms that all his authority is for the defenseof the Gospel: "Having," he says, "in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled" (2 Corinthians 10:6). When the obedience which he requires, that is, obedience to the Gospel, is accomplished, then he has authority to avenge all disobedience, that is, to pronounce and inflict the extreme censure of excommunication. And to the Thessalonians he thus describes the power given him by the Lord: "For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter had tempted you, and our labor be in vain" (1 Thessalonians 3:5). Whence it is clear that his power, as well as his labor, aimed only at one thing: that the faith might be preserved in purity and integrity among those to whom he had preached the Gospel. The same is the scope of the power given to the Church for preserving this faith and preaching it: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believes not shall be condemned. The punishment of unbelievers is pronounced here, but the Church is given no power to put it into execution. It remains with God alone to execute it.

Here is a translation of the text into English:

XLI. There are altogether two kinds of things which the Church commands. For either they pertain to faith and conduct, or to those things which conduce to faith and conduct. Each kind is expressly prescribed by the word of God, but not in the same way. For those things which pertain to faith and conduct are not only commanded in general by the word of God, but

specifically and one by one, and they are of such a kind that no change can occur in them. But those things which conduce to faith and conduct are also commended expressly, but in general. And those are not of one kind. For they pertain either to the polity of the Church or to the personal conduct and manner of living of individuals. Of the former kind are those which pertain to the order that must be observed in the Church, concerning which we have the precept that all things be done decently and in order (1 Corinthians 14:40). To the second kind belong those things which pertain to the private duties of piety toward God and charity toward one's neighbor. In neither kind does the Church, as such, have the power of enacting laws. For in those things which pertain to faith and conduct, the law is express and set forth by our Lord Jesus Christ. But in those things which pertain to those things in which neither faith nor conduct resides, but which conduce to faith and conduct, and which pertain to the order of the whole Church and the modesty of individuals, we indeed have a general law in the word of God, but no particular one, because that whole matter depends on circumstances. Now God willed that it be in the power of the Church to define this, yet with these laws: that what the Church defines agrees with God's general definition; and that its definition does not directly oblige the conscience, but indirectly, by reason both of the general command and of avoiding the scandal which would arise from contempt of order and of the Church; or insofar as it indeed proceeds from the Church alone, that it obliges through blind obedience and by force of dominion, inducing such blind obligation and the right of punishing transgressors in body, fortune, or civil honor; or finally, that it has the character of a law properly so called proceeding from an eminent and domineering authority, not insofar as it is sanctioned by the domineering and supereminent authority, which belongs to the civil Magistrate alone who has the power of the sword, and by that sanction acquires the force of binding even in the external court, yet without any tyranny of forcing the conscience.

XLII. With these things thus constituted and explained according to the principles of the Divine word and of universal religion, let us consider what right of judging each individual in the Church has concerning the things which are commanded. And as to those laws by which the inner man is directed, and the actions and inclinations of the understanding and will, faith, conscience, confidence, are governed, no mortal is subject to examination. Each one has the right either to examine these once known, or to explain them as he pleases. For we are bound to obey the known will of God without any exception, who by the right of creation are subjects of God, and by the right of redemption are His children. For who are you, O man, who answers back to God? (who calls into controversy and disputes His will?) "The thing molded will not say to the molder, 'Why did you make me like this,' will it?" (Romans 9:20). A son honors his father, and a servant his master. "If then I am a father, where is my honor? And if I am a master, where is the reverence due me?" says the Lord of Hosts to you (Malachi 1:6). Neither can any mortal interpret those laws except by demonstration of the will of God. For "who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been His counselor?" (Romans 11:34).

XLIII. Yet individuals, whether separated or assembled, are bound each to know those laws, and consequently to use their own judgment in knowing the things revealed in them. But they are not bound to resign this judgment to any certain class of men, much less to those who seize for themselves the power of judging these things according to their own pleasure and obtuding their judgments on the blind credulity of others. Here, therefore, judgment belongs not to the few, nor

to all deciding according to the preponderating votes, but to each individual - I say, not that unchecked judgment, but the judgment of discretion and subjection by which, through pious and submissive scrutiny of the better or differing, the Divine laws are known and discerned from human, Antichristian, and diabolical ones (Philippians 1:10, Romans 2:18). For in order that any law or truth may be known and perceived, there is need of the judgment of discretion. For how can truth be perceived without judgment? Certainly judgment occurs when it is determined that this is true, that is false; this is to be done, that omitted. Individuals therefore judge concerning the Divine laws when they acknowledge them as Divine, admit them, and reject whatever is contrary to them, and this by perceiving their Divinity by the very sense of the soul, without which sense and proper judgment of discretion the Divinity and obligation of those laws can no more be perceived than light can be seen by another's sense and judgment. But those who turn this judgment of discretion, which is nothing other than the "obedience of confession" (2 Corinthians 9:13), into a judgment of authority, and moreover claim it for a certain order of men to the exclusion of the rest, even taking away from the others this very judgment of discretion - by a nefarious metamorphosis they make, as far as in them lies, gods out of certain men, and brute beasts out of others, likening them to arational animals in judging matters of the utmost importance for eternal salvation.

XLIV. But as to those laws by which the outward man is governed, we have shown above that they receive a twofold difference, according as they are propounded or enacted by the Church. For either they pertain to faith and conduct, or to those things which conduce to faith and conduct. As to the former, it belongs not only to the few and to one order, but to all and each individual to judge concerning them, being merely Divine and therefore not depending on the Church but only on God, whether they are truly Divine as propounded and narrated by the Church, and consequently conformed to the word of God. It is said to each individual, as St. Paul said to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 10:15): "I speak as to sensible people; judge for yourselves what I say." While some are speaking and setting forth the Divine laws, the rest are bound to weigh and judge what is said, according to the same apostle's words in 1 Corinthians 14:29: "Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh carefully what is said." For the secrets of the Lord do not belong to the few, nor are they made known to the few, but to all who fear Him, to whom He also makes known His covenant (Psalm 25:14). And the natural man is not able to receive the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them because they are spiritually discerned. But the spiritual man discerns all things, yet he himself is discerned by no one (1 Corinthians 2:14-15). Nothing certainly could be said more explicitly. Who is the natural man? He who is governed solely by his soul, not endowed with the Spirit of God. The spiritual man, therefore, is whoever is governed not only by the soul and natural reason, but by the Spirit of God. And these are not the few, or any particular order of men, but all who are children of God, begotten of God (Romans 8:14). And it is for these to discern all things, and not to be discerned by anyone, so that in matters of faith they do not allow themselves to be oppressed and overwhelmed by the judgment of other men, but rather discern and approve the good will of God themselves, and reject the fictions of men. For those who were once darkness, having been born of God, become light in the Lord, and as children of light walk, proving what is well-pleasing to the Lord (Ephesians 5:8-10). So, those who have the Anointing, the Holy Spirit, know all things, and have no need for anyone to teach

them, that is, merely by dictate and command, without demonstration of the Spirit (1 John 2:20, etc.). And each faithful one is commanded to beware of false prophets and the leaven of the Pharisees (Matthew 7:15-16; 16:6), to test all things, to examine the spirits whether they are from God (1 Thessalonians 5:21; 1 John 4:1). And if it has been granted to beasts to discern their proper food from what is improper, noxious and poisonous, shall not men regenerated, endowed with the Spirit of God, have the power of discerning the proper and excellent food of their souls, the word of God, from poison?

XLV. Why then, Emissary, do you thus try to blind the eyes of individual and private believers, and quench all their light? Is it not that, being blind yourself, you may be a leader of the blind? But truth does not dread disciples who have eyes; nay, it rather desires them. On the contrary, those who so shamefully distrust their own doctrine that they do not even dare to hope that the people will admit it unless they are first compelled to close their eyes and extinguish the light of their own judgment, by this very indication clearly betray the desperation of their religion, unable to sustain the test of the Divine word, the Lydian touchstone. As seducers they trade indeed cautiously, but neither chastely, nor piously, nor wisely, being like fraudulent merchants who withdraw their wares of bad faith from the eyes of experts and expose them for sale to the inexperienced and those lacking in judgment. Thus indeed it was fitting for that Adversary of Christ to deprive the laity of the foundation of salvation, Scripture, and the judgment of its salutary meaning, without which all faith, patience, consolation, and hope perish (Romans 15:4), and the utmost consumption is induced in the members of Christ (John 6:63); in short, Christians are thrust unarmed into the final conflict with Satan, whose sword, shield, and whole panoply besides is placed in the entire word of God, as Christ's own struggle with Satan and St. Paul in Ephesians 6:12ff. show.

Here is a translation of the text into English:

XLVI. Nor is it thus that "each one is his own judge, and consequently there is nothing just or unjust," to respond at once to that perverse saying of the Emissary and the modern Jesuits. For if the subjects of a King are bound to yield obedience only to his known and perceived laws, and if the sense of those laws is doubtful, to inquire their meaning from the King himself and nowhere else, do those who judge thus and discern the true laws of their true King from the false and fictitious laws of an imposter and tyrant thereby become their own judges, so that in reality nothing is just or unjust? Therefore, lest men become their own judges and just and unjust become confounded, will it now be necessary to transform them by an Isyllean metamorphosis into beasts destitute of all reason, at least in the reception of laws? He is his own judge and decrees what is just or unjust, not who, being the subject of any Lord, acknowledges, receives, and by his own judgment discerns the law prescribed by that Lord from the fictitious law of another Lord, and thus satisfies his conscience; but he who is his own Lord, or prescribes laws to his subject by the right of eminent dominion and some jurisdiction, and obliges himself and others to do his commands. Thus the domineering Clergy of the Roman Church are their own judges, because shaking off the yoke of the Divine laws, they make law for themselves and for others, yet more for others than for themselves, according to their own pleasure, under the pretext of governing the Church and propounding and interpreting the

Divine law; not demonstrating law made by another, but depriving those whom they have subjected to themselves and their lust beyond all right and wrong of all just right of discerning the truly Divine laws from human and Antichristian ones, and binding them to blind and irrational obedience, subjugating them; and consequently abolishing the distinction between Divine justice and injustice altogether.

XLVII. But thus they complain that we abolish the gift of prophecy, as well as the office of Pastors and Teachers in the Church. Yet we by no means abolish them, but while vindicating faith and authority for God alone, we deny that the ordinary Prophets, Pastors and Teachers of the Church, not immediately inspired by the Holy Spirit, are infallible in the discharge of their office unless they demonstrate the will of God from the written Canon, and consequently that they are masters and lords of faith. Moreover, the gift of prophecy or of explaining Scripture, which renders one capable of discharging the office of a public Interpreter in the Church, a Pastor or Teacher, is one thing; the gift of faith, which renders one steadfast in knowing and assenting to the doctrine with plhroforia, is another. We claim the former for Pastors and Teachers, the latter both for Pastors and Teachers and for all believers, even private individuals. For to these is given, through the Spirit of faith, the ability for each according to his measure to understand what is true and what false, what is to be done, what is conformed to the word of God and what is opposed to it, according to the Lord's saying: "If anyone wills to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from Myself" (John 7:17). If Christ has granted to all and each the faculty of judging concerning His doctrine, how much more concerning the doctrine of men, who are all by nature liars?

XLVIII. Meanwhile, it is the office of Pastors and Teachers not only to inquire privately for themselves into the sense of the Sacred Scriptures and the doctrines of the faith, but also, having dexterously conceived a judgment either separately or in sacred assemblies and synods, to go before the whole assembly publicly and serve in rightly forming the judgments of their hearers. Hence Pastors are so called because they ought to feed the people with knowledge and doctrine (Jeremiah 3:15); Poilemej, Pastors, whose office it is to go before the flock and lead it (Hebrews 13:17); and Didaskaloi, Teachers, whose office it is to teach the people or disciples, not their own, but Christ's, to observe all things whatsoever Christ, not anyone else, has commanded (Matthew 28:20; Ephesians 4:11). Both the sublimity of the doctrine itself and its paramount necessity for eternal salvation, as well as the condition of most hearers who are either too much distracted by the cares of this world or laboring under a certain lack and weakness of judgment, so that in judging they could hardly avoid going astray without a guide (Acts 8:31), demand this direction; the Lord thus graciously providing that our faith may be aided and supported on every side. Yet all this belongs not to authority and eminent power or dominion and mastery, but to mere office and ministry, in the discharge of which Pastors and Teachers are bound to demonstrate doctrine and submit it to the judgment and examination especially of those who are led by the Spirit of God, not simply and imperiously asserting the will of Christ, but demonstrating it from the indubitable word of God to which both they and the whole Church are bound (since, according to the common saying, "the mode of operation follows the mode of being," and the mode of being is such that in respect to it the whole Church depends on Scripture as its foundation and seed), so that if they do otherwise and depart from

their office, they ought not to be heard but rejected, according to those words of St. John: "If anyone comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into your house, and do not give him a greeting; for the one who gives him a greeting participates in his evil deeds" (2 John 10-11).

XLIX. There remain the laws of the Church pertaining to those things in which neither faith nor conduct resides, but which conduce to faith and conduct, and by which the right order and outward decency of the Church are regulated - laws which, as we have said, are not properly laws, nor have binding force even in the external court of the Church except insofar as they are sanctioned by the eminent civil authority. Just as private individuals did not enact these laws, so they cannot explain them either. The Church, and in it the civil authority, has the power of enacting, sanctioning, and consequently also interpreting these laws; nor is it permitted to anyone to interpret them according to the pleasure of his own mind and wrest them to his own decision. For here the Emissary's argument holds: "It would be unjust to enact laws for any region and leave the interpretation of the same to the inhabitants of that region free. For thus each one would be his own judge, and consequently there would be nothing just or unjust." Yet not all right of judgment is taken away here even from individual believers and private persons. For not only ought they to use their judgment in discerning the true laws of the Church, since the Church enacts its laws not for beasts but for prudent and rational creatures; but also, before yielding obedience to such laws, it is their duty to apply careful judgment and seriously inquire whether there is anything in them contrary to the Divine laws. For beyond all doubt the Divine laws take precedence over all others, and this exception to obedience is perpetual: that we must obey God rather than men. If, therefore, it is evident that they are contrary, such laws and their interpretation by the Church or that assembly which enacted them must be left to it; and either God Himself, if it be permitted, must be separately worshiped, or such an assembly must be forsaken.

L. So the Almighty God has not left us in uncertainty, as the Emissary objects, nor has He constituted no rules by which our faith and religion might be directed, though both all private individuals and all together are bound to weigh doctrines proposed by men by a serious and spiritual judgment subject to the word of God alone, and not to receive them unless so weighed. For this is the certain rule: that nothing is to be believed for salvation except according to the prescription of the Divine word, and that nothing can be believed unless it is known and perceived by judgment. But in order that it may be rightly known, perceived, and judged, the grace of the Holy Spirit illuminating the eyes of the understanding and opening hearts effects this among all those who are saved by His word; and those among whom He does not effect this are of the number of the children of perdition. "For if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing, in whose case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn on them" (2 Corinthians 4:3-4). And the Holy Spirit has been promised not only to the teachers, but to all believers, who without Him are neither believers nor children of God nor new creatures, according to the testimonies: "My Spirit which is upon you, and My words which I have put in your mouth shall not depart from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your offspring and your offspring's offspring," says the Lord, "from now and forever" (Isaiah 59:21). "For to us God

revealed them through His Spirit...Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God, that we might know the things freely given to us by God" (1 Corinthians 2:10, 12).

LI. But perhaps the Holy Spirit teaches and inspires each believer, yet not independently of the Church and its teachers, to whom obedience and credence must be yielded without exception. Thus the Romans indeed contend, as if, forsooth, the Holy Spirit penetrates into each subject believer through the Pope, Cardinals and Mitred Prelates, just as that precious ointment poured on the head of Aaron went down over his beard and to the edges of his garments (Psalm 133:2). But by what testimony, by what solid reason, do they assert this? By none at all. For it makes no mention of any infallible revelation of the Pope and Cardinals, and it mentions only Christ, through whom, as the Head, the Spirit of God formerly flowed both into the whole Body and into the individual members of the Body. Everywhere that Spirit which is in and works upon individual believers is called the Spirit of God and of Christ, nowhere the Spirit of the Pope. And it is said to proceed from the Father and the Son alone, nowhere from the Pope. Nor does the Spirit of God flow from one head to another, and thence finally into the subject body and members. But how could it flow from those who, setting aside the sure word of God and not speaking from the word of God, do not demonstrate the wisdom of God to the conscience, and whose fruit of obedience is pride, tyranny, superstition, idolatry, persecution, and everything that is of the world and not of God?

LII. But the ulcer of Pontifical credulity is here manifest. For thus they argue: The word of God has no authority without the dictate and command of the Church, that is, of the Pope and those who assent to him; the dictate and command of that Church, the authority of Scripture being set aside, binds the conscience just as the word of God does; the Holy Spirit is to be tested and examined in each individual not by that which the Holy Spirit has spoken indubitably and clearly in the word, but by the obedience which is yielded to the Pope, Cardinals and Prelates. But what reason is there? Because these are the teachers who, endowed with the spirit of infallibility, cannot err; but you, whoever you are, being a private person, are able to err, even if in the fear of God and with a good conscience you hold and follow what Scripture dictates. But tell me, pray, are there not even among those who are called and ought to be teachers, seducers, false prophets, false Christs in the world, who are to be distinguished from the true and sincere teachers? But here they revert to those notes of the Church which they have devised for themselves without any word of God (for they make the Church better known than the word of God), and to some admission, I know not what, of Pastors. As if, forsooth, Scripture had not clearly forewarned us that from the very number of the disciples there would go out those who would teach destructive heresies and not spare the flock (Acts 20:29-30; 1 John 2:18-19), and that the Antichrist would sit in the Temple of God, that is, the Church (2 Thessalonians 2:4). Hence it is clear that we are not made secure either by external communion of the Christian name, or by admixture, or by a legitimately entrusted ministry, or even by presidency in the Church.

LIII. The Emissary asks of any upright man: "Is not leaning on one's own fancy the same as explaining Scripture by Scripture?" I ask in turn: Does your Church, or the Prelates propounding

the word of God and explaining Scripture, propound the word of God and explain Scripture from their own mind and judgment, or from Scripture? If from their own mind, which they are indeed found to do, do they not in that way lean most of all on their own fancy? If according to your judgment from Scripture, again they lean on their own fancy. Thus it will come to this, that the whole Christian religion is nothing but a sad offspring of human fancy. This is the outcome of your theology. But perhaps this applies only to private individuals, not to Prelates. But what is the reason for the distinction? For when the Spirit of God opens the eyes of private individuals and reveals His word and its sense to them from His very word, will He be called "fanatical"? But will He be called "Divine" if He has done the same thing in the case of the Prelates? Or if while the Prelates are busied with other things, those private individuals in interpreting some doubtful passage follow the analogy of faith and interpret some obscure passage by a clearer one, that is, explain Scripture by Scripture, will they be said to lean on the spirit of fancy, while on the other hand the Prelates, sleeping as to God but awake to the world, will be thought to be swollen with the Divine? Let those respond whose heart and mind are not perverse.

LIV. He leans on his own fancy, or rather on that of another, in matters of faith, who, setting aside Scripture and the demonstration of things to be believed from it, assents to things not revealed, not examined at the touchstone of the Divine word, not approved by a good conscience, and received solely by the necessity of human obedience, nay, often receives as an infallible prophet, as the vicar of God and Christ, as the head of the Church, a man manifestly impure and endowed with no certain sign and character, not to say of infallibility; and seeks salvation in communion with him. This is what you compel your private persons or laity to do. Not he who, denying himself and renouncing his lusts, perceives in the fear of God through the grace of the Holy Spirit and with a heart purified by faith the most sincere wisdom from the word of God and from nowhere else, and by the same Spirit, which is given as a pledge to all believers through Christ alone and not through any man, explores, receives, and assents to the more excellent things, and only to those known and demonstrated from the word of God.

LV. The Emissary asks to have it demonstrated to him who has granted the power of deciding matters of faith to any private man. No one, I say; for here that Doctor of the King wrestles with shades. For the judicial decision of matters of faith with authority belongs to God alone, the only Lawgiver, who alone can dictate faith to consciences and judge them according to His dictate. It is quite another thing to know, receive, and by a sound and spiritual judgment discern from the fictions of false teachers and false prophets the things decided and judged by God from His word, when duly set forth and examined by Pastors, Teachers and others. The former does not belong either to private persons or to erring Prelates; the latter belongs to the whole Church and to each private individual. In turn, then, let it be demonstrated to us who has committed to the Papal Church, which is resolved into that one individual the Pope, and indeed to the exclusion of all the rest, the power of deciding matters of faith joined with authority and power to bind the consciences of subjects. If they love the truth, they will ingenuously profess that God has not committed this power either to the Pope or to any mortal, but that the Pope, after being instigated by the stings of ambition and avarice to corrupt the Church and rend it into many parts, being reproved by the pious on that account, in order to avoid the tribunal of the Divine

word by which he felt himself oppressed and to vindicate that surpassing arrogance of his against the will of God and His word, has seized it.

LVI. "But Christ," the Emissary insists, "left His power of remitting sins in Heaven also to the Church (not to private persons), and gave her His Spirit, by which she might exercise that power; first indeed through the Apostles in the Creed, and long afterwards through the Council of Nice, by which the Creed bearing its name was composed." Who does not see the blindness of that teacher? For he extends the Church's power of remitting sins in Heaven, not without blasphemy. The Gospel asserts the power of remitting sins on earth, and promises the Divine ratification in Heaven of the remission on earth. Moreover, that power of remitting sins on earth is purely ministerial, consisting in the proclamation of the Gospel or gracious sentence already pronounced by God alone as Judge on account of the merit of Christ, and made known by the word of Christ. But what has this in common with that power of deciding articles of faith and obtuding the same on consciences unexamined and not demonstrated from the Divine word, which the particular Roman Church has seized for itself to the exclusion of all the rest, not so much by price as by force? For he who remits sins just as the Apostles remitted them, and as any particular Pastors today, their successors in that common office, remit them, no more has on that account the power of forging articles of faith and obtuding them on consciences unexamined, than any herald of a sentence of absolution pronounced by a Prince has, by virtue of being such a herald, the power of enacting laws according to his pleasure, or judicially of dispensing or even punishing offenses. Are not those very ones to whom Christ gave the power of remitting sins heralds, that is, of another's right and sentence (Romans 10:14; 1 Timothy 2:7)? And are they not heralds of the Gospel, not indeed their own (for so Christ alone is the herald of His own Gospel), but of another's, that is, of Christ, in whose name the glad tidings are borne to the wretched (2 Thessalonians 2:8)? Which sentence of absolution, think you, precedes - that of God, of Christ, or of the Minister? If the former, then the Minister will be nothing but the herald of a sentence already pronounced. For the same absolving sentence can proceed only from one power, and that the principal and domineering one. Nor is there any place here for a subordinate judge, since no such judge has been appointed, nor indeed could he be appointed because of the lack of exousia or knowledge of the heart, faith and conscience. If the latter, then the Minister will already be Lord, and will lord it over the sentence of God, of Christ Himself; and thus finally, as the Emissary contended, he will remit sins in Heaven - a most shameful metamorphosis of the Priest into God, into Christ Himself! In apprehending and knowing the remission of his sins, what, I ask, will the wretched man do? Either he will ascend into Heaven, or he will attend to the word of Christ and its proclamation, or he will trust the man proclaiming his own word and not Christ's. The first, St. Paul forbids in Romans 10:6ff. The third makes an idol out of man. Therefore, in distress or consolation of conscience afflicted on account of sin, he will attend not to anything else but to the word of Christ and its proclamation by men.

LVII. Without the Holy Spirit no one can call Jesus Lord, no one can be a child of God (1 Corinthians 12:3; Romans 8:14). Therefore, without that same Spirit no assembly can be the true Church of God, nor can any man be a believer and member of the Church. Moreover, that same Holy Spirit guides, moves, and necessarily imbues with light the understanding, and

instructs with a readiness of obedience the will, of all and individual believers, both teachers and taught, pastors and those pastured. And He led the Church to compose such Creeds as the Apostles' and Nicene. Yet He did not restrict Himself either to any one particular Church such as the Roman (being too free and fruitful to wallow over the Tiber alone, after He was due, according to the prediction, to be poured out on all flesh), or, now that such great corruption prevails there, too chaste to pour Himself out over it today; nor has He imparted to any Church or assembly of teachers or learners, much less to one individual such as the Pope, the power of forging new articles of faith not defined in the word of God. For what else are the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds but a collection and compacting of articles of faith defined in and repeated and demonstrated from the word of God by their authors? Which collection no more argues in the collectors the power of forging articles of faith than the mere study of collecting and compacting the Imperial laws of Justinian and other Emperors confers on some collector the authority and power of enacting those laws themselves.

LVIII. Truly these words of the Emissary are most harsh, not to say worse: that "the Church by the power received from Christ has, since the times of the Apostles, acted as judge of the Scriptures, defining which books are Canonical and which not." For whoever makes himself judge of the Scriptures exalts himself above that which is God's, and subjects Scripture to himself, so that it must stand, as it were, before some loftier tribunal of his as judge, about to pronounce sentence on it with judicial authority from the repository of his own breast, from which there can be no appeal. This very thing Tertullian in his Apology, chapter 5, justly reproached the Gentiles with in these words: "Among you, the Divinity is weighed by human caprice. Unless God shall have pleased man, He will not be God: man must now conciliate the favor of God." It is one thing to judge concerning the Divinity of this or that Canonical book, that is, by the guidance and light of the Holy Spirit, not to feign but to demonstrate to itself from the inherent characters of Divinity the sublime Divine authority of Scripture, and to receive and embrace it humbly when demonstrated. This is the office both of the Church and of all individual believers, to whom no authority thence accrues of forging articles, but only the obedience of faith, which receives and embraces the Scripture acknowledged and demonstrated, and the articles clearly defined and expressed therein. Thus the Council of Laodicea separated the Canonical books from the Apocryphal and composed a Catalogue of the Canonical books; so did Jerome, Athanasius and others. Tell the Emissary what pre-eminence the Roman Church has here above the rest. For the Fathers of the Council of Laodicea were almost all Orientals; nor were either Jerome or Athanasius, Italians or bishops of the Roman Church. What, therefore, do you think is your profit or loss here?

LIX. Nothing stands more validly against the power and infallibility which the Roman Church without suffrage arrogates to itself in deciding articles of faith and interpreting Scripture, than that in its decisions it has enormously and most grievously erred, not rarely, in interpreting Scripture. For the Second Council of Nice erred when it defined the religious worship of images; the Lateran Council erred when in its first chapter it sanctioned transubstantiation; the Council of Constance erred when in its 13th session it declared, decreed and defined "that although Christ after the Supper instituted and administered to His disciples the venerable Sacrament under both species of bread and wine, yet (N.B.) NOTWITHSTANDING THIS, the praiseworthy

authority of the sacred Canons and the approved custom of the Church should be observed as law, which custom, although observed by the celebrating priests under both species, by the laity under the species of bread only is to be held as law which it is not permissible to reprobate"; the Council of Trent erred when it defined, under anathema, that the traditions of men are to be embraced with the same pious affection as the written word of God, exploded the imputation of Christ's righteousness and justification without works, and sanctioned under anathema innumerable other things diametrically opposed to the written word of God.

LX. The Emissary objects: "I am most desirous to know who is the judge of this matter and whether in this case we ought not rather to defer to the whole Church, whose succession has been continued without any interruption down to the present day, than to private individuals who have introduced schism for the sake of their own advantage." With you I ask, Who will be the judge? Will it be he who has introduced manifest errors, clearer than the noonday sun? That is, the Pope and his sworn ministers, the bishops of more corrupt ages, who dare something against Christ and the word of God, and whose one aim is that the Pope may be preeminent when Christ is brought into subjection, and traditions may prevail when the authority of God's word is cast aside? He needs hellebore, whoever receives this rash assertion with blind credulity, and embraces the accused as judge, and makes him, which has never been heard of elsewhere, at the same time the norm (for the voice, definition, proposition of the Pope is the norm of the Papal faith, nothing else), the judge and the accused at once, the plumb line, the workman, the destroyer. If the Church is the judge, it will be the true Church, not the false; the Church of Christ, not of Antichrist. Therefore first demonstrate that yours, and yours alone, is the true Church of Christ. But where you have demonstrated this, it must first have renounced those manifest and other most grievous errors, devourers of faith and salvation, introduced in the corrupt old age of the world for the sake of belly and dominion, and stubbornly defended today; and at the same time it must have put away that dictatorial arrogance by which it exalts itself above Christ and His word, without which it can never be demonstrated to be, nor can it ever be, the true and Church of Christ.

LXI. To answer your question plainly, the judge is either supreme, altogether infallible, autopistos, or inferior, subject to the examination of conscience according to the word of God, and consequently infallible secundum quid. The supreme judge is He whose honor is chiefly at stake, who can neither deceive nor be deceived: God Himself, Christ Himself, or, which is the same thing, the Holy Spirit Himself speaking in the Scriptures. With reverence St. Augustine acknowledges this supreme tribunal in On Marriage and Concupiscence, Book II, 59: "This controversy," he says, "seeks a judge. Therefore let Christ judge, let the Apostle judge with Him, because Christ Himself also speaks in the Apostle." The same Augustine in Sermon 16 on the Words of the Lord thus devolved the judgment of his controversy to Christ: "What shall we do? Shall we hear this controversy as judges? Far be it. Rather, being constituted under a judge, let us knock that we may obtain to have it opened to us; let us flee under the wings of our Lord." The inferior judge is either public or private. The public judge is the Church, which ought to follow the norm prescribed by the supreme Judge, and by this one argument most powerfully proves itself the true Church: if it religiously follows the norm and judges that to be believed and done which is contained in the norm. The private judge is each individual believer, whose part it

is to test all things, hold fast to what is good, prove the spirits whether they are from God, at the touchstone, that is, of Scripture, as we have shown above. But each of these inferior judges, since he can deceive and be deceived, is subject to that supreme one, both as to judgment in his conscience in this life and as to that decisive judgment in the other.

LXII. For example, the Pope with his followers in the Second Council of Nice decreed that images are to be religiously worshiped and adored. This decree is diametrically opposed to the words of the Decalogue: "You shall not worship them nor serve them." This is the most clear voice of the supreme Judge. Therefore the inferior judge, whether the Church or any believer, subjecting his judgment to this, dismisses the Pope with his decree. The Pope in the Council of Constance abolished Communion under both kinds. This decree directly contradicts Christ's words: "Drink of it, all of you." This is the open voice of the supreme Judge, to which any particular Church or any believer, religiously subjecting his judgment, condemns the Pope's decree. The Pope in the Council of Trent pronounced anathema on those who ascribe justification to faith alone or to the merit of Christ alone apprehended by true faith, not to inherent righteousness. Therefore "Let Christ judge, let the Apostle judge with Him, because Christ Himself also speaks in the Apostle." For he concludes in Romans 3:28, Galatians 2:16, that a man is justified by faith without works of the law, and is justified only by the faith of Jesus Christ. Therefore the Catholic Church, and any particular Church, and individual believers, willingly subjecting their judgment to this supreme Judge, pronounce anathema on all who judge contrary to Christ and the Apostle. Cease, therefore, Emissary, to inquire who is the judge in matters of faith and interpretation of Scripture.

LXIII. You are certainly altogether destitute of a legitimate judge and legitimate judgment. For you impiously reject the supreme Judge speaking God, the Holy Spirit, in the Scriptures, and substitute in His place the Spirit of the Pope, which cannot demonstrate itself divine by any character; and you acknowledge no inferior judge subject to God speaking in the Scriptures, nay, you openly charge with the crime of private spirit and enthusiasm those who are such. What, therefore, can prevail and make inroad among those so disposed except ignorance of the true God and His word, bitter confusion, the efficacy of delusion, and every evil work? Not to mention that concerning the supreme judge on earth, from whom you do not even allow an appeal to God Himself, you are so impotently tossed and fluctuate that the unity of faith of which you boast is found to gape and totter nowhere more than in this very principle of faith. For some ascribe that judicial power and infallibility to the Pope alone, even defining apart from a Council, and defend most validly the fallibility of Councils not confirmed by the Pope. These are nearly the Spaniards and Italians. Others ascribe the same to Councils, and prove by irrefragable arguments the fallibility of Popes defining apart from a Council. These are the French. Both sides have adherents here and there. Both use arguments for demolishing their adversaries' position, and evident facts to which we deservedly add our suffrage, which are altogether unobjectionable. Both employ the name of Church to make a fair show. "We must believe the Church," they all cry. But shall I rejoin, must we believe its mere dictum, or what is demonstrated from elsewhere? If its mere dictum, then in its own cause it must be simply believed just as the supreme God in Heaven. But can Jews, Pagans, Turks, heretics ever be converted to Christ by this method? Nay, they will rather persist in demanding by a similar edict that credence be given

them, perhaps with no less show of reason. If what is demonstrated from elsewhere, whence, then? From Scripture? But you deny that Scripture has any authority at all without the dictum and testimony of the Church. From tradition? But hardly any plebeian can derive that from its earliest sources. From arguments? But all these, destitute of revelation, will effect nothing here, and the infidels will allege similar ones for themselves.

Here is a translation of the text into English:

LXIV. Moreover, is it to be believed first that the Church exists and is infallible in its judgment, or that God the Almighty Father, Creator of Heaven and Earth, Jesus Christ the only Savior, and the Holy Spirit the Comforter, are ours? If the former, the order of the Apostles' Creed is perverted, and the faith itself which is placed in the Church, before the knowledge of God the Father and Christ, from whom the Church has its origin, essence and foundation, will turn out monstrous. If the latter, whence shall I know that God the Father is the Creator of Heaven and Earth, that Jesus Christ is the only Savior, that the Holy Spirit is the Comforter? From the Church? But it is supposed not yet known. From Scripture? But you utterly deny that it is the word of God without the testimony of the Church. Besides, faith would thus be again most like a two-headed monster, one part of it resting on the dictum of the Church, the other on Scripture. From nature? But flesh and blood does not reveal those mysteries, but the Father who is in Heaven.

LXV. But granted that the Church is the judge of faith, granted that it is infallible, yet afterwards the plebeian will rightly object: "If a priest, if a confessor does not obtain the same power and the same infallibility." For I hear this one almost alone, this one alone pours into me the things to be imbibed at his dictum. For I have never seen or heard the Pope, or the Council with the Pope. Indeed my priest shelters himself under the shield of the Church, loudly extols the Church, and boasts of its judgment, testimony, definition. But whence shall it be certain to me that he has clearly apprehended the judgment of the Church? Whence, that he proposes the same to me in good faith and so clearly that I can safely trust him apprehending and propounding it? What certainty of faith will there be here? For he himself does not have the gift of infallibility, nor does he even profess it. Where then shall I turn? To Scripture? But the reading of it is forbidden me; and moreover, its interpretation is suspended on the Church. To the Bishop? It is not always permitted; and moreover, he is no more infallible. To the Pope? Scarcely or not even scarcely is it permitted; and if I doubt, he will regard me as a deplorable heretic, not teach me. For he is not accustomed to teach or preach, and perhaps cannot. Nay, most learned men, Archbishops, Bishops, Prelates, Priests, Frenchmen and innumerable others affirm that he is not infallible if he speaks and defines apart from a Council. To a Council? But it is most rarely held, and perhaps henceforth, things being as they are in the Papacy, no other will ever be held. Besides, access to a Council is not open to me, a plebeian. Finally, most learned men of the greatest authority, Italians and Spaniards, stoutly maintain that Councils both can deceive and be deceived. As for the ancient Councils, they are not known to me, being written in a foreign language; nor if they are translated can I be certain about the faithfulness of the translation and their true sense. Finally, those very persons who teach me deprive me, being themselves confessedly fallible, of the judgment of my own opinion and examination of doctrine,

crying that I must believe what the Church believes. Thus they forbid me, having open eyes to see and being endowed with reason and judgment, to judge. Therefore nothing will prevent those men who profess themselves to be my teachers, yet able to err, from leading me into horrendous errors, or at least being able to do so, while in the meantime my faith hangs between the sacred and the loose, and has nothing certain or stable on which to rest.

LXVI. Behold, Emissary, your judge, behold your Church! And yet it does not appear by any probable argument that your Roman Church is that true Church to which you assert judicial power has been granted. The Emissary, indeed, speaking before so great a Prince, doubtless brought forth the choicest argument he had. But he brought forth the succession continued without any interruption down to the present day. Here is that Achilles, who presents himself with such a face:

"Wherever there is given a succession of Bishops from the Apostles down to the present day without any interruption, there is the one true Catholic Church.
But at Rome there is such a succession.
Therefore there, and nowhere else, is that one true and Catholic Church."

With this single argument the Emissary dared to demonstrate to his King the truth and Catholicity of the Roman Church above all others which he could have brought forth, and which others have in fact brought forth; but such an argument, however, as was formerly that of the Princes of Egypt saying to Pharaoh: "I am the son of the wise, the son of ancient kings" (Isaiah 19:11).

LXVII. For that major premise appears nowhere in Holy Scripture, nor was it handed down by the Apostles among the doctrines of the saving faith. Undoubtedly the word "Church" here denotes an assembly of upright men, yet not just any, but of those whom God will deign worthy of participation in eternal salvation. But what is required for an assembly to consist of upright men is sufficiently known by nature; but what is required for those upright men, being so acknowledged, to be God's, so that He wills to make them eternally blessed, that indeed requires revelation. Therefore, what the true Church pleasing to God and Catholic is cannot be demonstrated except by an argument resting on Divine revelation. For, as St. Augustine admonishes us, the Church ought to be acknowledged in no other place than in the Canonical Scriptures. Let the Papists, therefore, read to us in those Scriptures which alone comprise the Divine revelations, that the whole Church is Catholic which has progressed by such a succession. Nay, let them but read this one thing: that such a succession is one of the signs which render a Church probably genuine. But if they are unable to produce this, it is manifest that the matter is carried on with mere trifles and inanities, when concerning Divine matters known only by revelation, nothing but uncertain subtleties of human wit are brought forth.

LXVIII. Nay more, that proposition speaks so indefinitely and universally that, taken as it lies, scarcely anything falser can be devised. For besides the fact that other Churches too, the Antiochene, Alexandrian, Constantinopolitan, Greek, have their own Catalogues of Bishops of no less certain faith than the Roman, it is also a most insecure assertion that wherever men

succeed one another, there exists that state of affairs which was at the time of him who was first in that succession - a notion which indeed departs too far from truth in all human life and actions. For thus there would be found to be no change at all in human affairs, since there is a perpetual succession from Adam down to all his posterity, although we cannot recite and enumerate all our ancestors in an uninterrupted series by their names. Did there not, therefore, as there once arose in Egypt a new king who knew not Joseph and resolved that the people of God must be circumvented craftily lest they should multiply, so arise in the Church mystical Pharaohs who knew not the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, who would bring the people of God, being craftily circumvented, into utmost peril?

LXIX. But they say that the Holy Fathers used the argument drawn from succession. We by no means dissemble this. However, they speak not of the mere succession of persons, but of the perpetual tradition of the same doctrine and faith as it were by the hands of Bishops succeeding one another; otherwise they are not to be heard. To prove such a tradition was easy indeed for St. Irenaeus and Tertullian, who first used a similar argument against their heretical adversaries; likewise for Optatus and Augustine in the controversy with the Manichees and Donatists. For that was a time less remote from the age of the Apostles, more holy indeed and more observant of Apostolic doctrine, and not yet so subject to those great and various changes which, as the highest ignorance and wickedness of bishops at length prevailed, the course and power of ages is accustomed and wont to induce. Moreover, that his discourse concerned not any successors whatever, but only the Orthodox who were of the same faith with the Apostles, Irenaeus himself expressly declared in Book III, chapter 4: "We must obey those Elders in the Church who have succession from the Apostles, who, together with the succession of the Episcopate, received according to the good pleasure of the Father the sure gift of truth." That is, as Ambrose judges in his book On Penitence, Book I, chapter 6: "He has not the inheritance of Peter who has not the faith of Peter." And that saying of Nazianzen in his Oration on Athanasius is well known and common: "It is by piety rather than by place that succession is to be estimated. For he who professes the same doctrine of faith is a sharer of the same throne; but he who embraces a contrary faith ought to be regarded as an adversary even on the throne. Succession of faith, therefore, is rather to be considered," etc. "Unless perhaps one should say that such a one is a successor just as we say that death succeeds health, a storm succeeds calm, and folly succeeds prudence." Concerning the very Chair of Peter, Bernhard did not hesitate to write thus in Epistle 189: "That Beast in the Apocalypse, to which was given a mouth speaking blasphemies and making war with the Saints, occupies the Chair of Peter as a lion ready for prey."

LXX. Not, therefore, just any succession, but a legitimate one according to the ancients, has any weight here. But a legitimate succession is not of place alone, but either of doctrine alone or of place and doctrine together. "For the Church is not necessarily where there is a succession" (namely, of place), says Bellarmine on the Church Militant, Book IV, chapter 8, using the example of the Patriarchal Churches to which local succession avails nothing because of their heretical Bishops. Succession of legitimate doctrine, therefore, supposes the truth and demonstration thereof. But what if he who has even legitimately succeeded should become a heretic? Will the Church still be Catholic in every respect then? Yet Bellarmine himself

acknowledges that by a heretic that laudable order of succession is disturbed. For thus he writes in the passage cited: "Add finally that those Patriarchal Churches had for long periods manifest heretical Bishops. Whence the succession of true Pastors was interrupted." And yet if to a heretical Bishop legitimately constituted another Catholic legitimately constituted is subrogated, the very principle of succession has no fault. Legitimate succession, therefore, insofar as it is such, does not prevent a Church from being stained with heresy. But suppose all the Bishops are Orthodox; yet if the Presbyters or the greater part of the people are held by numerous and most grievous errors, will that Church remain true and Catholic? No sane person, I think, will simply affirm this. For neither would anyone call a Republic well constituted merely because it has obtained good rulers, unless the people too have done their duty. Therefore, a perpetual succession, even of the best Bishops, cannot be considered a firm indication of the Catholic Church. Finally, however that major premise may be painted, it cannot be effected from the fact that a Church has had a perpetual succession that the same will not be different hereafter and does not now behave rightly. For neither if it was once well will it now or always be well, nor if once ill will it now or always be ill. Otherwise, it would have been easy for the ancient heretical Bishops, Paul of Samosata, Photinus, Arius and others, to demonstrate that they were Catholic, not heretics, since before them the Churches over which they presided had perhaps not had a heretical Bishop or Presbyter, there being an unbroken succession of holy, faithful and believing Bishops and Presbyters derived from the Apostles.

LXXI. Now the minor premise of that argument also totters in no one respect. Not to mention that the perpetuity of the succession is not a little shaken by the long interregnums or, if you prefer, interpontificates, both foreign and domestic Papal schisms, by which the whole state of the Pontifical succession has been rendered uncertain. For that is not perpetual which is distinguished by some great interval, whether there are none at all who care for the matter, or those are so uncertain that you are in doubt whom you ought to follow. But that the Roman Church has often fluctuated through very long interpontificates and most stubborn schisms, no one ignorant of Church history can be unaware. But this is more, that undoubtedly those must be reckoned in the census of succeeding Bishops not who are such merely in name, like carnal statues, but who in reality fulfill the duties of true Bishops - that is, who (as the Apostle describes) are "examples to the flock, blameless, not self-willed, not pugnacious, hospitable, gentle, not contentious, free from the love of money, good managers of their own households, dignified, temperate, holding fast the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching, that they may be able both to exhort with sound doctrine and to refute those who contradict" (Titus 1:7-9); who are also legitimately ordained and elected, not taking the honor to themselves but being called as Aaron was. Will anyone, even most devoted to their party, dare to claim that these qualities have continued in a successive series of Roman Bishops? For it has scarcely been the case in the last few centuries that you could repeatedly count ten able to exhort with sound doctrine and refute those who contradict. As for who has spoken sacred words to the people in a sacred edifice, you could scarcely in several hundred years cite one or two instances. Of those who have ascended that sublime throne for the last five hundred years, most have been lawyers, merchants, crafty politicians, soldiers - few or none learned, not to mention theologians, which indeed Pontifical writers themselves have by no means concealed. That there have been some heretics long ago is well known, and before Albertus Pighius nearly

all Pontifical theologians ingenuously confessed that all could lapse into heresy. But how rarely do you find one who is an example to the flock, to believers, in speech, conduct, chastity, and abstaining from lording it over the clergy? For almost a hundred and fifty years, we have cited the testimony of Genebrard above that about fifty Popes had utterly declined from the virtue of their predecessors, being "Apotaticals" or "Apostates" rather than "Apostolicals." Were those true Bishops? Just as a mouse sprinkled with flour is the master of the bakery. But what shall we say of the vices in the election and vocation to the supreme Pontificate? For no sane person would say that the Popes were the successors of the ancients when elected by vice. Baronius himself stigmatizes those promoted thus to the Papacy as "False-Popes"; and under the year 908, paragraph 4, he writes thus: "Well-ordered ecclesiastical discipline has judged that the invaders of the Apostolic See are not 'Apostolical' but 'Apostatical.'" Yet in the 9th and 10th centuries he laments that not a few Popes were thrust in without law by harlots. Concerning John XIII, under the year 965, paragraph 5, he writes thus: "Such a monster occupied the Apostolic See, to whom neither age nor birth nor a legitimate election gave support, and who retained merely the name of Pontiff usurped by wicked arts." Nor will I urge how grievous were the vices that attended the elections of nearly all the Roman Pontiffs from Gregory VII down to our age, when so many conclave histories forbid us to be ignorant that most were elected by vice. I will pass over the unworthy elections of Cardinals and clergy, whose dignity, since the first and only step to the Pontificate, makes it no difficult judgment whether he who is constituted a Cardinal by vice (as most certainly very many obtain the purple hat by money or by the favor of Crowns, etc.) and has often been iniquitously transferred from a layman into sacred orders, and consequently is not truly a Cardinal, can thereafter be rightly constituted Pope or Roman Bishop, or whether he can rightfully elect a Pope. Nor indeed is the vice of election here amended by subsequent consent as is customary in civil life, the Bull of Julius II sanctioned in the Lateran Council being an obstacle - a Bull which the Cardinals still today swear in every conclave to observe by touching the sacred objects, declaring an election made by vice to be so invalid that it confers no administration in spirituals or temporals on the one so elected or assumed, and that such an one so elected or assumed can be opposed and excepted against by anyone who took part in the election, as in a case of undoubted heresy; nor can such an election ever be made valid by any subsequent enthronement, lapse of time, or even adoration and obedience by all the Cardinals.

LXXII. We conclude that the Roman Church is neither one, nor Catholic and Apostolic, because it is destitute of unity of faith; and it rends asunder the true members of the Church; and it is unable to assert its truth and Catholicity by any probable argument; and it has defected from the ancient Roman Church; and it confounds the Church with worldly empire; and it dreads the tribunal of Scripture, nay openly rejects it under the pretext of the imaginary Ocean's entrance; and while vindicating to itself supreme legislative and judicial power and Divine infallibility, it obtrudes its dicta and definitions on consciences not by any way of demonstrations from the word of God, but by mere command, which least of all befits the true Christian Church; and it endeavors to render all demonstrations from the word of God, the human authority being set aside, suspect and rejects them; and it deprives not only all other Churches in the East and West, but also its own people, of the judgment by which true doctrine is discerned from false by the word of God, and it forces them even with the threat proposed to a brutish necessity of

assenting; and it is destitute of every legitimate judge and judgment, both supreme and subordinate; and finally, it strives to prove its Catholicity by these very deeds most alien from the Spirit of Christ and the character of the true Church; and so clearly shows that the Emissary, as a blind guide altogether missing his mark, has attempted not to lead the Most Serene Prince into the Royal path of truth, but has striven in vain to seduce him into the precipice of errors.

THE DEMONSTRATION IS COMPLETE.

THE END.

A HISTORICAL-THEOLOGICAL DISSERTATION ON THE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

Which, the One Immaculate Lamb Jesus Christ being propitious, is submitted to the pious and gracious examination of the learned by

J. HENRY HEIDEGGER, Doctor and Primary Professor of Sacred Theology, and at this time Head of School

The respondents being:

JOHN HENRY FRISIUS, Minister of the Divine Word
and
JOHN HULDRIC CEPORINUS, Student of Sacred Theology

The day after the Synod of May, the usual time and place

Zurich: Printed by DAVID GESSNER, 1672

I. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo and apex of all theologians who lived after the Apostles, left words most worthy of praise and full of modesty concerning the Virgin Mother in his book On Nature and Grace, chapter 36: "Concerning the holy Virgin Mary, for the honor of the Lord, I wish to have no question whatsoever when the matter relates to sins." The patrons of the immaculate conception certainly also have this passage frequently on their lips, and twist it to prove the avamevrta of the Mother of God. When, however, nothing is more obvious than that he piously thought nothing should be asserted in either direction concerning sin (namely actual sin of Mary, about utterly suppressing and conquering which, so that no more would be committed, was his question against the Pelagians), nor even a question raised about it; indeed not out of consideration for the Blessed Virgin herself, but for the honor of Christ - not in this sense, that

he thought the honor of Christ would be impaired if Mary were said to have been liable to sin, but that we should defer this to the honor we owe Christ: not to speak of the sins of His Mother.

II. We would greatly desire that it were permitted also to us to be so fortunate that, in honor of our Lord and Savior, nothing should be said concerning the sin, whether original or actual, of His blessed Mother, nor any question at all raised about it. And it would indeed have been permitted to us, had not ill-advised men arisen in the Church who, overstepping the limits set by St. Augustine and paving the way and degree to the par excellence or religious adoration of the Blessed Virgin, would strive with all their might's contention to exempt her from every sin, not only actual but also original.

Which madness indeed has proceeded so far that even simple people of different parties, to whom perchance a word escaped imprudently concerning the liableness of Mary to sin, are today seized as blasphemers and thrown into prison, subjected to examination, and compelled, as sad experience proves, even to stand trial for their life. Just as of old St. Augustine was unwilling to raise any question concerning the sin of His Mother for the honor of the Lord, so today, alas, we have arrived at the point where, both on account of the honor of the Lord, whose sole privilege and signal prerogative of being conceived without stain from the Holy Spirit has been violated and communicated to the Blessed Virgin without any support of Scripture, and on account of the importunity of the Adversaries and the question raised against our will concerning the sin of the Blessed Virgin, that question is to be discussed.

III. The controversy comes to this state of the question: Whether the Blessed Virgin Mary was immune from all sin, even original, so that she was conceived without any stain? Concerning actual sin, most of the Adversaries affirm, and pronounce boldly that it is an article of faith, that Mary was utterly without any actual sin whatsoever, even venial, as Eustachius a S. Paulo asserts. Although others speak disjunctively, saying that her immunity from every actual sin too is either an article of faith defined in the Council of Clermont under Urban II, or something proximate to the faith, insinuated by the Council of Trent in Session 6, Canon 23. But concerning Original Sin, at first indeed there was doubt in the Pontifical Church; soon there arose a schism of parties contending keenly on both sides; finally, by various definitions of Popes and Councils, yet not without grave disturbances, the matter was scarcely settled at last. So that three complete historical periods seem to be constituted concerning this controversy ventilated in the Papacy: namely, the Preparatory, the Dogmatic, and the Definitive, occupied in various definitions of Popes and Councils to put an end to the altercation, concerning which we think a few things should be culled in advance from the series of events.

IV. I call that the Preparatory period, in which a departure began from the received doctrine of the Church concerning the immaculate conception of Christ alone, and from humble and almost contemptible beginnings and motives, as the very Irishman Wadding, of the Minorite order, calls them, a prelude was made to the opinion concerning the avamartia of the Blessed Virgin.

This period began around the year of Christ 1126 and runs to the year 1300. The matter is thus: After the heresy of Nestorius arose, which impiously divided the one Christ into two, it came into

use in both the Eastern and Western Church for the Blessed Virgin to be called Theotokos, Mary the Mother of God, which was most rightly instituted at first in honor of Christ and to assert the unity of His person, but was gradually transferred to amplifying the honor of His Mother. The same thing also happened in the picture of Christ reclining in the arms of His Mother, which was first introduced to testify to the veneration of Christ even as an infant, but was afterwards transferred to the veneration of the Mother without the Son, He being added as an appendage to the picture. Soon certain writers and preachers, swept away as it were by the torrent of the common people's lack of self-control, omitting mention of Christ, so exceeded all bounds in heaping up encomiums and epithets of religious worship to be rendered to the Blessed Virgin that around the year of Christ 1050 they instituted a daily office divided into Canonical Hours in her honor, in the same form as those hours were anciently celebrated in honor of the Divine Majesty. And that veneration grew to such an extent a hundred years later that even those things which are predicated of the Divine Wisdom in Scripture were attributed to her. But among the privileges and prerogatives communicated to her was also that immunity from Original Sin. Which opinion, hitherto residing in the minds of private individuals, finally in the year of Christ 1156, which we have fixed as the beginning of this period, began to be introduced into the Offices of the Church by the Canons of Lyons, the Feast of the Conception being also instituted, in the opinion of most, in the time of Anselm, to which I know not what revelations gave occasion. But both the Feast and Office of the Conception had hitherto prevailed in only a part of the Church. And that Feast indeed, according to the interpretations of Bonaventura, Aegidius and Paulus the Carmelite and others, began to be instituted not on account of the conception itself, which was with sin, but on account of the person already conceived and about to be sanctified immediately. For just as if a First-born Son is born lame to a King (for they illustrate the matter with this similitude), who is to be freed from lameness immediately, there would certainly be cause for rejoicing on account of the person born, not on account of the lameness with which that First-born was born; so also that Feast was instituted, and in the course of time celebrated with indulgences granted by the Pope, not on account of the conception itself of the Blessed Virgin, which was stained, but on account of her sanctification soon to follow. In the same way the Office of the Conception, in whose first Antiphon are these words: "Thou art all fair, my love, and the original stain is not in thee," is interpreted by the more sound in the Papacy as referring to the conception of the Blessed Virgin not the first and carnal, but the second and spiritual, which took place immediately after the union of soul and body, when the Spirit of God was most copiously poured out upon her. "Otherwise," says Bandellus on the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, page 1, "many words of that Office will be false, and contrary to the Holy Doctors and Sacred Scripture." But however that may be, it is certain that St. Bernard, otherwise so profuse in chanting the praises of the Mother of God that he called her hyperbolically the "neck of the Church," as if all grace flowed from the Head into the Church through her, immediately and strenuously opposed that novel institution, writing to the people of Lyons an Epistle "On Not Instituting the Feast of the Conception of the Virgin," in which, among other things, occur these noteworthy words: "The Lord Jesus alone was conceived by the Holy Spirit, who alone was Holy in that very conception; excepting whom, He regards all the rest born of Adam, concerning which one humbly and truly confesses of himself, saying, 'Behold, I was conceived in iniquities, and in sins did my mother conceive me.' Since these things are so, what will now be the reason for the festal celebration of this conception? How, I ask, shall that

conception be asserted as holy which is not from the Holy Spirit - not to say which is from sin? Or how shall that be considered festal which is in no wise holy? The glorious Virgin will gladly forego this honor by which either sin seems to be honored or a false holiness induced. Otherwise this presumptuous novelty, mother of rashness, sister of superstition, daughter of levity, will by no means please her, being contrary to the custom of the Church." Nor was it Bernard alone, but in the following 13th century also the Scholastic Doctors both Franciscan and Dominican, and among the Franciscans indeed the most celebrated Doctors Anthony of Padua, Bonaventura, Alexander of Hales, de Mediavilla, Occam, Alvarus, Bertrandus de Turre, John of Rupella, of Pisa, Lyranus, and very many others, both by voice and writing refuted the creeping error. Nay, five Supreme Pontiffs also, from Bernard down to the year 1300, namely Innocent II and III, Honorius III, Clement V, and Innocent V, whose words Bandellus on page 49 and following alleges at length, persisted in the truth hitherto received in the Church, and not obscurely asserted that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in sin. And these are the beginnings and preludes of the error.

V. The second period follows, in which the categorical assertion of the immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin already resounded in the Church and was publicly defended, not without the fervor of contradicting parties. That age begins from the year of Christ 1300 and extends to the Council of Basel celebrated in 1493, at which time something began to be defined concerning this matter. Therefore, at the beginning of the 14th century, John Scotus the Franciscan, surnamed the Subtle Doctor, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin having been called into question, and the arguments of both the affirmative and negative opinions having been carefully examined, at length taking refuge in the asylum of Divine power, concluded that God was certainly able to effect that the Blessed Virgin should either not be born at all in sin, or should emerge liable to sin only for a moment of time, or even for a time. And that God alone knows which of these three happened to the Blessed Virgin, but that the first could probably be attributed to her unless it conflicts with the authority of the Church and Scripture. His words on this matter are extant in Book 3 of the Sentences, dist. 3, q. 1, where after deducing arguments for each side, he finally concludes thus: "Concerning the question I say that God could have made it so that the Blessed Virgin should never have been in Original Sin. He could also have made it so that she should have been in sin for only one instant. He could also have made it so that she should have been in sin for some time and been cleansed in the last instant of that time. But which of these three, shown to be possible, happened in the case of Mary, God knows. But if it does not contradict the authority of Scripture, it seems probable to attribute the more excellent to Mary." Following the doctrine of this most celebrated Franciscan Doctor, the Franciscans of that time boldly entered through the door opened by their author, and what he had said could be done, and had proposed as probable under a doubtful and uncertain condition, "if it did not contradict orthodox faith," these men pronounced to have been done absolutely and simply, and so not only asserted but even maintained the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin.

However, the Preachers or Dominicans immediately opposed the Franciscans vehemently, under the auspices of the renowned Thomas from the same Order, who in the previous century under Innocent IV and Gregory X had clearly asserted that the Blessed Virgin was altogether

conceived in Original Sin. His express words are in the 2nd Book of Sentences, dist. 3, art. 1: "The Blessed Virgin was conceived in Original Sin. On account of which, as Bernard writes, her Conception ought not to be celebrated." And article 2: "The Blessed Virgin by her first sanctification, as is commonly held by all, was cleansed from Original Sin, the fomes essentially remaining but bound; which was totally removed afterwards by her second sanctification." Therefore, as soon as the Franciscans dared to assert the immaculate conception publicly, the followers of their Thomas the Dominican strenuously opposed them, and labored so vigorously to overturn the novel error that in his own age Bandellus enumerated seventy-two Doctors and most clear witnesses to the truth from that Order, whom he said were prefigured by the Seventy-two Disciples of the Lord. Nevertheless, the vain appearance of piety and religion effected that the opinion of the Franciscans was more acceptable and pleasing to the common people, nay, even approved by the vote of the University of Paris itself, which surpassed all others in the reputation of outstanding doctrine. Yet it is attested in the Annals of the Franks that in the year 1388 a schism arose in that University of Paris, so that they not only disputed within the Dominican School, but also one of them, John Montelonus, publicly taught it. Nay more, at Rouen men of that Order called "Hugos" by the common people, because one of them had agreed that he should be so publicly called if he did not prove his view by valid arguments, split off from it by schism, so that as many as wrote on the third book of the Sentences, at distinction 3, strenuously maintained their respective sides.

Period III, the Definitive Period

The definition of the Council of Basel... The definition of Sixtus IV concerning the Feast of the Conception... The tumult at Ferrara…

VI. The third period, or the definitive one, follows. For as party zeal increased and most grave disturbances arose on both sides, various definitions and declarations of Popes and Councils were procured by the importunate appeals of the parties. For in the year 1439 the Council of Basel began to define, or rather to publish under lead, as Almain speaks, in Session 36 that the opinion that Mary was never subject to Original Sin but was always immune from all original and actual fault, is to be held and embraced by all Catholics, and that henceforth it is unlawful for anyone to preach or teach to the contrary. And this definition prevailed in those nations which approved that Council, but not in the rest, which were more numerous. Nay, the Dominicans themselves condemned this Council, and Antoninus, according to Major commenting on that passage of the Sentences, was accustomed to say, in order to detract from its authority, that the Council of Basel had a basilisk birth.

In 1476, Sixtus IV, a Franciscan (that same one, indeed, who gained profit from brothels, and who, when solicited after becoming Pope to decide the controversy according to the promise he had made before the Papacy, eluded it with the words of the Apostle: "When I was a child, I spoke as a child," etc.), issued a Bull or Constitution found in Book 5 of the Extravagantes, tit. de Reliq. et ven. Sanctorum. In it, by apostolic authority and a constitution to endure forever, he confirmed a new Office of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin composed by Leonard Nogarola, a Clerk of Verona and Protonotary, and granted a plenary indulgence to those

celebrating it and favoring it by their presence. Meanwhile the matter was agitated with great disturbance and vehement contentions not only in the Schools but also in sermons before the people, one party fighting with testimonies of Scripture and suffrage of antiquity, the other however with arguments drawn from the dignity and excellence of Mary, revelations, and miracles. What tumult agitated Ferrara itself around that very time, what clamors were excited among the unskilled common people both in the Temples and in the marketplace by those who asserted the immaculate conception, and were so mad as not to blush to say that she was conceived by the Holy Spirit; what was the outcome of the disputation on this matter held in the ducal palace before the Prince Hercules d'Este himself - Vincentius Bandellus, who in that disputation defended the truth and emerged victorious, relates at length in an Epistle written to that Duke. Therefore, as hatreds increased more and more, the same Sixtus IV, by issuing another Constitution the day before the Nones of September in the year 1483, interposed to restrain the excessive zeal of the parties. The sum of that Constitution amounts to this: that it is indeed free to hold either opinion, since the Roman Church and Apostolic See has as yet defined neither side; yet under pain of excommunication neither party may accuse the other of heresy. But what was the mind and intent of Pope Sixtus in that very Bull is abundantly indicated. For not only does he begin from the view of the Preachers or Dominicans, as those who had given occasion for the edict, but also he censures it much more harshly. And that you may know the Franciscans were preferred in that Bull, the books of the Preachers were ordered to be burned in which it was written that the doctrine of the Adversaries was heresy; not so the books of the Franciscans. By this act the Pope hoped easily to suppress that party. Moreover, he decrees that no one may reprehend that opinion on account of which the Feast of the Conception was instituted, namely that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without Original Sin. All of which are so many oblique arguments approving the error of the Franciscans in that Bull.

VII. But not even this Constitution of Pope Sixtus sufficiently restrained the zeal of the parties contending most keenly. For in the year 1494, Trithemius, Abbot, in a written book on the praises of St. Anne, the mother of Mary, chapter 7, firmly asserted that the Mother of God was not sanctified from the original stain but preserved from it. Wigandus Cauponis, a Preacher of Frankfort, from the Order of Preachers, opposed him. A literary war having arisen between them, Trithemius summoned many more to impugn Wigandus. Soon, however, peace having been made between those two, and Wigandus recanting at Cologne, nevertheless the Dominicans appeal to Pope Alexander for being harassed by the Franciscans. Three years later, John Verius, a French Dominican, discoursing at length on the Sanctification of the Blessed Virgin at the Feast of the Conception, being summoned by the University of Paris, recanted. The next day, namely the 17th of September, 1497, eighty-two Professors of Sacred Theology at St. Mathurin in the city of Paris conspired that no one should thereafter be enrolled in that University unless he first obligated himself by oath to assert the immaculate conception. In the year 1499 the Theological Faculty of the University of Cologne also defined the same immaculate conception. The example of these two Universities was followed in 1501 by the Theological Faculty of the University of Mainz, decreeing that no one should there be advanced to degrees unless he first bound himself by oath to maintain the immunity of the Blessed Virgin from all sin. Therefore the Franciscans, insisting on the bulwark of the consent of these three Universities, proceeded to harass the Dominicans to such a degree that the latter were

compelled again to appeal to the tribunal of the Pope by earnest prayers. The result was that two Cardinals, Oliver and George, the former the Protector of the Preachers, the latter of the Minorites, by command and authority of Pope Alexander VI, on the last day of March in the year 1502, issued a decree. In that decree those aforesaid Cardinals state that whereas the enemy has oversown tares, and has turned the Gospel of peace into biting and scandalous taunts while delivering sermons concerning the spotless and most holy Conception of the Mother of God, and the provision made by Sixtus IV has not withdrawn them from their ill-conceived discourses, therefore they afterwards decree and ordain that the inhibition made by Sixtus, namely that neither party be condemned, be integrally and inviolably observed under penalty of the sentence of excommunication already pronounced; and that under threat of eternal damnation and penalty of deprivation of the office of preaching, total silence concerning this matter be observed before the laity. These things, from Trithemius and Bzovius under the year 1502, as well as Nicholas Basil, the Monk of Hirsau, relating them more fully in his additions to Nauclerus, may be consulted.

VIII. Seven years after the decree of those two Cardinals, or rather of Alexander VI, namely in the year 1509, followed the miserable tragedy of the Dominicans of Berne (following the example of Catherine of Siena, who also had previously defended the conception of the Blessed Virgin in sin under the pretext of stigmata and visions from Heaven, just as, on the contrary, Brigitta, wife of the King of Sweden, had asserted that the immaculate conception was revealed to her by God), striving to sustain the good cause by most wicked and diabolical arts, the history of which not only the domestic annals, but especially the prolix writing entitled "Concerning the Four Heresiarchs of the Order of the So-Called Observant Preachers Burned at Berne," composed, as the prologue has it, "by the entire study of the convent of Berne, and by Father Fremberus," and inserted by our distinguished Hottinger in the fifth volume of his Ecclesiastical History, relates at length. The occasion for the tragedy was provided by Wigandus, surnamed Wirt, that same one, unless I am mistaken, who had previously had dealings on this matter also with Trithemius, and to whom there had anew arisen a controversy with the Parish Priest of Frankfort concerning the Conception of the Blessed Virgin. When this Wigandus was summoned to Rome to plead his cause, some Brothers conspiring in the Chapter of Wimpina attempted to aid him with fictitious miracles and apparitions, namely John called Vetter of the Convent of Berne, Stephen Bolshorst the Preacher of the same, the Sub-Prior Francis Ulschi, and finally the Procurator Henry Steinecker. Forsaking the Powers above, or the immortal God, whom they could easily have consulted in His word if their mind had not been perverse, they stir up Acheron, tell the Devil by way of the Sacrament, with the pledge of their own blood added, to second their attempts; with utmost wickedness they attack John Jetzer, a novice of their own Order opportune for fraud on account of his simplicity, and first making trial and harassing him by sending the disguised spectre of Francis Ulschi and fictitious nocturnal terrors, they gravely announce that Scotus and other assertors of the immaculate conception are tormented in the fires of Purgatory. Soon, feigning the persons of St. Barbara and Mary the Mother of God herself, they appear to him by night, and reveal that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in Original Sin, and that this was to be declared by Pope Julius with fullest indulgences proposed, and the Minorites teaching the contrary were to be exterminated; they pierce him with five wounds, that they might have in their Order one bearing the wounds of Christ to oppose to the

stigmatized Francis; they fashion an image of the Blessed Virgin weeping with nocturnal and other colors; they lay snares for the life of Jetzer by a poisoned host and other means, lest the horrendous crime be divulged by him; finally, they wickedly mock that wretched client and the whole populace long enough, until, the fraud being disclosed, they were apprehended, devoted and addicted to expiatory flames, and suffered the penalties for their misdeed. This Divine Nemesis, indeed, they experienced, because they foolishly persuaded themselves that, neglecting the word of God, they could sustain the cause of God by nefarious machinations of this kind. But as the hatreds of the Brethren swelled more and more, and broke out afresh every December, soon after this tragedy at Berne, Pope Leo X, desiring to apply a healing hand to this evil, thought the controversy should be utterly determined, and to that end had already taken care to write to various parties. But the attempt at reformation of the whole of religion already undertaken by our heroes Ulrich Zwingli and Martin Luther at that time blunted the keenness of his intention and turned his thoughts to weightier matters.

IX. Therefore, at the beginning of the restored Gospel and the reformed Church, these contests subsided for some time, and it happened for a brief period in these quarrels of the brethren, as usually occurs in a city under siege, that the factions ceased, and forces and counsels were united against the common enemy. Yet these were truces rather than a solid and lasting peace. For in the Council of Trent, of which both the Dominicans and Franciscans were a part, those contests were restored after their interruption. In the 5th Session of that Council, Original Sin was discussed. Here several Bishops and the Franciscans did not approve of saying universally that the sin of Adam passed into the whole human race, unless the Blessed Virgin were expressly excepted. Otherwise, they said, the Church which celebrates that conception as immaculate would be condemned, and derogation made from the honor of her by whose means all the grace of Christ is derived to us. The Dominicans strove against this, asserting that that proposition, which admits of no exception of man without the word of God, was the Apostle's, nay of the ancient Church. That hitherto, indeed, the Church had tolerated that opinion of the immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. But that he who inspects the matter more deeply will find that the Virgin was no more exempt from the common contagion than others. When this contention became widespread at Rome, the Pope, fearing a schism, commanded the Legates to remove that bone of contention, and simply to renew the Constitutions of Sixtus IV. By the intervention of some Prelates, the Legates persuade the parties to lay aside their contentions. Both agree, on the condition that a tempering might be found in drawing up the decree by which prejudice would be made to neither party, and so that the Blessed Virgin would be comprehended in the Canon, but not appear expressly excepted. Thus, therefore, it was at length done that to that decree in which, among other things, it is established that that sin which is transfused by propagation, not imitation, from Adam into all, belongs to all and each individually, these words were subjoned by way of appendix, by which those Fathers declare "that it is not their intention in this decree, where Original Sin is treated of, to include the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, but that the Constitution of Sixtus IV of happy memory is to be observed, under the penalties contained in that Constitution, which they renew." Which words certainly can by no means be so explained that a foul and grave error is not imputed to all those Fathers. For if they will that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without sin, they posit and define the contradictory of that view in which the Fathers were; but if they

simply signify (although the words they have used can scarcely bear this sense) that it is not certainly true that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in sin, then with honest speech those good Fathers have affirmed as certain that which was doubtful, and have held as indubitable what was merely problematic. Meanwhile, to which side the Council inclined is by no means obscure. For it declares that in the decree by which it establishes that sin is transfused from Adam into all, it does not include the Blessed Virgin. Which is nothing else than to say that sin is not transfused from Adam into the Blessed Virgin, and consequently to contradict flatly the preceding decree.

X. But since the Council of Trent did not sustain defining this controversy so exercised by express and categorical words through fear of a schism, scarcely any hope remains that a clear definition putting an end to the controversy will be made in another general Council. For (I relate the words of a most celebrated Pontifical Doctor, the author of Notation 64 on the Moral Matters, etc., to the History of the Council of Trent by Sforza Pallavicino, page 101) some sagacious men observe that since so many difficulties occurred in beginning, prosecuting and completing the Council of Trent on the part both of Pontiffs and of Princes and of the Fathers themselves who convened at Trent, it will be most difficult for another general Council to be celebrated by Pontiffs in the future, which cannot, as he says, but be most pleasing to the Roman Pontiffs themselves, as also to the Roman Curia and the Regulars themselves. Since, however, toward the end of the Council of Trent, the Fathers commit to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff those things also which may require not merely a declaration or definition by a General Council, or in whatever more common manner may seem fit, etc., hence it has happened that even after the Council of Trent the Roman Pontiffs, compelled by the perpetual tumults of the contending Brethren, with the Dominicans ever and anon stirring up their energies armed with the defense of the most open truth and good cause, and the party of the Franciscans on the other hand growing stronger by the accession of the Jesuits, have more than once renewed the old Constitutions, nay, even amplified them.

Thus indeed, in the very next year after the Council, namely 1570, on the eve of the Kalends of December, Pius V, a Dominican, issuing a Bull on this same matter, first complains bitterly that some Regulars of different Orders, and Secular Clerics, omitting those things which might promote the glory of the Divine Majesty and the veneration of the Most Holy Mother of God and the piety of the faithful, waste away over questions and wordy strifes, from which arise wrath, contentions, and other monsters of vices; but especially when the sermon turns upon the glorious Conception of the Virgin Mary, so pertinaciously contend for either side, as if those dogmas were such as it is necessary to believe in the heart unto justification and to confess with the mouth unto salvation. Then, after extending a prolix complaint, he renews the decrees of his Predecessors, of the Council of Trent, and of Sixtus IV, and that they may be more effectually observed, he decrees and ordains that no one, of whatever Order, grade, condition, dignity he may be, shall presume in popular sermons, or wherever there is a promiscuous multitude of men and women, to dispute concerning either side of this controversy, or to write or discourse on this very question in the vernacular tongue. But as long as one side has not been defined by the Apostolic See, that learned men may discourse on that question in public academic

disputations, and either assert or impugn either side by arguments, provided that neither be denounced as erroneous.

XI. But not even this renewed and more strictly binding injunction kept these long-exulcerated parties within bounds. For from the year 1614 to the year 1612 in this very century, grave commotions excited by both contending parties not only shook the whole of Spain, but even brought it into extreme peril. The history has been related at length by Luke Wadding, the Irish Minorite, Theologian sent to Rome in this very cause by Anthony a Trejo, Bishop of Carthagena and Minorite General. I will embrace the event in brief from him. Francis a San Jago, a Minorite, feigned that he had been forewarned and conducted by a ring received from the Virgin of Guadalupe, in order to vigorously promote the mystery of the Immaculate Conception amidst the impending tumults in Spain. Hence great festivities concerning the Conception of the Blessed Virgin throughout the province of Baetica. Those of Seville attempting the same thing are accused by the assertors of the truth and charged with introducing a new and unheard-of doctrine. They clear themselves before the Prince, by whom being defended they pursue their celebrations, and affix trophies of the Marian victory over Original Sin, sealing the exits of the squares, streets and crossroads, the thresholds of the Temples, with this inscription: MARY CONCEIVED WITHOUT ORIGINAL SIN. Meanwhile, the defenders of the stained conception do not keep quiet. They attack this singular privilege of Mary as heterodox and abominable. The matter proceeded to such a degree that nearly the whole of Spain was blazing with the conflagration of dissension. Paul V, taking pity on the lot of Spain, on the 6th of July in the year 1616, issues an Apostolic edict, and renewing the Bull of Sixtus IV, innovates the sanctions and constitutions of the Council of Trent and of Pius V. But not even thus were the waves of minds composed. The Franciscans sing of victory, while the indignant Dominicans strenuously defend their view, so that the contention proceeded even from words to blows. The Catholic King Philip III, moved by the complaints of the people, sends Placidus de Tusantes, General of the Benedictines, to Rome. He obtains a decree of the Inquisition, the sum of which is that it is permitted to the Franciscans to assert the Immaculate Conception, but not to the Dominicans to assert the stained, yet with this provision: that no prejudice be cast upon the view of the Dominicans, nor may the Franciscans impugn it or even name it. This decree being brought to Rome, the Franciscans prepare new triumphs, breaking out into solemn sports and spectacles. But some, and among them especially the Bishop of Osuna, deny that that decree is fit and opportune for removing scandals, nor do they deem themselves sufficiently secure unless the Pontiff is induced to absolutely define the Immaculate Conception. Hence the solemn festivities already prepared are suspended by royal authority. But by no means do the Franciscans refrain from biennial rejoicings and celebrations, against whom the Dominicans inveigh with taunts. The King meditates a new Legation to the Pontiff, which the Pope anticipating dissuades, subscribing with his own hand that he had undertaken in his latest decree all that he was able and it was expedient to do. But with the Holy War resounding on every side, the King, situated between the rock and the sacred place, is constrained on one side by the mandate of the Pontiff, on the other by the peril arising from the blazing discord among the people. Yet he confirms his resolution and dispatches to Rome Anthony a Trejo, formerly General of the Minorites and now indeed also the chosen Bishop of Carthagena. He explains the desires of the King to the Pontiff. The latter denies that he can do anything other than what he had done in his

recent edict. The Legate insists before the Pontiff and suppliantly entreats the definition of the controversy. There were not lacking those who charged it as a fault upon the King that he wished to intermeddle in this ecclesiastical matter. Against these the Spanish Orator wove a long Apology, in which he proves that they were acting unjustly and iniquitously. But he sings to deaf ears. The Pope denies that he will define the controversy. Again and again the Orator insists before him and endeavors to induce him to define the controversy by most weighty Orations. Among other things he said that this contest causes the loss of souls, that many are perplexed, of suspended mind and doubtful judgment, not knowing which way to turn themselves. But in vain does he tragically exaggerate such things before the Pontiff. He stands like the Marpesian rock. He denies that he can define it. He objects that the Dominicans, in a book written by Peter of Vincenza a Dominican and presented to him by them, establish that their view is the unanimous doctrine of all the Fathers, and not only establish this but also endeavor to prove it. The Orator excepts that there has been no one from the Pontiffs after the Apostles who could err in establishing dogmas. The Son could not endure a lie from the Father Pope. He next objects that the book presented to the Pontiff by the Dominicans was transcribed from Bandellus, and endeavors to refute it. At the same time he petitions that that book of Bandellus be proscribed and condemned. The Pontiff denies him everything. The Orator a Trejo insists again, and entreats the Pontiff at least to order all to celebrate the Feast of the Conception, and to remove the intolerable dissonance in its celebration. The Pope refuses even this. Finally, he denies in general that a definition is fitting and necessary; nay, he even maintains that if the controversy were to be absolutely defined, owing to the authority of Scripture, the Doctors, and Thomas, the decision would have to be pronounced in favor of the Dominicans. By these protractions Philip the King, induced, sent a new Legate to Rome, the Duke of Albuquerque. He first of all makes a complaint concerning the medals of the Conception on which was engraved the image of the Conception with this inscription: "Conceived without Original Sin," prohibited by order of the Master of the Sacred Palace and adjudicated to the treasury, which he therefore suppliantly besought the Pope to permit to be struck and distributed in honor of his wife. But he too failed to gain his request. The Orator a Trejo again insists and urges the definition by an argument drawn from revelations and most grievous scandals, which he repeated from various ages, and at the same time entreats the Pontiff to approve the oaths and vows by which whole Academies, Cities and Kingdoms had bound themselves to maintain the opinion of the Immaculate Conception. But all was with fruitless endeavor. The former Legate is compelled to return to Spain from Rome without accomplishing anything. Meanwhile Paul V dies and has Gregory XV as his successor. Soon after, Philip III also dies in the habit of a Franciscan Monk, leaving the affair to his son Philip IV. He confirms the Legation and restricts it, ordering them to act more remissly. Meanwhile, new litigations arising in Spain give occasion for new instances. The Orator Albuquerque is ordered by letters given to him on the 10th of November in the year 1621 to make trial of the new Pontiff Gregory XV. He feeds the Orator with good hope that he will soon provide against such continual scandals. Meanwhile, a new Legate, the Count of Monterey, arrives at Rome from Spain, who finally obtained an amplification of the decree issued by Paul V. Namely, by a Bull issued by this Gregory on the 24th of May in the year 1622, repeating and confirming the preceding decrees of Sixtus V and Paul V, he added: that no one, even in writings and private discourses, may dare to assert that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in sin, except those to

whom this has been simply indulged by the Apostolic See. Yet in such wise that no prejudice be cast by this new decree upon the opinion of those who assert the stained Conception. Also commanding all and singular persons, both ecclesiastical and secular, that in the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and in the celebration of the Divine Offices, they use no other term publicly and privately than "Conception" (for the Dominicans had hitherto used the term "Sanctification"). This decree was afterwards sent by the Pope to Philip IV, together with the reasons set forth why that controversy could not be defined. Among other things, the Pope thus writes: "Since the Eternal Wisdom has not yet laid open to the Church the inner mysteries of so great a mystery, the faithful people ought to rest in the authority of God and of the Roman Pontiffs." This decree being published, the whole of Spain, but especially Baetica, resounded with rejoicings and triumphs, and trophies were erected as if over the Dominicans defeated and put to rout. Soon, however, a new constitution issued in the form of an indult in favor of the Dominicans on the 22nd of July in the year 1622, by virtue of the exception inserted in the previous Constitution, somewhat disturbed the excessive joy, in which the Pontiff indulged to none except the Dominicans that they might, among themselves only and not among others or with others, and in private conversations, be able to discourse and treat on the matter of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which had been interdicted to all defenders of the affirmative view in the first decree.

This is the end of the Spanish tragedy. But the catastrophe of Wadding, Book 4, page 492, has it thus: "Truly, if I may say what I think, I contend for this with the utmost vows, and have judged that the last germs of scandals can be extirpated only by a definition. Therefore, by his own judgment, the germs of scandals remain as long as that Roman Aeolus suspends the definitive sentence."

XII. There are some, therefore, who endeavor to persuade us that a definitive judgment has already been given by Alexander VII (that same Fabio Chigi who, when still a Nuntio, protested against the Peace of Münster, and so, as the witty remark of the Most Christian King's Legate M. de Servient is reported to have been made concerning him, "from not being a Protestant he has become a Protestant"). But if we believe Pontifical writers, he did not utterly remove the pending controversy and germs of scandals, but merely renewed the old Constitutions of the Popes and bound them more strictly by adding graver penalties. For thus I gather from the book of the Anonymous writer published by Stanislaus Felic of Cologne and praised above, page 14, where he distinguishes between the defining Church and the opining Church, to the latter of which he calls it a mortal crime to yield Catholic faith, because thus our judgment is proposed to the judgment of the Church permitting or propounding such an opinion as opinionable. And he subjoins that he who would call the followers of the contrary opinion not Catholic or less Catholic, or not pious or impious, besides the mortal crime against charity and certainly obliging to restitution of reputation against justice, is also rendered obnoxious to most grievous penalties decreed at times in the external court, which, he says, the Supreme Pontiffs formerly inflicted in their Bulls, explicitly concerning the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and which Alexander VII most resolutely willed to be undergone by those contravening his Constitution published in a Bull at Rome on the 21st of December, 1661, against those acting contrary to it. While culling these harsh words from that Anonymous author, the very Bull of Alexander itself, which I had

long sought for in vain in these regions, comes to hand, promptly and courteously communicated to me by a uniquely venerated Friend and Fellow-student from the vicinity. This Bull was issued on the 8th of December (the festal day of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin) in the year 1661, and promulgated on the 11th. Its title is: "Of Our Most Holy Lord, by Divine Providence, Pope Alexander VII, the Renewal of the Constitutions and Decrees issued in favor of the Opinion Asserting that the Soul of the Blessed Virgin Mary was Preserved from Original Sin in its Creation and Infusion into the Body." It prefaces concerning the debt of the Pastoral Office, concerning the removing of scandals, concerning the ancient piety of the faithful toward the Blessed Virgin in asserting her immaculate conception in the first instant of the creation of her soul, and the celebration of the Feast of the Conception; concerning the Constitution of Sixtus IV, the increase of this piety and opinion through the erected religious order, confraternities, and indulgences granted to them, so that now nearly all Catholics embrace that opinion; concerning the Constitutions of Paul V and Gregory XV. Afterwards it complains that the Bishops and Chapters of Spain have set forth to him by letters, and the Catholic King has intimated to him by sending the Orator Louis Bishop of Piacenza, that the assertors of the contrary opinion impugn, carp at, and interpret too narrowly those aforesaid prohibitions in private and public, so that the offenses, scandals, and strifes which Paul V and Gregory XV wished to obviate still endure, and greater inconveniences are feared. It subjoins that for maintaining this piety and devotion of worshipping and celebrating the Blessed Virgin as preserved from Original Sin by the prevenient grace of the Holy Spirit, the Constitutions of Sixtus IV, Paul V, and Gregory XV are renewed by him, together with the penalties contained in them, with the added penalty of perpetual inability to preach, publicly read, teach, interpret, and other penalties to be inflicted at his own and his successors' discretion. It also prohibits and proscribes books, in which that aforesaid opinion, feast, or cult according to it is called into doubt, or anything is in any way written or read against these things, published after the decree of Paul V. Finally, under the same penalties, it forbids anyone to impute the crime of heresy to one holding the opinion that the Blessed Virgin was conceived with Original Sin, "since," says the Bull, "this has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See, just as we now by no means wish or intend to decide it." Finally, it severely enjoins Bishops and Superior Prelates, and the Inquisitors of heretical pravity, to proceed and inquire against transgressors and animadvert strictly upon them. This is the epitome of the Bull, which some sagaciously conjecture to have been issued by Alexander in favor of the Jesuits, to whom he was more addicted on account of Father Sforza Pallavicino, the Jesuit General, to whom he owed the first step of his fortune. Thus this Alexander, like a new Rehoboam, proceeding from bad to worse in dealing with the Dominicans, who in many things are by far sounder than the rest. For when it was his part to relax the rigor of the Constitution of Gregory XV, he chose rather to say: "My little finger is thicker than my predecessors' loins. They made your yoke heavy, but I will add to your yoke. They chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" (1 Kings 12:10-11, 14).

XIII. But it is also notable that on the very next day, namely the 11th of December in the year 1661, Theses or Catholic Assertions concerning the Incarnation against the principal heresies of all ages were posted and defended by the Jesuits at the College of Clermont in Paris, of which the 24th thesis, opposed to the Barolian heretics of the 12th century, is as follows: "What could

not the chosen Mother of God merit? Not only did she probably merit several circumstances of the Incarnation, but even the execution of that Maternity itself. But what did not the Son grant to such a Mother? Together with Original Justice, the plenitude of graces, so that she not only did not contract Original Sin, but not even the debt of contracting it."

XIV. Thus far we have pursued with a historical thread even that last definitive period. And it is clear in general that in the first place indeed, on the occasion of the Feast of the Conception not before the 12th century, a prelude was made to the creeping error, and the Conception of the Blessed Virgin was doubted; soon it was pronounced on both sides, and camps were pitched in opposition; and finally various tragedies ensued calling for various definitions, the last of which, especially that of Gregory XV and Alexander VII, brought that whole cause to such a state that the sounder party, which had long defended the truth vigorously from the word of God and the consensus of the ancient Church, being oppressed, no other doctrine than that which wickedly violates the privilege of our Savior, and sonorously proclaims not only the immaculate conception of Christ alone, but also of the Blessed Virgin, can be heard, taught, or comprehended in writing with impunity, publicly or privately in the Papacy. So Alexander VII in the Bull first expressly affirms that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from Original Sin by the prevenient grace of the Holy Spirit, and roundly asserts that nearly all Catholics now approve this, nay, even celebrate the Feast of the Conception on account of that opinion. Then he corroborates with new and graver penalties the Constitutions of Paul V and Gregory XV, by which the assertors of the sounder opinion are forbidden not only to defend it publicly and privately before others, but even to discourse on that opinion among themselves without a special indult, and thus reduces the Dominicans and their followers to forced silence, changing to Seriphan frogs those who had previously been more loquacious than cicadas. Alexander indeed protests, following the example of his Predecessors, that this controversy has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and Apostolic See, and that he does not intend to decide it. But the protestation proceeding from fear of the parties contradicts the fact. For what remains to be defined, after the immaculate conception has been established in public cult and approved by the suffrage of the Pontiff himself, and its Adversaries have been reduced to such silence that they do not even dare to discourse with impunity among themselves apart and with no bystanders concerning the Conception of the Blessed Virgin in sin? Certainly human and ecclesiastical definitions can obtain no force at all in themselves to subdue the mind of man to interior assent, nor can they reach further than that the contrary be not asserted either publicly or privately. But not only has Alexander VII already achieved this after Gregory XV, but he himself, whom nearly all, and in matters of fact his flatterers the Jesuits, establish as infallible in questions of faith, not obiter and perhaps doing something else, but in the very Bull itself roundly asserts that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from Original Sin by the prevenient grace of the Holy Spirit. If this assertion is false, then the Pope has hitherto been false, and his Bull is of no moment. If true, and the Pope has judged it true, why did not that Roman Praetor simply propound it to be believed by all? Why did he not cut short the ambiguous fates of litigations, and remove the scandals connected with them? If doubtful, why did the Pope roundly assert it as indubitable? Why did he grant the faculty of defending without limit to the denying opinion, but enjoin upon the asserting one perpetual and most religious silence under the gravest proposed penalties?

XV. Moreover, it will not be alien from our purpose to elicit from the history above related in good faith some few corollaries. First, the Adversaries contend that the Blessed Virgin, received into Heaven, is still concerned with human affairs and the Church, and exercises dominion over the upper as well as the lower world. If this is true, how does it happen that the Roman Pontiffs, so often addressed and besought by every sacred thing in her favor, have hesitated so long to pronounce? That she herself has not asserted her own cause? That she has not so long brought into concord the parties so long and so pertinaciously clashing on her account in the very bowels of the Church? That she has not at least by her intercession with her Son obtained a halcyon and solid peace? Secondly, that most grievous conflict of the Pontificians concerning the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, protracted through nearly five centuries and agitated by many sad tragedies, affords an unambiguous argument that it greatly displeases Christ, our only Savior, to whom alone the Father God has given power in Heaven and on earth, that singular honor and glory are transferred to the mother; and consequently that by a just judgment He has confounded their tongues, that in this matter none should understand another; nay, that He has even permitted Satan from time to time to play second parts in that scene, and finally has struck the Roman Pontiffs themselves with a spirit of slumber and fear, so that no one has dared to this day to draw a categorical definition. Thirdly, on every occasion the Adversaries extol to an amazing degree the prerogative of their Church, which enjoys an infallible judge and easy termination of controversies by the same. But here indeed the Ausonian Prelate has slept concerning his Church. The Gregories, Alexanders, and Thersiters act their parts. The question is concerning a matter unknown in the Church for a thousand years, and concerning which before the Scholastics of the mendicant orders no controversy was moved by anyone. They have suffered it not only to be agitated both publicly and privately, by living voice and pen, but also for the parties driven into dire hatreds to break out into mutual charges of heresy. They acknowledge that thence have arisen innumerable scandals in various regions. So many supplications of Kings, Kingdoms, Clergy, peoples have devolved upon them; so many most costly Legations have been sent to them, by which a definition has been solicited. And yet the Pontiffs have made no account of all these things. They have stubbornly denied that they will define the controversy. In public Bulls inclining with their whole weight toward the inferior opinion, nay, even openly asserting it, as Alexander VII did, they yet deny that they wish that opinion to be the decided one. What, I ask, can be devised more alien from the office of a judge? That they do indeed allege various excuses to exculpate this supineness, I am not unaware. "Not yet," thus wrote Gregory XV to Philip IV, "has the Eternal Wisdom laid open to His Church the inner mysteries of so great a mystery." Truly it is a wonder if it is so great a "mystery," and consequently of the utmost importance for salvation, that it has not yet been laid open by the Eternal Wisdom to the Vicar of Christ, who feigns that he holds the Divine and human laws shut up in the repository of his breast, after more than sixteen hundred years! A wonder if it has not been laid open, why has there been so long a conflict about it! But that pretext plainly ceases today, after Alexander has openly asserted in a public document that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from Original Sin, and yet did not seem to wish to define the question. Others therefore devise other equally frigid pretexts. If they were to say what is the fact and disclose the true cause of their timidity, the Pontiffs would indeed confess that it is of the utmost importance to them to make use of the Franciscans and other accomplice friends,

and not experience the hostility of the Dominicans. For they need both, indeed, to sustain their authority and power, but especially the sect of the Dominicans, which in Spain by reason of the office of the Inquisition committed to them is most powerful, and to whom therefore, as we have seen above, even Gregory XV stroked their heads with a special indult. This is the genuine cause of the suspended definition. Fourthly, the history of this controversy demonstrates how slippery and easily mutable into various forms the Roman faith is. For at first, indeed, there were most harsh contentions, nor was this matter disputed that each side might be held as opinionable, but that one side or the other was certain. Whence the increasing fervor branded the contradictors with the infamous note of heresy. Soon the Council of Basel defined it. Afterwards Sixtus IV left each opinion free. The Council of Trent followed this example. Then under Gregory XV silence was enjoined on the Dominicans. Finally Alexander pronounced the immaculate conception, and yet denied that the question was being defined by him. Could greater inconstancy be noted in the ancient Pyrrhonians and Academics? Fifthly, the Pontificians greatly glory in the most religious consensus of the members of their Church with the head and among themselves, so that they contend that their Church ought to be recognized as the true one from the false by that consensus. But in this dogma there is no consensus either of the head, or of the members with the head, or of the members among themselves. Not of the head, for some Pontiffs have defended the immaculate, others the stained conception. Bandellus in chapter 18 enumerates eleven Pontiffs as witnesses that the Blessed Mary was conceived in sin. Nor have there been lacking others to favor that side even after Bandellus. Certainly Paul V ingenuously confessed to the Spanish Orator John a Trejo that if the controversy were to be defined, it would have to be defined according to the Dominicans, as Wadding testifies. But other Pontiffs, like Sixtus IV, Gregory XV, Alexander VII, maintain the immaculate conception. Not of the members with the head, because the Dominicans do not agree with Sixtus IV, Gregory XV, Alexander VII; but the Franciscans openly dissent from the eleven Pontiffs praised by Bandellus, and from Paul V. Moreover, both parties have stubbornly refused obedience, from Sixtus IV down to Alexander VII, to the Pontiffs so often enacting and sanctioning laws in these contentions, even under the penalty of anathema and eternal damnation. What they will do in the future, revolving time will teach. The whole Capitol thundering with clamors and lightnings, and like a Tityrus driving the unwilling flock, recommending the studies of peace, whole Kingdoms, Academies, Orders have despised and made no account of him. An egregious consensus of the members with the head, indeed! Not of the members among themselves, because the Dominicans and Franciscans, the leaders of the factions, have been torn asunder from each other for many ages back not merely by dissension of minds, but have also exhibited very many evidences of hostility publicly. Wagon-loads of taunts have been hurled from both sides. The odious charge of heresy has been brought. Nay, the Dominicans have even been aspersed and proscribed by the Franciscans with the infamous name of "Spotted Ones" or "Hugos."

XVI. Finally, the most illustrious Dean of the Church of Curen rightly made this corollary among other objections to George, the deserter of good causes. But what does the common Adversary respond to that in his August Dissertation? He says, "This sophistry is irrelevant to the matter. For the point of the question rests on this: Whether a doctrine founded in the Word of Divine, when applied by an authoritative and cogent reason of credibility, can be so far controversial

that such dissent may prevail within the Roman Church itself?" Although the Franciscans have endeavored to prove the Immaculate Conception from the Sacred Scriptures, yet we have no authoritative definition by the Pope speaking ex cathedra with a cogent reason; it is not clear that any sacred text alleged by the Franciscans proceeds in the sense Divinely handed down concerning the Blessed Virgin's Immaculate Conception. Let us briefly see what force this response, also celebrated by others, has.

First, we take the confession that the Franciscans have endeavored to prove the Immaculate Conception. It is true. The old Franciscans endeavored from fabricated revelations, the more recent ones even from distorted Scriptures. But they have never proved it. Neither is the Adversary certain by firm faith that the arguments which he brings forward in Scholastic Theology for the Immaculate Conception are valid. This savors more of Pyrrhonism than of Christian Theology. For neither party is permitted to believe that the arguments which it brings forward for establishing its own opinion are firm, owing to the lack of definition. Secondly, he defines an article of the Church to be a doctrine pronounced from the Word of Divine by an authoritative definition of the Pope speaking ex cathedra. But where has Scripture, or any Council, or finally the Pope speaking ex cathedra, established this definition of an article of faith? Were there then no articles of faith before Popes speaking ex cathedra? Is a doctrine founded in the Word of Divine not to be believed unless mendacious men, in whose nostrils is breath, have dictated that it must be believed? Is this not to deny the power and efficacy of the Word of Divine manifesting itself to every conscience, to attribute more to mortal men than to the immortal God, and indeed to establish the ultimate analysis of faith in the sayings of men? Before the rise of Arius, what Pope speaking ex cathedra defined the consubstantiality of Christ, His equal Deity with the Father? Did Christ's natural Deity not therefore exist among the articles of faith? From Christ to the 12th Century, no one doubted that the Immaculate Conception was the privilege of our Savior alone. Therefore, because it pleased Scotus and the mendicant Monks to call this into doubt, and no Pope speaking ex cathedra was found to put an end to the controversy, did the universal Church before Scotus wrongly believe, and did the privilege of the Savior on that account deserve to be precipitated from the list of articles of faith?

Thirdly, what will happen if the Pope, negligent of his duty, hampered by fear and carnal counsels, hardens his mind not to define that which is in question, but to leave the apple of discord and the seeds of scandals in the midst, and to disappoint and mock the vows and desires of the whole Church? Nay, the Church of Christ would be ill-consulted if what is certainly known from the undoubted Word of God could not be believed with certainty on account of the contumacy and negligence of one man, and if, amid so many scandals of dissensions and the foul contradictions of wrangling Doctors, it must needs waver and fluctuate. But that this very thing has happened here is clearer than the noonday sun from the history recounted by us above. The Popes, fearful of offenses on account of their own conveniences, shrank from doing their duty. Vázquez himself, after Suárez, not only confessed in his Scholastic Theology, Vol. IV, p. 38, but also proved, that the immunity of the Blessed Virgin from sin can be defined by the Church whenever it shall judge it expedient. For, he says, it suffices for such a definition that that truth is comprehended in Scripture and handed down by the Fathers, so that as the common consensus of the Church increases, it can altogether be defined. As far as I

understand, then, he judges that it is not yet expedient for it to be defined, until the common consensus of the Church increases further. If this is true, no article of faith can be definitively fixed and established unless the consensus of the Church is first known. But after the consensus of the Church, what further need is there of definition? Surely in the cause of Jansenism neither Innocent X nor Alexander VII paid any regard whether the consensus of the Church increased or not. Nay, as the Jansenists prevailed, he defined that their five propositions were heretical, and, what is ridiculous and indeed iniquitous, Alexander even defined in a question of fact that they existed in the condemned sense also in Jansenius's Augustinus, and enjoined under anathema that what all who have turned over Jansenius's Augustinus a hundred times will find to be utterly false must be believed. The Adversary must therefore search for another reason why it is not yet expedient for the Church to define what he has acknowledged can be defined. Considering each point exactly, he will find that it is not expedient for the Pope for no other reason than because it would make the interests of the parties irreconcilable to his See. Surely, as Wadding testifies, Anthony Trew, by some speeches held by him at Rome, so wrested from Pope Paul V the club of all pretexts for the non-expediency of definition that at length, dissembling the true cause for suspending the definition, the Pope opposed to him no other shield than the fear aroused, namely, that if a definition must certainly be drawn up, it will be drawn up for the Dominicans. Finally, the Adversary denies in vain that the Pope speaking ex cathedra has not yet defined the controversy. For does the Pope not speak ex cathedra when he pronounces something in a Bull issued and published everywhere under the Fisherman's ring? But this is what Alexander VII recently did, who in a Bull issued and published under the Fisherman's ring flatly pronounced that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from original sin by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and that for this reason the feast of her Conception is celebrated in the Church. Although, indeed, he afterwards protests that he wishes the controversy to remain undecided, yet we have already proved above that this protestation is contrary to the fact. Besides, on the very next day after the publication of the Bull, the Jesuits at the College of Clermont did not blush to number that thesis on the Immaculate Conception among the Catholic Theses.

XVII. I shall not be reluctant to add one thing, which we have also touched upon above in passing, namely that the very assertors of the Immaculate Conception greatly dissent concerning the mode of the Blessed Virgin being freed from original sin. For some, as Bellarmine testifies in Chap. 16, think that the Blessed Virgin did not even potentially sin in Adam. And they add that the law concerning not eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was given to Adam for all and singular of his posterity, except Mary, who therefore in the loins of Adam ate also of the forbidden food, but without sin, because the prohibition did not pertain to her. However, John Perlinus, Ferdinand de Salazar, Cardinal de Lugo, Gundisalvus Sanchez, Diego Granados, and others explain this very opinion diversely, whose opinions August Reding recounts in his Scholastic Theology, Vol. IV, Question 1, Article 2, Chapter 2. The Jesuits in the Clermont Theses also hold this opinion, where they deny that the Blessed Virgin contracted the debt of Original Sin. Bellarmine nevertheless denies that this opinion is safe, because the Virgin herself was redeemed by Christ's blood. But Bellarmine himself maintains that the first conception of Mary was like the conception of others, but that Mary's soul in the first instant of its creation and infusion was without the stain of sin, so that that person

never actually existing had sin. He says, therefore, that this is the difference between Mary and the other Saints, that the Saints are commonly freed from Original Sin after their nativity or animation, but Mary alone in the very instant of animation. According to which opinion Alexander VII seems to have pronounced in the Bull.

In the Legend of the Saints it is related that Mary was conceived not from conjugal intercourse, but from a kiss which Joachim gave to his wife Anna. Peter Galatinus, the plagiarist of Raymond Martini, from a Kabbalistic book of doubtful credibility by Rabbi Haccados, entitled "The Fountain of Gardens," babbles more foolishly than obscurely that the matter of the Blessed Virgin was produced from the beginning and inserted into a limb of Adam and preserved there, which was afterwards handed down to Seth, then to Enos, and successively by right to the rest up to St. Joachim, from which matter the Virgin Mary was formed. In Chapter 4, from the opinion of the Talmudists, as he at least pretends, he asserts many prodigious things, namely that Mary was the first creature in the human race, the mother of all men, and superior even to the Angels themselves. There are some who maintain that the fomes of sin was utterly removed and extinguished in the Blessed Virgin. But others teach that by the fullness of grace that fomes was so weakened that it could not incline her to sin. It is necessary, indeed, for those who once leave and despise the truth to be agitated by such a spirit of vertigo.

XVIII. It remains for us to briefly expound and confirm the orthodox opinion concerning the conception and sin of the Virgin. We therefore acknowledge and proclaim with all our heart and full throat that the Virgin Mary was indeed Blessed, Holy, Blessed through grace, to be sure, not by nature. But we also doubt not, and piously believe, that there was so great an efficacy of the regenerating and sanctifying Holy Spirit in her as there is in any mortal, although the moment of her sanctification and spiritual nativity is known to God alone, yet that it exerted itself early in her through the grace of the Holy Spirit, and indeed so that the remains and dominion of sin and concupiscence were far more efficaciously broken, weakened, and extinguished in her than in the common mass of the faithful. But otherwise we deny that she was immune from all sin, and therefore is to be exempted from the common lot of the faithful, none of whom are saved without being redeemed by the blood of Christ, and we assert both that her conception and first nativity were contaminated by Original Sin, and that the fomes of sin was not utterly extinguished in her before her death and final end, and therefore that actual sins, such as those of ignorance, human infirmity, and other such sins truly of their nature mortal, were indeed committed by her, but were graciously remitted by the precious blood of her Son Christ.

XIX. For immunity from all sin, both Original and Actual, in a man born after Adam by carnal generation from sinful parents, is so great a thing, and so great a privilege, that without an express, clear, and obvious testimony of Scripture, no pious and prudent person could or ought to attribute it to any mortal. It pleased the Eternal Wisdom to leave us a clear and express testimony in Scripture concerning Christ's own immunity from all sin, since it expressly mentions both that he was conceived by the Holy Spirit and therefore not from the lust of man (Matt. 1:18, Luke 1:35), and testifies that he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners" (Heb. 7:26). If therefore the Blessed Virgin too was immune from all sin, it is far more necessary that they make the faithful believe this by a similar clear and express testimony of Scripture. But no

one has been able to furnish this up to now. For although they have endeavored to adapt certain texts from Scripture to the doctrine itself already minted and long since received by many in the Church, yet it is certain that no categorical, simple, and express testimony has been brought forward by anyone as yet, and those which they have brought forward are indeed clear and simple in their genuine sense, but when applied to this thesis are dubious, fallacious, distorted, obscure, allegorical, and corrupted by a vicious translation. Let us demonstrate this briefly.

They say, "The Blessed Virgin crushed the serpent's head" (Gen. 3:15). Therefore she must have been immune from sin. But from the original words and their construction, the intention of the speaking God, and parallel passages, we and even the most learned of the Adversaries themselves, namely Cajetan, Isidore Clarius, Pagninus, Ribera, a Costa, Canus, Costerus, Lindanus, and others, have proved most efficaciously that the crushing is attributed not to the woman but to the seed of the woman, Christ, so that it is not SHE but HE who is the crusher. Even if that crushing were enunciated concerning the Blessed Virgin, she would be no more exempted from all sin than the remaining faithful, who also, although in a lesser degree, through the spirit of faith and fortitude in virtue of their Head Christ, crush the serpent's head. They say, "Mary is called altogether fair, in whom there is no spot," (Song 1:15, 4:7). Therefore she was contaminated by no stain of sin. But let them produce even the shadow of a reason that argues these words of the Song are spoken of the Blessed Virgin alone, or one single one of the Greek and Latin Fathers earlier than Rupert who has expounded those passages of the Song concerning the Blessed Virgin. Nearly all the ancients agree that it is the Church, the Bride of Christ, any faithful soul that is adorned with this eulogy. Meanwhile, I acknowledge that the Blessed Virgin was altogether fair and without spot, not because she was devoid of all sin, but because both her natural and voluntary stains, like those of all the faithful who must also be "holy and without blemish" (Eph. 1:4, 5:26-27), were not imputed to her, but were pardoned through Christ, nay, were daily wiped away through sanctifying grace, until, her course consummated by death and freed from all remains of sin, she was presented as a Holy Virgin to her Spouse Jesus Christ.

Finally, they insist that the Blessed Virgin is saluted by the Angel himself as "full of grace" (Luke 1:28). Therefore not even that grace, immunity from sin, was lacking to her. But the Angel calls her not "full of grace," but "one who has found grace," that is, "one who has found favor in the eyes of the Lord." This prerogative belongs not to Mary alone, but to all the faithful, although in different degrees. For if Paul truly said (Eph. 1:6) that God "has made us accepted in the beloved," truly the faithful are also called by the law of their birth "the ones graced." And a similar phrase concerning the faithful occurs repeatedly, as in Gen. 6:8, 18:3, 19:19, Ex. 33:12, etc. Does this mean they were immune from all sin on that account? The ancients also said "full of grace" not unwillingly on our part, not on account of immunity from sin, but on account of the Incarnation of the Word in her, because she alone obtained the grace to be filled with the Author of grace, as Ambrose says in Book 2 on Luke. And Augustine in the Enchiridion, Chapter 36, says no differently: "She is said to be 'full of grace' and to have 'found favor with God' for this reason, that she might be the mother of her Lord, nay, the Lord of all." Behold, therefore, how not only are the chief arguments on which they build up a matter of such moment not clear and express, but are also utterly foreign to their purpose! But if the Adversaries delight to quibble in

their usual manner that this argument from negative authority is weak and invalid, I in turn assert that even such arguments are most valid in matters of faith, relying on the Divine oracle: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20). And I shall even say with Tertullian against Hermogenes, "I adore the fullness of Scripture. Let Hermogenes (the Franciscan, the Jesuit, Pope Alexander) show that it is written, or let him fear that woe upon those who add to it."

XX. Not only is that immunity of the Blessed Virgin destitute of the clear and express testimony of Scripture, but it is also contrary to clear and express Scriptures which no Sophist has ever been able to abolish, obscure, or elude. For the general sentence of the Word of God, the rule which says: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" (Job 14:4); "That which is born of the flesh is flesh" (John 3:6); "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23); "In Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15:22); "By one offense it came upon all men to condemnation" (Rom. 5:18). Concerning actual sin, similar sentences occur repeatedly: "There is no man that sinneth not" (1 Kings 8:46); "In many things we offend all" (James 3:2); "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John 1:8).

From this general rule, in no way ambiguous, Scripture nowhere excepts any man born by the law of natural generation. For as for Christ, since he was conceived in an ineffable manner by the Holy Spirit, beyond the law of nature, and was begotten not by virtue of that law, "Increase and multiply," but by virtue of the promise made after sin, he cannot be comprehended under that general rule. For Scripture means by ALL, pure and unadulterated men, born of the flesh, that is, of human lust, born "of the will of the flesh, and of the will of man" (John 1:13), which Christ was not; but Mary was. Therefore, since in Scripture Christ alone is excepted, as being a person of a different condition, the rule will be so much the firmer in regard to all the rest. For here too the common canon holds good: "The exception confirms the rule in cases not excepted." But if Mary was not conceived in sin or common condemnation, it will be true that someone can be born of Adam by the law of natural generation without imputation of sin. If this is true, condemnation will also not come upon anyone by his own fault and on account of the truth of judgment and justice. It will therefore no longer be true what the Apostle says (Rom. 5:19): "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners," that is, the great multitude of all men propagated naturally from Adam. For this signifies the natural consequence of the fall. And this is also made clearer from the fact that the condemnation is referred to the law, not to an arbitrary decree.

XXI. And hence it is that the Holy Fathers except from this common rule the one and only Savior of ours, nowhere the Blessed Virgin. Ambrose on Psalm 118, Sermon 6, concerning Christ: "Rightly is he eminent, for he alone is not ensnared by the nets of sins. All were within the nets; nay, we are still within the nets, because no one is without sin except Jesus alone." Augustine on "The Spirit and the Letter" to Marcellinus: "No one in this life seems either to have attained or to be about to attain the perfection of righteousness, except the one Mediator alone." The same author, in his work "On the Merits and Remission of Sins," Book II, Chapter 20: "The fourth point remains: Whether there is not only no one among men born, or ever will be, who has had absolutely no sin, but whether there could ever have been such a one at all? Here was the

place for excepting the Virgin Mary. But he responds: "That there is, has been, or will be any mere man besides the one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, is most certain that there neither is, nor has been, nor will be." Cyril in his Oration on the Right Faith, to Theodosius: "Christ alone was the first and only man on earth who did not commit sin." Clement of Alexandria in the Paedagogus, Book I, Chapter 2, concerning Christ: "For this reason he alone is the judge, because he alone is without sin." Tertullian on Prayer, Chapter 7: "The Lord knew that he alone was without offense." Basil on Penitence: "No man is without sin. For to him alone is borne witness that he did not commit sin." And thus those holy Doctors of the Church except not only Christ, but Christ alone and the only one so expressly from that common rule, that Zwingli and Calvin themselves could not except him more expressly.

XXII. Moreover, the assertors of the Blessed Virgin leave nothing untried in order to extricate themselves from this argument, which admits of no exception. They therefore interpret the passages from Scripture and the Fathers cited above, in which that universal rule is comprehended, in this way: that all sinned in Adam and incurred condemnation, either in act or in such a way that they had the debt of contracting Original Sin, unless Divine grace had hindered it. In the latter sense, they say, the Blessed Virgin too sinned in Adam, not that she actually contracted sin, but that she ought to have contracted it, unless by singular grace she had been guarded and preserved. But this is not a solution of the argument, but a bare affirmation of the thesis, and therefore a mere petitio principii. The proof rather incumbent on them was to show that the debt of contracting sin was pardoned and remitted by grace. And the passages cited do not speak of potentiality, but of act: "In Adam all sinned"; "That which is born of the flesh is flesh"; "All have sinned and come short of the righteousness of God," etc. And the Holy Fathers cited except only Christ from the act of contracting sin. Augustine denies that there ever was or will be anyone in whom there has been perfect righteousness. Basil says that Christ alone did not commit sin, which is certainly to be referred to act, not potentiality. But if the Blessed Virgin had been subject to sin not in act but only in debt expunged by grace, it would follow that the sin of Adam excepted the sin and merit of condemnation of his posterity not necessarily and by force of the law and vindictive justice of God, but freely, that is, by the free will of God, which is utterly impious.

XXIII. Now it is added that the Blessed Virgin herself cries out against this, when her soul magnifies the Lord, and her spirit rejoices in God her Savior (Luke 1:47). She therefore acknowledges that Christ is her Savior. But the whole Scripture testifies that Christ is the Savior of no one except by saving them from sins, namely by remitting them and taking their penalties upon himself. Nor is it a trifle unworthy of consideration that they feign Christ to have been the Savior of Mary not by curing her of committed sins, but by preserving her from committing them. Where in canonical Scripture or the ancient Doctors of the Church do they free the Mother of the Lord from all sin and from the care of her Savior Christ by such a distinction? On the contrary, Scripture denies that the healthy need a physician, and asserts that it is not the righteous but the sick who need him (Matt. 9:12). But who calls those "sick" in whom health is full? Nay, Christ speaks even more expressly (Mark 2:17): "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Are those, then, among the not righteous, among sinners, who are preserved from sin? But why say more? Did not Christ so become the Savior of his mother that he suffered

death for her? Bellarmine acknowledges it; the Fathers acknowledge it. But Christ died not for the righteous, but for the unrighteous and sinners (1 Pet. 3:18). This is emphatically inculcated by St. Augustine in Book VI against Julian, Chapter 1, where he denies that he has ever read that Christ died even for those who had no sin at all. And in Sermon 8 on the Words of the Apostle, he interprets: "Jesus is Savior. He is Jesus the Savior. Those whom he does not save have nothing that needs saving in them; to them he is not Jesus."

XXIV. Moreover, that Christ was truly the Savior of the Virgin, and did not merely preserve her but also cured her of contracted guilt, is strongly confirmed by the fact that Scriptures mention, and the ancients observe, some sins in her, like certain moles on a most beautiful body. For in Luke 1:34, to the Angel promising her the Son Jesus, the Virgin responds: "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" In these words Chrysostom in Homily 4 on Genesis, and after him Euthymius, notes a sin of incredulity. Although we do not contend overmuch about this matter: but it is certain that similar words spoken above in v. 18 were imputed as a fault to Zacharias. In Luke 2:48-49, when Joseph and Mary had found Christ, long sought for, in the Temple at Jerusalem, his mother said to him: "Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." Then he said to them: "How is it that ye sought me? Knew ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Here too, Christ's subsequent reproof intimates that something human had befallen the Virgin, as the ancients have noted. "The mother is reproved here," says Ambrose, "because she still requires what is human." Salmeron also says that Christ's words are gentle, yet somewhat harsh and biting. But harsh and biting words cannot, nay ought not to be used, except either towards those departing from their duty, or certainly towards someone importunate. But to think anything not most exact of Christ would be impious. Therefore it seems safer to believe that his parents gave Christ a cause for reproof. The same also seems to be established concerning that incident in John 2:3-4, where to his mother indicating the lack of wine he responds: "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come." Here Athanasius against the Arians, Oration 4, says, "He rebuked his mother." Chrysostom in Homily 45 on Matthew: "He rebuked her, fearing unseasonably." These incidents, whether a rebuke or a repulse, certainly cannot be said to have happened without reason proceeding from fault on the part of the mother, without injury to Christ himself. Irenaeus observes here an "untimely haste," and Chrysostom "a certain vanity." Augustine, "On the Creed," Book II, Chapter 7: "In that first miracle, she wished to act as a woman, to command her Son as a mother, as a mistress, forgetting that she was a handmaid." He therefore thought that she had not been without fault in seeking to command her Son as a mother and mistress. The ancients also acknowledge that in Matthew 12:46-48, Mark 3:31, when she stood outside and called to him as he was teaching the people, she sinned. Theophylact on Mark 3 says: "The mother suffered somewhat from ambition, wishing to call him away from teaching." Chrysostom more severely, in Homily 45 on Matthew, notes in her here not only importunity, but even refractoriness, which he indeed censures not too gently. It suffices us to derive from this an argument of human infirmity. The same ancients do not doubt that she was scandalized, like the rest, even by Christ's death, although we do not affirm this as being less certain. We acknowledge that the faults with which she is charged in Scripture are slighter ones, but yet of such a kind as to confirm clearly the canon of James (3:2): "In many things we offend all."

XXV. And this is also the reason why the Blessed Virgin was subject to miseries and most grievous calamities, nay even to death itself; concerning which no sane person has ever doubted hitherto, who has read those words of Simeon (Luke 2:35): "A sword shall pierce through thy own soul also"; as well as those in v. 48: "Behold, I and thy father have sought thee sorrowing." But that she also died, no one of sound mind has ever doubted hitherto. Augustine expressly asserts in his Commentary on Psalm 34, Concio 2, that "Mary died on account of the sin of Adam." And Baronius, in his Annals for the year 48, § 12, says: "The Catholic Church admits no doubt concerning the death of the Mother of God." But whence did these calamities, nay death itself, derive their origin, if not from sin? For "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23), and "the sting of death is sin" (1 Cor. 15:56), "By sin death entered into the world" (Rom. 5:12). And God himself traces all the troubles of body and mind to sin (Gen. 3:16-17). Shall we say that she underwent these troubles on account of others' sins? And yet Scripture testifies that Christ alone bore the sins of others, and that even irrational creatures were made subject to vanity on account of the sin of man, for whose sake they were produced. Other arguments also might be brought into the field, such as that the Blessed Virgin, being born of both parents, and indeed naturally, ought to have been born in an ineffable manner from the Holy Spirit, as Christ was in order to be preserved from sin; that it is undoubted that she was baptized, and the ancients believed this, although baptism is the laver of regeneration from sin; that Scripture shows that she needed remission of sins, since it commands all the faithful to pray for it (Ps. 32:2, Matt. 6:12); that the Blessed Virgin proclaims the mercy of God even towards herself, while she reflects upon the lowliness of his handmaiden (Luke 1:48, 50), although Paul testifies (Rom. 11:32) that the mercy of God always supposes sin, which the Church has ever acknowledged. But we are compelled to compress all these arguments into a summary. For the ancients have collected three hundred testimonies of the ancient Church against this doctrine, to which the Jesuit Salmeron could oppose nothing but a sarcasm: "It is the part of a pauper to count his flock." Nay, Melchior Canus ingenuously confesses in his Theological Topics, Book VII: "All the Saints with one voice affirm that the Virgin was conceived in sin." But we are compelled to reduce all these matters to a compendium. We shall also take pleasure in expounding more accurately elsewhere how Christ, holy and pure and exempt from all stain, could be born of a Virgin infected with sin, and without any ignominy or prejudice to the offspring, when the Adversaries place the citadel of their arguments in this very doubt. Now, therefore, let praise, honor and glory be to the only immaculate Lamb, Jesus Christ, forever and ever. AMEN.

THE END.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS ON THE BULLS, CHAPTERS AND CANONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

Disputation I.
ON COUNCILS AND THE POWER OF THE POPE

Under the auspices of Christ, the only head of the true Church,

Presided over by JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, Doctor of Sacred Theology and Public Professor of the same,

For obtaining the Theological Examination, the following will respond:
John Henry Zwingli
John Bernard Brunner
John Rudolph Hospitaler

On the __ day of November

ZURICH, 1661

A VOTIVE ACCLAMATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Recently having the study of innocent piety, they mourned with sad heart the burden of grief, because the theologian of faith perished in cruel waves, because the deep wave carried off the excellent man. But since the faithful [theologian] raises himself from the bright rising, they bid the mournful voices depart from their heart; and they recall the new endeavors of a rejoicing breast, and rejoice that the gifts are restored to their souls.

I roll up my vows and prayers humbly to the stars, and beseech the Heavenly Father with suppliant voice: May He never withdraw the bright lights which He has granted to our studies, but allow them still to be! That the sons of piety and art may increase in number as the tender shoot rises from the soft ground. May the Heavenly Deity especially sanctify the labors of the President, that his teachings may bear fruit! May He grant lasting strength of body, that the healthy Doctor may go forth beloved! That he may be able to discharge his sacred duty, and live through many sound days!

Safe and unharmed, may he complete many Decembers, nay, live through the long ages of the aged Pylian! With sincere heart, the youths have expressed these vows, whose names the first page declares.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS ON THE BULLS, CHAPTERS AND CANONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

Preface

About five years ago, I proposed to debate the controversies of the Council of Trent in the illustrious University of Steinfurt. And indeed I chose that Council, in order to pave the way for

studious youth to the Pontifical controversies, because its voice, according to Bellarmine's testimony, is held to be the voice of the Catholic Church, by which name he designated it in his usual manner. But at that time I had reduced to questions those things which that Synod had annexed to the Chapters and Canons, omitting, however, those which do not strike at Protestants, or are imputated to them by calumny. And I have set forth our reasons, by which the thesis is confirmed, consigned to a brief book, in proportion to the scope of my design. But since I had omitted some questions to be excerpted from the Pontifical Bulls pertaining to the same subject, as well as the very arguments by which the Pontificians endeavor to prove the counter-thesis, and the responses of the Evangelicals to them, having been requested more than once and insistently by friends who judged that my labor in the Lord had been useful and fruitful, I have thought that I must discharge the full task. I have also determined to add, on the one hand, a brief narration of the history of the Council of Trent itself, to be inserted before each Session and premised to the Theological Questions, taken from Pietro Soave Polano and other writers of approved credibility; and on the other hand, the Chapters and Canons of the Council. But I shall also endeavor to call in, whenever occasion invites, the Historico-Theological Censure of Scipio Enrico, the Theologian of Messina, against the History of the Council of Trent by Pietro Soave Polano. What weighty and most learned men, Calvin, Chemnitz (against whom Diego Payva D'Andrada the Portuguese, Jodocus Ravestein, and William Dalmatius have striven in vain), Innocent Gentillet the jurist of Dauphiné, J. Fabricius Montanus against the Spaniards Fontidonio and Cardillo, Joachim Ursinus, and others have labored on this subject, is well known. I shall apply myself solely to this, that by both a choice of solid reasons and perspicuity and familiarity of method, I may be able to please the good and to instruct those who endeavor to attain to the inmost recesses of the blessed knowledge of Divine things. Nor do I despair that I shall obtain some favor with those who are bees, not spiders, and shall somewhat promote these sacred studies. Nor perhaps will this seem unsuitable, that I begin the web of public Disputations from the Council of Trent, following in the footsteps of my Venerable Predecessor, whose memory is blessed, he who, producing the History of the Church as a narration of that which was as it were an impediment to the Reformation, at the same time made an end of writing and living, alas! May God prosper the undertakings through Jesus Christ, the true head and only Savior of the Church.

QUESTIONS ON THE BULL OF INDICTION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, CONCERNING COUNCILS AND THE POWER OF THE POPE

History of the Indiction

The Bull of Indiction of Paul III, descended from the family of the Farnese, praises the Pope's vehement zeal for celebrating a General Council. But many things prove that this zeal was feigned, both by his predecessors and by Paul III himself. For in the first place, his predecessor Clement VII always abhorred the mention of a Council to the greatest degree, either because he feared lest, being thoroughly conscious of his simoniacal arts, he should experience the same danger of dignity and life as once befell Balthasar Cossa, called John XXIII; or because he denied that a Council could be a suitable judge of those controversies concerning the authority of the Apostolic See, which he understood were being moved chiefly by the adversaries.

Secondly, Paul III, a crafty man, wished altogether to appear as not dreading a Council. But he himself wished to choose the manner of holding the Council and a place convenient for his affairs, lest either he should have cause to fear danger in a place where someone else was more powerful, or such a manner of holding the Council should be prescribed as would make no small trouble for the Papal cause. Moreover, he knew that under the pretext that he was ready for a Council, many things which he had conceived in mind could be concealed, and many others from which he was more averse could be put off. Therefore, on the 27th day of May of the year 1536 he had published a diploma in which he designated Mantua as the place for holding the Council. But he had clearly known that neither would the Protestants, on whose account the matter was being handled, appear at Mantua for very many reasons which Pietro Soave Polano set forth in his history; nor would Frederick, the Prince of Mantua himself, allow a Council to be held in that place unless certain laws were proposed, which the Pope would never consider valid. Rightly did Henry VIII, King of England, in a Writing issued against the Indiction of Vicenza, say that this was a mere illusion. "Why," he said, "did he command men to come to an uncertain place, which he did not have in his own power? Clearly because all this zeal was feigned, not serious."

Fourthly, the Emperor Charles V himself, observing this ambiguous manner of proceeding by which the Pope, under the appearance of seeking a Council, uniquely refused it, appointed the Convention of Nuremberg, in which Doctors and Theologians and other prudent men might negotiate between the parties and strive for their reconciliation: he would by no means have done this if he had thought the Pope was acting seriously. Whence the Pope sent the Bishop of Montepulciano to Spain to the Emperor, to deal with him concerning not approving or at least circumventing the decrees of that Convention. Fifthly, the Pope, perceiving that his artifices were now known to all, at length opened the veil of his heart and revealed his mind. For having sent the Cardinals to take votes, he approved the opinion of those to whom it seemed more advisable no longer to set a definite day, but, as the Bull says, to suspend the celebration of a General Council to his and the Apostolic See's good pleasure. For in this remarkable fraud they were calculating that the suspension could be continued under any pretext, whenever expediency should suggest it: but that it could be proclaimed whenever danger should threaten from a Provincial Council or Religious Colloquy.

Hence in the next Convention appointed at Nuremberg by the Emperor, so that the matter of reconciling the parties might be dealt with among the Theologians of the Protestants, Melanchthon, Bucer, and Pistorius, and certain Pontificians, Eck, Pflug, and Gropper, when the question of the authority of the Church and the Hierarchy came up, Cardinal Contarini, sent by the Pope, immediately responded: That this matter is to be referred to the Pontiff and the Apostolic See. He would define all things by a Council to be convoked briefly. From this the genuine use of that suspension to the Pope's good pleasure can be recognized: namely, that meanwhile no Council is appointed, as long as no fear threatens from a National or Provincial Council; but where it does threaten, the Pope may deter them by this as if by some adversary. Having covered this concerning the History of the Indiction of the aforementioned Council, we shall excerpt Theological Questions from that very Bull of Indiction.

QUESTION I

Is the ordinary and perpetual power of convoking a General and Ecumenical Council held by the Roman Pontiff? The Bull of Indiction holds this opinion. Nor did Paul III arrogate to himself the power of convoking a Council for any other reason. These are the words of Carsillo Villalpando the Spaniard, who himself was sent by the Bishop of Avila to the Council and attended it, and wrote a book on Councils in defense of the Council of Trent, Disputation 1: "The force and faculty of indicting, convoking, and celebrating an Ecumenical Synod pertains not to the Emperor, but to the Supreme Pontiff." We deny that such a right belongs to the Pontiff, and we assert that it belongs to the supreme Civil Magistrate, if he is consenting and united; and if he is not consenting or united, then to those upon whom the body of the faithful has imposed and delegated the power of governing the Churches. For:

1. The Pontiff has this right of convoking neither from the Word of God, nor from the delegation of the Church or body of the faithful.

2. In the Old Testament, not the Pontiff, but pious Kings and Princes exercised this right. Not Aaron, but Moses appointed the solemn assemblies of the people by God's command, after making two silver trumpets which he should use for the convocation of the assembly (Num. 10:2). It is clear from their history that Joshua, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah did the same.

3. The power of convoking depends on outward jurisdiction. For it pertains to that to deal with the place, time, form of public assemblies, and the expenses to be disbursed for them. But the Pontiff does not have outward jurisdiction in the Church, since that, depending on architectonic power, belongs by natural right to the supreme Magistrate, as is clear from Rom. 13:1,4.

4. The convocation and indiction of a Council is a work of human order. But the vindicator and curator of human order is not the Pope, or any other ecclesiastical servant, but the Supreme Civil Power.

5. Whether a Council is to be convoked, or matters are to be consulted on and defined in it, or its definitions are to be executed, coactive and coercive authority is required, which by no right pertains to the Pope, since the Ministers of the Church have not imperium, but diakonia.

6. Councils are most often appointed when the truth of faith and peace of the Church is disturbed. But it is disturbed for the most part by the Ecclesiastics themselves. Therefore, if the coactive authority of the supreme Magistrates does not maintain order, greater confusion would arise from the schism of the Ecclesiastics, while some act against others, and as it were the net-men engage with the pursuers.

7. The Pope himself can become a guilty party, and therefore is to be judged in a Council. Therefore the ordinary and perpetual right of indicting Councils does not belong to him. Thus in that very Council which the Protestants desired in the preceding century, the controversy concerning the Pope's authority and doctrine had to be moved.

8. Even in ancient times, the right of convoking Councils was held not by the Pontiffs, but by the Caesars. Constantine the Great indicted the Nicene Council, Theodosius the Elder the First Constantinople, the Younger the Ephesine, Martian the Chalcedonian. Nay, Nilus of Thessalonica has proved that in ancient times all Councils were convoked by the Emperor, in his book against the primacy and tyranny of the Pope.

9. Not to mention the consensus of the Fathers, Jerome, Liberius, Sozomen, Socrates, and others; certainly Aeneas Sylvius, afterwards made Pope, uses this argument in Book I on the Council of Basel: "What will be the remedy if a criminal Pope disturbs the Church, destroys souls, if he preaches against the faith and imbues his subjects with heretical dogmas?" And Cardinal Nicholas Cusanus confessed that eight General Councils were convoked by the Emperors, thence concluding: "A Council will be legitimate, even if not convoked by the Pope." Cf. Bullinger on Councils, Book I, Chapter 7.

OBJECTION I. Councils are to be gathered in the name of Christ (Matt. 18:20). Therefore by the Pope, who holds the vicarial authority of Christ in these lands.

Response: The consequence is denied. 1. Because thus many particular congregations not convoked by the Pope would not be held in the name of Christ. 2. Because the Pope does not hold the vicarship of Christ. 3. Because to be gathered in the name of Christ is to be gathered for the sake of Christ, and under His auspices and spirit, with the will of hearing and following Him alone according to the Word of God, not by the authority of Christ visibly present in Himself or in some vicar.

II. The Civil Power cannot compel all, as the Pope can. For to him all Christians are subject as to Ecclesiastical actions: to it as to Civil actions they are never all subject, as to Ecclesiastical actions none are. Therefore this right belongs to the Pope. So says Scipio of Messina against Paul the Servant.

Response: The antecedent is denied. 1. Because all Christians are not subject to the Pope, either as to Civil or as to Ecclesiastical actions. Usurpation is not a legitimate right. 2. Because in the Oriental or Western Churches separated from communion, he does not even have usurped dominion. 3. Because over the Laity, who are also an essential part of a Council, the Pope has no dominion as to coactive power. 4. Because the Pope, as such, has absolutely no coactive power. 5. Because the supreme Civil Magistrate, either one, or many united into one vote, whether the Emperor, Kings, Princes, or Christian Republics, all consenting to one vote, can compel the whole Christian world.

III. Provincial Councils are convoked by the Metropolitan; National by the Patriarch. Therefore General Councils ought to be convoked by the Pope as the First Bishop. So says Scipio of Messina, p. 150.

Response: The consequence is denied. 1. Because Provincial and National Councils are indicted by an ordinary law sanctioned and approved by the Magistrate. But a General Council is extraordinary on account of the cause of heresy or schism most often stirred up by the Ecclesiastics themselves. Therefore here the Magistrate ought to succor the Church laboring under an internal evil. Nor does the Pope obtain such a right of convoking a Council by any law; otherwise he would have convoked all the General Councils, which has not been done. 2. Because today the Pope is no longer the Bishop of the First See. Of old, Rome was the principal place of the world, not today. 3. Because the very Metropolitans and Patriarchs themselves were made so by human ecclesiastical law, not Divine.

IV. It belongs to him to convoke a Council who can instruct Christians concerning matters of faith. But this the Priests can do, not Caesars. So says Scipio of Messina, loc. cit.

Response: In a Council, those things which pertain to order must be distinguished from those which pertain to its cause, which is purely Ecclesiastical. What pertains to order belongs to the Civil Power. But the cause is Christ's, and is debated by those who are gathered in the Council in His name. Therefore the antecedent fails, because the coaction of a Council pertains to order, and therefore to the supreme Magistrate; but the instruction concerning matters of faith pertains to the cause, which is debated by those who are called to the Council, such as Pastors, Doctors, and others delegated by the Church.

V. The Council of Chalcedon in Session 1 has it that a seat among the Bishops was not granted to the Bishop of Alexandria, because he had held a Synod without the authority of the Pontiff. Therefore it acknowledged that this power of convoking belongs to the Pope.

Response: It does not follow, because the Council speaks of the authority shared with the Roman Pontiff, not his sole privilege. Dioscorus held a Council at Ephesus without the consent of the Roman Pontiff. This was rightly reprehended at Chalcedon by Paschasinus and Lucentius, legates of Pope Leo, because it was the custom that all the Patriarchs should be present at Councils either themselves or through others. It was therefore proper not to neglect his consent.

VI. In the Epistle of Marcellus the Roman Pontiff it is expressly stated from the Apostolic tradition that Councils are to be celebrated only by the authority of the Roman Pontiff. Which Epistle was accepted by the Nicene Council, according to the testimony of the Letter of the Alexandrian Synod to Pope Felix. So says Scipio of Messina.

Response: 1. This canon cited from Marcellus is supposititious, both because it is not found among the Apostolic Canons, and because the legation of that Pope does not mention it in the Nicene Council, and because the Nicene Fathers in Canon 6 acknowledge not a universal power of the Pope, but an equal one with the others. Therefore Marcellus's Epistle is a pure rhapsody, as are the remaining Decretal Epistles of the ancient Pontiffs. 2. The Epistle of the Alexandrian Synod to Felix is spurious, as is evident from this, that it says Athanasius received the consecration of the Pontifical honor from Felix at Rome, when Felix was not at that time the

Bishop of Rome, nor did Athanasius, made Bishop of Alexandria from being a Deacon, ever see Rome. Whence not even Baronius approves that Epistle, as is clear from his Annals, Year 357, Section 66.

VII. Pope Leo in Book 1, Epistle 33, writes that he indicted to his Co-Bishops a Synod of a General Council. Likewise Pelagius II in Epistle 1 to the Orientals writes that the authority of indicting General Councils was bestowed on the Apostolic See by the singular privilege of Peter. Nay, Sixtus III also professes that Valentinian convoked a Synod by his authority. Whence Valentinian, when asked by the Bishops concerning a Council, denied that it was permitted to him to scrutinize such things. Finally, the Decree of the Lateran Council, Session 11, attributes this right to the Pope.

Response: 1. Most of the testimonies are of Roman Pontiffs extending their fringes, who cannot be heard as witnesses in their own cause. 2. Leo speaks of a National, not a General Synod. 3. Valentinian does not deny that it is his to convoke, but to scrutinize the matters themselves, namely of faith. 4. The Lateran Council was Antichristian.

QUESTION II
Whether in a General Council the power of voting ordinarily belongs only to the Major Prelates, that is, Bishops and Archbishops; but extraordinarily to Cardinals, General Abbots of Orders?

The Bull affirms this, in which Pope Paul calls to sit in the Council and give their opinions his Venerable Brothers the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and Beloved Sons the Abbots, and others to whom it is granted by right or privilege. Concerning these, Scipio of Messina says: "These alone are the true judges in these causes. The rest, however, who may come to the Council, may come as counselors or disputants (such as Presbyters, lesser Clerics, Doctors of Theology), or as auditors (such as Magistrates, Notaries, Guards, Servants), but by no means can they be judges." This is the mind of the Papists.

We determine that in a Council all those can vote who are endowed with gift and calling: with gift, those who are pious, upright, learned; with calling, who are called ordinarily to teach and sent, such as Pastors or Doctors; or extraordinarily, delegated by the Church, such as Elders, Presbyters, and any of the laity sent by the Church. We oppose the following arguments to the Pontificians:

1. Scripture and early antiquity are ignorant of the name, order, dignity of most of those to whom the Pontificians attribute this right. How then does it belong to them by Divine right? By Divine right there are no Bishops distinct from Presbyters. The dignity of Cardinals was not even known to the ancient Church. Both the name and the thing itself of Abbot, in its present sense, is unknown both to Scripture and to Antiquity.

2. In the Council of Jerusalem, the norm of all Councils, those who voted were not Bishops, Archbishops, Cardinals, Abbots, but the Apostles, Presbyters, and Church (Acts 15:2,16,22). Whence Paul, in Acts 16:4, is said to have delivered to the cities through which he passed the

decrees determined by the Apostles and Elders. What is a "decree determined" if not a sentence adjudged? And yet it is attributed to Presbyters.

3. Those may be called to vote in a Council who have the faculty of judging concerning spiritual matters and the gift of discernment. For nothing more is required for voting. But such may be individual Pastors, Teachers, Presbyters, Laymen delegated by the Church. This is supported by the fact that in 1 Cor. 14:29, to all gathered in the Church of Christ, that is, to those who are endowed with the office and gift of prophesying, the power of speaking is granted, but to the rest the power of judging.

4. The power of giving opinions in a Council properly belongs to the Church, to which in the person of Peter Christ gave the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. But the Church's cause may be pleaded not only by those wearing mitres and purple, nor only by the anointed or shaven, but by all who are endowed with gift and calling.

5. This was the practice of the primitive Church. In Socrates, Book 1.9, Constantine the Great himself confesses that he undertook "the examination of the truth." In the Council of Chalcedon, according to Evagrius, Book 2.4, the Legates of the Emperor, the Senators, and Patricians decreed by giving their votes. And indeed Aeneas Sylvius, concerning the Council of Basel, Book 1, confesses that others than Bishops had a deciding voice in Councils. Nay, in the very Council of Basel itself, Bohemian Presbyters voted.

6. Dignity and eminence of person is nowhere required for this in the Word of God. Nor is the gift of prophecy and knowledge bound to the Pontifical hierarchy. The Abbot Panormitanus rightly pronounced that the opinion of one unlearned man, well supported by the testimonies of Scripture, takes precedence over the Decrees of the whole Council and of the Pope, if they are not confirmed in Scripture.

7. We have the agreement of Nicholas I himself, whose words in Gratian, Distinction 96, are: "Where have you read that the Emperors your predecessors took part in Synodal Conventions, except perhaps in certain ones where the matter of faith was treated, which is universal, and pertains not only to the Clergy, but also to the Laity, and altogether to all Christians?"

OBJECTION I: It belongs to the Pastor, who ought to feed and teach so that we are bound to believe him, to define in a Council what is to be believed and done. But only Bishops are Pastors.

Response 1: The major premise is denied, both because the end of Councils is not to preach the salutary word to the people and administer the Sacraments, which is the Pastor's role, but to examine the erroneous opinions of heretics, to refute and condemn them from the Word of God, to consult for the unity of the Church, to define what is to be believed and done - which can be common to Presbyters, Pastors, and Laymen endowed with gift and calling; and because the Pope has communicated the right of voting even to non-Pastors, such as Cardinals and General Abbots.

2: The minor premise is denied, both because the Pontifical Bishops do not feed the flock, but are for the most part pettifoggers and "leaders of the people by the way of life"; and because Curate Parish Priests are given to the Pontificians, who discharge the office of Bishops, not Bishops themselves; and finally, because there is no obstacle to our men, who teach the Word of God and administer the Sacraments, being called Pastors, who are not Bishops in the Pontifical sense, but Overseers in the Scriptural sense.

II: Presbyters and Laymen do not represent the Church, but only Bishops. Therefore not they, but only Bishops can vote.

Response 1: The antecedent is denied, both because in the Pontifical sense the Church simply cannot be represented; and because in a sound sense, outside of order, all those delegated by it can represent the Church.

2: The consequence is denied, both because Cardinals and Abbots, not representing the Church, nevertheless vote; and because thus only the Pope, whom alone his sycophants hold to represent the Church, could vote; and finally, because gift and calling suffice for voting.

III: In a Republic, no one, however pious and learned, if he is not in public office, can decide causes. The same holds in the Church.

Response: But calling confers authority. Whence those called to a Council ought to be regarded as constituted in public office as public persons.

IV: The decrees of all Councils are valid only from Bishops, as is clear from the subscriptions.

Response 1: This is false, as is clear from the foregoing. Even at Nicaea Vitus and Vincentius were present; at the First Constantinople, some Presbyters, Alpius, Paul, and Bassus attended.

2: It is no wonder that for the most part Bishops attended, since few were sent from each province, and from each Presbytery those Bishops were chosen who excelled in doctrine, piety, and skill.

V. A convention of Bishops was convoked concerning the question of Easter, according to the testimony of Eusebius in Ecclesiastical History 5.23. The same is taught by Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and Jerome. Theodosius the Younger, in his Epistle to the Synod of Ephesus, denies that those who are not in the order of most holy Bishops can be mixed up in Ecclesiastical proceedings. Finally, in the Council of Chalcedon, when some Monks and Laymen had entered on behalf of Dioscorus, the Fathers cried out: "Cast out the superfluous ones, this is a Council of Bishops."

Response: 1. Most of these things were done as matters of fact, not of law. The Bishops soon enough arrogated a looser power to themselves. 2. Most of those statements of the Fathers are

indefinite. 3. The Bishops were usually present, not because they were Bishops, but because they excelled others in erudition and doctrine, and for the same reason were placed over the Colleges of Presbyters. This the modern Pontifical Bishops have assumed as a perpetual right. 4. Theodosius speaks of the order of Bishops delegated to the Council, outside of which no one was permitted to intrude themselves. 5. The Chalcedonians were expelling the Monks and Laymen who had come to cause disturbance.

QUESTION III

Whether the sentence of those who define doubtful matters of faith and morals in a Council is so judicial, that it must be stood by just as the sentence of a Praetor is stood by in political causes? The Bull holds this opinion, in which the power of giving sentence, that is, judicial and praetorian, by which one must stand or fall even in the judgment of conscience, is attributed to the Bishops.

We distinguish the external and internal forum, the political and that of conscience. The sentence defined in a legitimate Council is judicial and praetorian as to the external and political forum, so that in the external society it must be stood by and fallen by, and from it the supreme Magistrate acquires the right of enjoining silence on dissenters, or interdicting the state and external immunities. Otherwise in the external society, disturbances could not be brought to an end or moderation. But as to the internal forum and that of conscience, a Council is not a mere inquisition and consultation for us, as Bellarmine wrongly imputes to us; but to it pertains both the religious communication instituted for the inquiry of what is true, just, and holy, and the utterance of a sentence not judicial and praetorian, but ministerial. But the praetorian judgment belongs to Christ alone, to be inquired by those attending the Council in Scripture, and to be pronounced from it as from the tables of the mandate; truly to be embraced by the faithful through the judgment of discernment. And so the Conciliar sentence as to the forum of conscience is one of persuasion, not of coaction, and a judgment not praetorian but ministerial, such as is that of a steward or dispenser in a household where the Master is present.

Therefore we oppose the following arguments to the Pontificians:

1. He can pronounce a judicial, principal, and praetorian sentence who rules over conscience itself and can bind faith by laws. But this is not possible for men, as is clear from 1 Cor. 4:1-2, 7:12, 2 Cor. 1:24, Col. 1:24, Gal. 5:1, 1 Pet. 5:1, but for Christ alone, whose knowledge and power are infinite.

2. That the decisive judgment of faith belongs to Scripture alone, Scripture itself abundantly testifies in Deut. 17:11, Isa. 8:20, 34:2,4, Ps. 94:14-15, Dan. 7:10 with Rev. 20:12, 2 Cor. 4:2, Heb. 4:12. And nothing more is required here than that each one have a good conscience, believing what is revealed for salvation, doing what ought to be done. But the Word of God alone manifests this to the conscience by a judicial sentence.

3. The office of Pastors is purely ministerial. For they are ministers and stewards of God and Christ (1 Cor. 4:1), deacons of the New Covenant (2 Cor. 3:6), servants of the Church (Col. 4:5),

ambassadors for Christ (2 Cor. 5:20). But to servants, legates, stewards, the power of judging autonomously beyond the tables of the mandate is not granted; nor is it right for the Church to obey those pronouncing judicially beyond the tables of the mandate.

4. The Fathers gathered in Council pronounce a sentence either conformable to the Word of God or not. If the former, they are not judges, because the sentence emanates not from them but from the Word of God, but faithful interpreters of the Divine Judgment, not making the Law itself, which is the role of a proper judge, but declaring it made elsewhere. If the latter, as men who do not have the Word of God abiding in them, they are certainly not to be heard, much less regarded as judges.

5. Even General Councils are liable to the danger of erring, both because infallibility is nowhere promised to them, and because experience teaches that they have erred. For the Council of Neocaesarea disapproved second marriages. The First Nicene Council decreed that heretics were to be rebaptized, and prohibited porneia to those who had cast off the girdle. But in later ones, the Second Nicene, the Florentine, the Roman, the Lateran, and especially the Tridentine, we clearly recognize the force of the deceptive spirit from the Word of God. What? Since Scripture predicts that all the inhabitants of the earth will worship the Beast (Rev. 13:8), at that time would some Ecumenical Council have had the privilege of infallibility?

6. Granted that Councils cannot err, nevertheless no one can be persuaded with certainty of faith that a matter was so transacted in a Council as is narrated, and not otherwise, since the narration of their deeds is of merely human industry. If therefore it does not constare by the Catholic faith, as they call it, that this or that Council was legitimate, its decrees will not be of the Catholic faith, but merely human, and liable to deception. Vega used this argument in the very Council itself.

7. The sentence of the Bishops in Council is judicial, decisive, and obligatory either in itself, or on account of the consent of the majority, or on account of the authority of the Pope confirming the Conciliar decrees. Not in itself, because each one can go into factions, nay, and even err. Not on account of the consent of the majority, because even they, as the adversaries confess, can err, as is clear from the reprobated Councils. And since each individual Bishop can err, why not even more when congregated? Thus a multitude of the sick gathered into one increases rather than diminishes the disease. Not on account of the Pope's confirmation, both because that is extrinsic and posterior to the Conciliar sentences of the Bishops, whose nature it therefore cannot change; and because he himself does not have an autokratoric judgment of faith; and finally, because among the Pontificians themselves it has not yet been determined and defined whether the faith of Christians rests on the judgment of Councils or of the Pope.

8. No human judge can treat and judicially decide his own causes, just as no one can testify concerning himself (John 5:31). But the causes of faith and morals are the proper causes of all men, because it is in the interest of all men to believe the truth and do what is right.

OBJECTION I: In Deut. 17:12 they are commanded, those who have doubts, to recur to the Councils of Priests, and whoever acts contrary to their decrees out of stubbornness is declared guilty of death. Therefore the decrees of Councils of Bishops in the New Testament are also so judicial as to bind the conscience of themselves.

Response: There is no valid consequence in the argument. 1. Because in the Old Testament, in obscure matters responses were given by signs and revelations of God; therefore those decrees emanating from God bound all under penalty of death. This no longer occurs in the New Testament. 2. Nay, the Priests themselves in verse 9 could not judge anything by their own initiative. For Moses says in verse 9, "They shall declare to thee the sentence of judgment." And in verse 11, "According to the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do." Nor were they guilty of death for not doing what the Priests had not declared according to the law. Thus when the Sanhedrin abounded with Sadducees, as happened under Jannaeus, the Pharisees in not obeying their impious decrees did not sin, even if they were killed by the king. Nor was Christ, rejected by the Council of Priests and condemned to death, therefore disobedient on that account. 3. The questions concerning which they are commanded to consult the Priests were not of faith and morals, but partly political, partly ceremonial: political, partly criminal, "between blood and blood," that is, capital cases; partly civil, "between cause and cause," concerning civil causes pertaining to the conveniences of life; ceremonial, "between plague and plague," that is, diseases or troubles which ought to be distinguished according to the ecclesiastical and ceremonial law. 4. Nay, there is also this difference between the Priests of the Old Testament and the Bishops of the New, that while the people were subject to those armed with the sword, upon whom the legal bondage was imposed, these truly neither use the sword, nor can subject the Church to their laws.

II: Christ commands the Church, that is, the assembly of Pastors in Council, to be so heeded in Matt. 18:17, that whoever does not hear it is to be regarded as a heathen and a publican. Therefore the Bishops in Council can bind to believing under penalty, which is to pronounce a principal sentence as a true Judge.

Response: 1. The voice of the Church in sacred matters nowhere denotes an assembly of dogmatizing Bishops, but the order of Presbyters and the consenting brotherhood. 2. Nor here does the Church denote the universal Church gathered in Council, but a particular one. 3. Christ commands to hear the Church, not in its dogmatic utterance of a judicial sentence concerning matters of faith and morals, but in its redargution or demonstration of sin from the Word of God to the conscience, and such as even two or three, nay even one brother, could make, as is clear from vv. 15-16. But the case of faith is different from that of brotherly offenses. 4. The judgment by which a sinful person is regarded as a heathen and a publican does not proceed from principal authority and power, but is a declaration of the Church's sentence, judging the contumacious sinner, because from the refutation from the Word of God he did not obey.

QUESTION III

Was the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15 an assembly of Judges pronouncing sentence with principal authority? For the sentence of the Synod was that of the Holy Spirit itself, as appears from v. 28: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us." Whence Luke calls the sentence of the Council "precepts, decrees, dogmas." Therefore the case is the same for the remaining Councils.

Response: 1. There is no valid consequence, because the reason for the Apostolic Council was different from those of later times. The former was presided over by the Apostles, universal heralds of the world, instruments for consigning the Canon, and therefore God-inspired men. Not so the latter. 2. Nor did the Apostles define dogmas as Judges of their own motion and plenitude of power, since Paul himself denies that he is lord over faith (2 Cor. 1:24), but rather they were ministers and irrefragable witnesses and legates of God, pronouncing the judicial sentence emanating from the Holy Spirit. "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and the Apostles" - to the Holy Spirit, that no further burden should be laid on the disciples, but that they should abstain from certain things; but for different reasons. For the will of the Holy Spirit cannot be attributed to any man. Therefore, since in the Conciliar sentence there was both an entolē, decreeing that no further yoke be laid on the disciples, and a dogma or syngnōmē forbidding the eating of blood, things strangled, and things offered to idols: that entolē was the Holy Spirit's, which the Apostles as its interpreters declared; but this syngnōmē, namely concerning things indifferent about which there was no special command, was the Apostles', to whom it was given to be faithful in the work of the Lord. Therefore what seemed good to the Holy Spirit pertained to faith; what to the Apostles, to practice concerning indifferent things. What seemed good to the Holy Spirit proceeded from the plenitude of His power; what to the Apostles, from the general mandate concerning maintaining charity and not offending weak brethren.

3. They all call the sentence of the Council a "precept, decree, dogma" with respect to the Spirit, but with respect to the Apostles, an oikonomia [dispensation].

4. Councils pronounce anathema on unbelievers, and call their laws "Decrees, Canons, Constitutions." Those who subscribe them say, "I N., defining, have subscribed." Therefore their sentence is judicial and definitive.

Response: The consequence fails. 1. Because the Fathers in Councils do not pronounce anathema of their own motion and plenitude of power, but as ministers declare anathema on him who does not love Christ and believe in Him. Thus any private person can say to him who does not love the Lord Jesus, "Anathema Maranatha" (1 Cor. 16:22), and yet he is not a judge of faith. 2. They can rightly be called Decrees, Canons, Definitions, whether immediately excerpted from the Word of God, or determinations of ecclesiastical order flowing from the general mandate. Yet neither shows that those defining, decreeing, constituting are judges of faith rather than its ministers. 3. The whole proof is of fact, not law; of example, not etiology. But the same deed can be good or evil according to its conditions, its species, end, or circumstances.

V. The Church has the promise of the assistance of the Holy Spirit and infallibility, John 16:13: "The Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth." Therefore when gathered in Council it is infallible, and its decrees are to be held in the same place as if they had proceeded from the Holy Spirit. Whence it further follows that the sentence of the Council is judicial and definitive.

Response: Granted that the Church is infallible on account of the assistance of the Holy Spirit, nevertheless its sentence is not therefore judicial and definitive. For he is a judge who makes and declares law from his own and principal power, not one who pronounces a sentence infallibly delivered by the Holy Spirit. But the former would belong to the Holy Spirit, the latter only then to the Church. The Apostles were also infallible. Yet they did not hold their sayings as autonomous and judicial sentences to be admitted by tyrannical force. 2. Christ's promise in John 16:13 had place in the Apostles, as is clear from the following words: "And he will declare to you the things to come." But their case was different from that of the ministers of the Church in Council. Nor did it have place only in them when gathered together, but also when separated, because the Holy Spirit guided each one into all truth. Does it therefore follow that each individual Bishop is infallible? 3. Those words nevertheless pertain not only to the whole body of the faithful, but also to each individual believer, who cannot be saved without the guidance of the Holy Spirit. And yet individual believers are not judges of faith. 4. The Church following the Apostolic, by virtue of this promise is guided by the Holy Spirit into all truth, namely that which is necessary for salvation and fundamental. Whence it follows that the true Church as such, when gathered in Council, cannot err in fundamentals. Yet its decrees, even in fundamentals, are not therefore judicial, because they do not rest on the plenitude of the Church's power, but on the principal sentence delivered by the Holy Spirit in His Word, and faithfully declared in the Council.

VI. If the Church gathered in Council cannot judicially define controversies, then there is no judgment in the Church by which controversies of faith may be settled and the truth preserved in the Church. For there is given nothing greater on earth than a Council.

Response: 1. The definitive internal or Divine judgment suffices the faithful for the tranquility of their conscience and salvation, namely that of Christ and the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures. These certainly are also in the Church, and indeed greater than a Council. For Christ is the Head of the Church, and Scripture is the norm of faith, from which not one iota will be changed even when heaven and earth pass away. 2. An external or human infallible and definitive judgment is neither necessary nor possible in the Church. Because controversies pertain not to external order and polity, but to the judgment of the mind, a Judge is necessary who illuminates the mind and sanctifies the will. But an external and human judge, as such, cannot effect this, since he has no power over the soul and conscience. 3. But Christ can also preserve the unity of the Church without a human judgment. For He daily intercedes for it with God the Father, and alone effects that we love one another and preserve the unity of the Spirit. What? Since the unity of the Church is founded on the truth of faith, and the cause of unity is therefore the same as that of truth? But a Council is not the cause of truth, but only the invisible presence of Christ and the Holy Spirit guiding into all truth. Therefore the cause of unity is the same.

QUESTION IV

Whether in a Christian General and Legitimate Council the Bishop of Rome has the right of presiding, either immediately by himself or mediately through legates? The Bull intimates this, as does the Decree of Session 2, in which the right of presiding is attributed to the three Legates of the Apostolic See. They were sent in the name of Paul III: John Maria Montanus, Cardinal of Palestine; Marcellus Cervinus, Priest of the Holy Cross; and Reginald Pole, Deacon of St. Mary in Cosmedin. As the Council proceeded, they were succeeded by Hercules Gonzaga, Jerome Seripando, John Morone, Stanislaus Hosius, Louis Simonetta, Mark Vigerio, and Bernard Navagero.

The sum of the orthodox opinion is that provision should be made in the Council itself for a twofold President, one political to preside over order, the other ecclesiastical to preside over the debate of the cause. And this ecclesiastical one the Evangelicals contend is not the Roman Pontiff by any perpetual right, but arbitrary and elective, and such a one indeed as is most skilled in the Scriptures, most exercised in managing Ecclesiastical affairs, most celebrated for his reputation of prudence, dexterity, and moderation. And since the ecclesiastical actions of a General Council and of particular nations are distinct, they distinguish between the universal President of the Council and the particular ones of the Nations. The universal presidency, since it is extraordinary, is conferred by election on the best candidate. The particular presidencies of old belonged by Ecclesiastical right to the Patriarchs. Today it belongs to the particular Churches to appoint such a one, either ordinary or itinerant.

Meanwhile, to the Tridentines both claiming a perpetual right of presiding for the Bishop of Rome, and excluding the supreme Magistrate from that right, we oppose the following arguments:

1. The ordinary and perpetual right in ecclesiastical matters rests on either Divine or Ecclesiastical law. But neither grants the Roman Pontiff an ordinary and perpetual right of presiding. Not the Divine, because the tables of this consigned right cannot be produced. Not the Ecclesiastical, because the members of the universal Church never consented to transfer such a right to the Pope.

2. The Roman Church is particular. But no Bishop of a particular Church has an ordinary right of presiding in a General Council, because each particular Church can both err and fall away from the faith. For in the New Testament God did not bind Himself to any particular assembly by oath or covenant, so that He cannot migrate thence and remove His candlestick, if ingratitude deserves it.

3. The power of the Priests of the Old Testament was greater than that of the ministers of the New. And yet they were not so arrogant as to exclude Magistrates from the government of ecclesiastical affairs, as is clear from the examples of Moses, David, Solomon, Hezekiah.

Much less does such power belong to the ministers of the New Testament.

4. It was promised to the Christian Churches that when the nations enter the Church's door, "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers" (Isa. 49:23). By what right then will the Church exclude her nursing fathers from such governance?

5. The acts of Order in a Council are to provide for necessary things by Doctors, Pastors, and others legitimately called; to interpose authority where necessary; to issue edicts, lest a "council of Cyclopes" be held in the great assembly, in which, as Euripides says, "there is no order"; to publish decrees with authority; to deal with dangers; to interdict heretical assemblies; to punish the contumacious; to shut out wolves. But those acts can by no means be exercised except by the supreme Magistrate presiding over order.

COROLLARIES
Or Theses excerpted from the Helvetic Confession

CHAPTER I
On the Holy Scripture, the True Word of God

1. The Canonical Scriptures of the holy Prophets and Apostles of both Testaments are the very Word of God.

2. This Scripture derives its authority from itself alone, and not from men.

3. In this Holy Scripture the universal Church of Christ has most fully exposed whatsoever pertains both to a saving faith and to the right ordering of a life pleasing to God.

4. Therefore nothing is to be added to or taken away from it.

5. And from it true wisdom and piety are to be sought, as well as the reformation and government of Churches, the institution of all offices of piety, and finally the proof of dogmas and the reprobation or refutation of errors.

6. Nor is any other Word of God to be feigned or expected from heaven.

7. In the preaching of this Word, attention is to be paid to the Word of God itself which is announced, not to the Minister announcing it. For even if he is evil and a sinner, yet the Word of God remains true and good.

8. The true institution of religion thus depends on the internal illumination of the Spirit, that nevertheless in the usual manner of instructing men, the external preaching of the Gospel is necessary.

9. Yet God can illuminate, even without the external Ministry, whomever and whenever He wills, by His power working in an extraordinary manner.

10. Some books of the Old Testament were called Apocryphal by the Ancients, and by others Ecclesiastical, which they indeed wished to be read in Churches, but not to be put forward for confirming any authority of faith from them.

11. Such are the Third and Fourth Books of Ezra, Tobit, Judith, the Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and the additions to Daniel and Esther.

TO THE RESPONDENT LORDS, DEVOTED LOVERS OF LEARNING:

Studies and care, most learned scions of Phoebus, have bent your breasts to their worship?
It lay concealed in your care to unravel the sacred laws of the Ausonian tongue.

O to conquer the Goliaths of the Tridentine assembly, and you wish with magnanimous daring to lay them low!
Does one not need to dread their three-pronged monsters, whose teeth have brought forth many plagues?
That thrice-accursed, three-forked, three-headed Pope will vomit dire thunderbolts at you with his triple throat.

But yet as David bravely slew the formidable giant with the sword of his mouth,
So you will slay the horrid monsters with the sword of your mouth, and the false dogmas of the sacred Fathers with the Trident.
Go on happy ones to persist in so great an undertaking, and prepare the weapons of your eloquent choir:
For Pallas promises these honors to you, which the sacred gown confers on her initiates.

F. John Caspar Brunner, Lover of Wisdom

What vain babble does the Papal crowd make concerning the Persons, Right, and Court of the Council, and the rest?
This Musagete, this new Sparta of Heidegger refutes many things, and with Reasoning denies them.
Meanwhile, O chosen youths, you approve the teachings that give genius, and judgment too:
May the Deity prosper the darings of your undertaking, that the Council of the Heavenly Ones may be granted to ascend their Throne!

P. John James Müller, Lover of the Liberal Arts

The Glory and Corruption of the Church Or A DISSERTATION On JUSTIFICATION

I.
The state of the first man before the Fall in Paradise was truly excellent and magnificent. For in that state, man, with full vigor of powers, chaste in mind and spirit, could spend his whole life "in righteousness and true holiness before God" (Eph 4:24), according to God and the norm of His will inscribed on man's heart, living in perpetual communion and sweetest friendship with God, and thus being truly blessed. For besides being created "very good" (Gen 1:31) along with the other creatures, and "good and well-pleasing to God" (1 Tim 4:4), he moreover received from God rectitude of intellect and holiness of will, so that the image of God shone forth most brightly expressed in him. For the purpose and goal of the most wise Creator in creating man aimed at this, that man should become His most excellent work of glory, in which not only the rays of divine glory would shine, but in which he would also celebrate and extol the glory of God in various ways. "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand so that we would walk in them" (Eph 2:10).

II.
Man, therefore, resplendent with the divine image, adorned with these divine gifts, and endowed with integrity of intellect and will, could render to his neighbor all due duties from a pure and sincere heart in mutual love, truly love him, and live with him in complete concord; and moreover, could revere God, his glorious Creator, and as "the work of His hands" (Isa 64:8), perfectly obey Him in all things.

III. And although man owed this innate obedience to his Creator both according to the law of nature, by which the creature is subject to the Creator as clay to the potter (Jer 18:6) and is under His despotic will; yet God, in His kindness and philanthropia towards man, required this of him by virtue of a covenant and pact which He made and struck with Adam himself in Paradise, so that in this manner the gracious Creator might more plainly manifest Himself to man, and the way to Him might be more opened to the hope of eternal life. In this gracious covenant, God obligated Himself that He would bless with perpetual communion with Himself in this life and especially in the life eternal to come, as a reward for obedience rendered, the man who observed the natural law inscribed on his heart, and ordered his life innocently according to that norm. Moreover, this law was by no means impossible for man to observe, whether you consider the necessary and most excellent faculties given to him for keeping it, or the law itself, which was in itself most easy. For natural and inborn justice and holiness of every kind was the very foundation and rule of holiness for him, and the law inscribed on his heart was the defined standard and canon of God's infinite holiness and justice for his finite holiness and justice, according to which he could work all righteousness and live most holily. But in order that God might test man's internal obedience and sincere love by an outward symbol, He superadded to this natural law the precept concerning not eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, which contained the sum of the whole law, and would declare man's love and complete obedience to God if he firmly observed it, and on the contrary his defection and apostasy from God to earthly lusts if he transgressed it.

IV. But since man, breaking the covenant, transgressed this law of God not only by the eating of the forbidden symbol but by a universal defection from the "royal law" (James 2:8), he incurred

guilt of death according to the divine threat, and not only lost the "righteousness of the law", broke friendship with God, lost communion with Him; but was also, by the order of God's punitive justice, made subject to the "curse" (Eph 2:3), so that the law became to him a "ministry of death" (2 Cor 3:7), a "commandment unto death" (Rom 7:10), a "killing letter" (2 Cor 3:6, cf. Heb 2:15), the "power of sin unto condemnation" (1 Cor 15:56). And so no salvation at all was to be expected for man from this first covenant of works, which he had made void by his transgression. "For our iniquities have made a separation between us and our God." Therefore, "with righteousness being far from us, and deliverance not overtaking us, we await light but lo, darkness, brightness but we walk in deep gloom" (Isa 59:9,12).

V. But this divorce, which had eternally separated God from man and cut off all communion with God from him, was removed, and the blessed "seed of the woman, who would crush the serpent's head" (Gen 3:15) interposed Himself spontaneously between these parties as a Mediator, in order to reconcile the offended God with man, to obey the divine law perfectly, to satisfy divine justice, to fulfill the conditions of the former covenant, and to discharge the twofold obligation by which the sinner was bound from the covenant, both to obedience and to punishment. "For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son" (Rom 5:10), "He Himself is our peace, who made both one, and broke down the dividing wall of partition" (Eph 2:14). And so the covenant of works having been abolished, the new covenant of grace succeeded, in which "the righteousness of God has been manifested without the law" (Rom 3:21). Namely, in Christ Jesus, the Surety and Mediator of this new and gracious covenant, who freed us from the state of sin and death, redeemed us by His most precious ransom, acquired righteousness for us before God's tribunal by His blood, and by His merit constituted us co-heirs of eternal life by that pure grace which we had previously lost through the transgression of the law; and so God absolves the believing sinner from death, and reckons him righteous unto eternal life, not on account of works of the law having been performed, but on account of Christ apprehended by faith. And this is the gracious justification of sinful man through Christ, concerning which the poet says:

"What is now new was old and has passed away,
And at that time grace began
Remitting sins through faith."

VI. This salutary doctrine of Justification, the principal treasury of our salvation and the prop and basis of the whole of Christianity, is most worthy not only of perpetual consideration but of the utmost utility. For by it the way is opened anew to our reconciled God, and the entrance into heaven is unlocked for us. Moreover, it discloses to us the sum of the whole new covenant of grace in Christ, and shows us the very Surety who has satisfied divine justice, acquired remission of sins and adjudication of eternal life for us, and restored to us communion with God – without rightly knowing which our whole salvation would be lost, since destitute of our own righteousness we ought to rely solely on His merit and righteousness, and be saved through His satisfaction. Whence St. Paul determined "not to know anything among the Corinthians except Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" (1 Cor 2:2). Wherefore, being about to fulfill my part, I have

determined to treat of this doctrine, and to subject it to consideration, if not exact and accurate, yet at least devout and pious.

VII. But since in this work above all "the first thing must be to determine the meanings of words", and if in any other place, most especially in this controversy the genuine signification of the term must be thoroughly examined, the word "justification" is Hebrew in usage but Latin in origin, and so is borrowed in order to rightly express and declare the sense of the Hebrew and Greek words. Moreover, it is always used in a forensic sense in Holy Scripture, and denotes:

1. To pronounce someone righteous: "I will not justify the wicked" (Exod 23:7). And this sense is most clearly illustrated by the opposite word in the notable passage Prov 17:15: "He who justifies the wicked and he who condemns the righteous, both of them alike are an abomination to the LORD" – which the LXX rightly renders "the one acquitting the ungodly and the one condemning the righteous."

2. To acknowledge as righteous. "Great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit" (1 Tim 3:16), that is, although He assumed human nature, yet His divinity so shone forth from it that He was acknowledged to be righteous and God. "And all the people who heard Him, justified God" (Luke 7:29), i.e. acknowledged Him to be righteous. "Wisdom is justified by all her children" (Luke 7:35), i.e. acknowledged to be righteous.

3. To give testimony to one as righteous, in which sense the Apostle James uses the word throughout Chapter 2 of his Epistle.

4. And to award the rewards that are due to the righteous: "Whom He called, these He also justified" (Rom 8:30).

But in no place does Scripture use the word "to justify" in the sense of "to make righteous in oneself" – even when it deals with justification by works of the law, from which passage the Pontificians wrongly strive to prove the collation of an inherent justification by a physical act. For in this controversy, judgment must not be made from the sound of the Latin word, but the words of the Holy Spirit must be attended to, which this word "justify" merely serves to express. Indeed, the very word "to justify" no more means "to make righteous" than "to glorify" means "to make glorious", or "to magnify" means "to make great." Cf. Luke 1:46: "My soul magnifies the Lord" – the place in Dan 12:3: "And they that be teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" – though it may seem to favor them, yet it only improperly ascribes justification to those who teach others the way of righteousness, and denotes leading to righteousness. And in Rev 22:11: "He that is righteous, let him be righteous still" – either man is incited to the exercise and study of righteous actions, or he is commanded, being only outwardly and civilly righteous, to lay hold of the righteousness of God by faith, which alone and uniquely suffices for salvation; or, already justified, he is commanded to declare his justification to others by the exercise of faith and love.

VIII. But in order that the whole doctrine of Justification may be more clearly opened up to us, we shall not, I hope, commit the fault of "dancing outside the olive grove", if we consider it in a threefold manner: how it would have been in the state of integrity before the Fall; how it is in the state of sin; and what, finally, it is for the regenerate man.

IX. In the state of integrity before the Fall, man would have been justified by inherent and native righteousness, seeing that he would have obeyed the divine law exactly according to all its degrees and parts. "For the doers of the law shall be justified" (Rom 2:13). "Do this and you shall live" (Lev 18:5, Ezek 20:11, Rom 10:5, Gal 3:12). And this properly would have been not so much a justification as a rewarding of good works according to the covenant and pact, yet in such wise that it would have been not by the intrinsic value and worth of the work, but solely by the free bounty of God and the power of His own appointment, so that the reward would have been of mere divine condescension. For God cannot become a debtor to man, the Creator to the creature: "Or who has first given to Him that it should be repaid to him?" (Rom 11:35, Job 41:11). But we have lost this righteousness by the Fall of the first parents, and have contracted the guilt and penalty of sin, so that we have all become obnoxious to divine condemnation (Rom 3:19): "There is none righteous, no not one" (Psa 14:3, Rom 3:10); "There is no man on earth who does good and does not sin" (Eccl 7:20).

X. And although God, even after the Fall of our first parents, exacted works through the Mosaic law, yet He did not do this as if the Israelites could perfectly fulfill it and merit eternal salvation by its observance, for sin had now entered in, and man, despoiled of his splendid and divine gifts, could only work evil unto iniquity: "Every imagination and thought of man's heart was only evil continually" (Gen 6:5). But God willed to prescribe to the Israelites a rule and canon according to which they ought to work righteousness and strive for it. And although by the malice of their heart they could not observe it exactly, yet they were bound to endeavor towards it according to their strength. For God did not wish His own people and "peculiar treasure" to be driven about by a blind mind and depraved will, but because He chose them as the flock of His pasture, He most strictly required them to be observers of His will; and this very thing the condition of the covenant demanded from them (Deut 5:2, 6): "Now therefore, if you will indeed obey my voice and keep my covenant, then you shall be my own possession among all the peoples, for all the earth is mine." And by this stricter precept He bound them to the observance of the law, that He might restrain with a firmer rein those prone and inclined to sin, and deter them from all wickedness unbecoming those who are holy and God's peculiar people. Nay, that by the law the knowledge of sin might come, and thence its correction: "For through the law comes the knowledge of sin" (Rom 3:20); "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid! However, I would not have come to know sin except through the law" (Rom 7:7). Further, by the law man's impotence and infirmity were manifested, that all presumption and boasting of his own powers might thence be excluded from him; for man might easily, by the vice of ambition, extol his own powers and forget the glory of his Creator. But since he continually transgresses the law and does not persevere in this covenant of works (Heb 8:9), his sin and wickedness are made manifest, and the whole world is made subject to divine condemnation (Rom 5:19, 20). The more, then, that man is now constituted guilty by the transgression of the law, the more illustrious is the benefit of God in Jesus Christ the Redeemer: "For the Law entered that the

offense might abound; but where sin abounded, grace super-abounded, grace indeed through Christ."

But especially the law was a guidebook to Christ and to seeking righteousness in Christ. Hence the Apostle speaks of "the righteousness of God apart from His law" as being witnessed even by the law itself (Rom 3:21). And the law is called a "pedagogue to Christ, that we might be justified by faith" (Gal 3:24). For there was no righteousness by the law, nor indeed was it given to man that he might be justified by it, otherwise righteousness would have been by the law, and not before faith, that is, the Gospel of the New Testament, by which "the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith" (Rom 1:17). The Israelites had to be kept as prisoners under the guardianship of the law unto that faith which was to be revealed. "But the Scripture has shut up all things under sin," that is, under the law, by the transgression of which is sin and anomia, "that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe" (Gal 3:22). For before the New Testament, God had promised the Gospel through the hands of the prophets, that is, the doctrine of justifying man by faith in Christ (Rom 1:2). Nay, even under faith itself in the New Testament, the law is not abolished: "Do we then nullify the Law through faith? May it never be! On the contrary, we establish the Law" (Rom 3:31). For in the annulment of the legal covenant, the use of the law is not abolished, which is that it may be a norm of actions to be directed according to the will of God; but its use for justification is annulled, for "the Law was powerless in that it was weakened by the flesh" (Rom 8:3).

Nay, its bondage and dominion have also ceased, in place of which Christ has substituted release and liberation from its curse (1 Cor 15:56-57). Moreover, every believer even of the New Testament is bound to observe it according to the measure of his regeneration. Or does not Christ frequently inculcate the study of charity to His disciples? But "charity is the fulfillment of the law" (Matt 22:39, Rom 13:10, Gal 5:14, Jas 2:8). But when the Apostle says "the law is not made for a righteous man" (1 Tim 1:9), he does not mean to exclude the observance of the law, but only to indicate that if the legal covenant is repeated in Holy Scripture, it is not done as if justification or damnation were to be expected from the promises and threats of the law for the righteous man; but because he is freed from the law (Rom 8:2, 4), namely from its curse and bondage, under which he was constrained before acquiring righteousness through Christ.

XI. In the state of sin, man has no righteousness from the law and works, but must seek it in the Mediator Christ, who merited it for him by His most perfect obedience to the law and voluntary death. "For we being sought to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also were found sinners" (Gal 3:17). But the sinner is justified by Christ when his sins are expiated, and the debts of which he was made guilty in Adam are canceled, discharged, and so he is freed by Christ from the curse of the law that lay on him on account of his transgression, and is reckoned righteous by Christ's righteousness, and so by virtue of it is accounted worthy to possess the kingdom of heaven.

XII. But the righteousness of Christ, on account of which a sinful man is accounted righteous, is the imputed righteousness of Christ, by which he is acknowledged as righteous in Him, as if he himself had paid the ransom price for sins to God and merited justification. For on account of

the communion which we have with Christ, Christ is in us and we in Christ; hence we are said to be indwelt by Christ (Eph 3:17), so that when Christ was punished, we too are accounted as punished in Him. Hence by imputation, on account of this communion, Christ is accounted a sinner, and we, by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, are accounted righteous. "For He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, so that we might become the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor 5:21). "He was sin itself," are the excellent words of St. Augustine, "and we are righteousness, not our own, but God's, not in ourselves, but in Him. As He was sin, not His own, but ours, not in Himself, but in us; so we are the righteousness of God in Him, namely by imputation." As the disobedience of Adam was that on account of which we were condemned by the righteousness of God (Rom 5:18), so the obedience of Christ was that on account of which God justifies us, He having exposed Himself as a sacrifice for guilt (Isa 53:10). "For if by the transgression of the one (the first Adam) the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift (that is, the righteousness of Christ given and imputed) by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many" (Rom 5:15), namely, by imputation. As Christ was made a curse for us, that He might redeem us from the curse of the law, so we receive the blessing of Abraham in Him through faith (Gal 3:13-14). Or who does not see that Christ's righteousness becomes ours only by imputation from the fact that even the justified themselves can sin and stumble through the vitiosity of their corrupt nature - which certainly would not and could not at all be the case if Christ's righteousness were infused into us, since it is most perfect, devoid of every stain, and such as the vindicating righteousness of God demanded, satisfying to the uttermost farthing? "For the righteous falls seven times a day" (Prov 24:16), and "we are all like the unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are like a filthy garment" (Isa 64:6). The Apostle himself denies having this righteousness, since he was conscious of nothing against himself (1 Cor 4:4). Hence whenever mention is made of the righteousness of Christ by which we are justified, it is never called ours, but always either God's, as He who graciously accepts it, or Christ's, as He who merited it for us: "My righteousness is near" (Isa 46:13); "Jehovah our righteousness" (Jer 23:6); "Christ became to us righteousness from God" (1 Cor 1:30) - which is not infused into us, but accepted by God the Judge as ours, and imputed to us, that we may be accounted righteous in Christ Jesus. Wherefore it becomes ours by faith alone, by which we ought to apply and appropriate it as ours: "For in it the righteousness of God is revealed by faith to faith, as it is written, 'The righteous by faith shall live'" (Rom 1:17). It is called "the righteousness of faith" (Rom 9:30), and we are said to be "those who by faith attain to the saving of the soul" (Heb 10:39), namely, by laying hold of the righteousness of Christ through faith. Nay, the Apostle says in express words, "God imputes righteousness" (Rom 4:6, Gal 3:6, Jas 2:23), namely, the righteousness of Christ. Great therefore is the hallucination of the Pontificians here, who teach that the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to us, but infused, in order that the merits of the saints, works of supererogation, and dreams of indulgences may be established - as if by virtue of Christ's infused righteousness the faithful saints could perform good works having the nature of merit! Let the Apostle exclaim here: "What do you have that you did not receive? And if you did receive it, why do you boast as if you had not received it?" (1 Cor 4:7). St. Paul expressly denies inherent righteousness, in order to assert that which is by faith: "That I may be found in Him, not having my own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Phil 3:9). "We are justified freely by His grace, through the redemption" (Rom 3:24), not through the infusion of

righteousness. The Apostle most clearly explains this to us by the example of the Father of all believers, Abraham, and says: "Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness" (Rom 4:6) - faith, not as a work, for then justification would be by works, which the Apostle denies in many places; but faith laying hold of Christ's righteousness, since "it was not through the law that the promise was to Abraham or to his seed that he would be heir of the world, but through the righteousness of faith. Therefore it is by faith, in order that it may be in accordance with grace, that the promise may be certain to all the seed, not only to those who are of the Law, but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all" (Rom 4:13-16)..."To the one believing in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is imputed for righteousness" (Rom 4:5). "By grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God" (Eph 2:8) - the righteousness of God is the gift imparted and imputed. Nor is it an obstacle that many who were made sinners through the disobedience of Adam are said to be made righteous through the obedience of Christ (Rom 5:19). For there the inherence of a quality is not intimated, but the certainty and truth of righteousness. The comparison which the Apostle there institutes consists not in the mode of the thing, but in its truth; nor is the righteousness of Christ any less imputed than the unrighteousness of Adam himself, although we possess that inherently, this only by imputation. Concerning which you may see more both copiously and solidly in the excellent disputation of our Praeses, p. 317 etc. "For we through the Spirit by faith eagerly expect the hope of righteousness" (Gal 5:5) - by fiducial love toward Christ, we hope for righteousness from His merit through faith.

XIII. But since Christ the Mediator and Surety of the covenant with God the Father for our reconciliation was bound not only to take away the anomia, the penalty and curse contracted from the transgression of the law, but also to fulfill the enomia, the requirements, and render to the divine law perfect obedience to the uttermost; therefore not only the passive righteousness of Christ, by which He discharged the penalty of sin and freed us from eternal death, "having blotted out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us, and has taken it out of the way, nailing it to His cross" (Col 2:14), but also His active righteousness, which consisted in His most holy life of innocence and most perfect observance of the law, which He fully and perfectly executed to its utmost tittle, becomes ours by imputation, and both concur for our justification. The Apostle combines both with an indissoluble bond in Heb 9:14: "How much more shall the blood of Christ (that is, His passive righteousness, the antitype of the blood of bulls and goats in the old and abrogated Levitical worship, which could not take away sins, Heb 10:4), who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself unblemished to God" - that is, who according to the norm of the law lived a blameless and most innocent life, and this is His active righteousness - "purify your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." Therefore Christ will purify our consciences, that is, He will justify us, not only by His blood, death and passion, but also in that He offered Himself unblemished to God the Father. Indeed the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin (1 John 1:7). "But Christ also became subject to the law, in order that He might redeem those who were under the curse of the law, and that we might receive the adoption" (Gal 4:5). Our Pontiff had to be "undefiled, innocent, separated from sinners" (Heb 7:26). Hence the Apostle introduces Christ entering into the world thus speaking: "Sacrifice and offering You have not desired, but a body You have prepared for me...Behold, I have come...to do Your will, O God" (Heb 10:5-7). And in order to assert that this

will was performed for our benefit and in our place, he finally concludes: "By whose will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb 10:10). Christ's active righteousness can by no means, then, be separated from His passive righteousness and His holy life from His death and passion, for our justification. Each is active. For His love and obedience never shone forth more brightly than in His very sufferings, when He was obedient to His Father God even unto death, and the death of the cross (Phil 2:8; cf. Heb 5:8); and in His very soul's anguish He pursued "the things pleasing to the Father" (John 8:29). For what do these words breathe but most perfect obedience? "Father, if You are willing, remove this cup from Me; nevertheless not My will, but Yours be done" (Luke 22:42). Did not a price accrue to His immaculate life from His death and sufferings, that they might be acceptable and satisfactory to God? For death is a certain part and complement of life (Heb 2:10, 10:14). Nor did Christ owe this obedience to God the Father for His own sake, as Son to Father and creature to Creator; but also and especially as Mediator and Surety of the elect, without detriment to His glory - these are the words of the excellent theologian Francis Burmann, Oeconomia Foederum, Book 2, Section 5, Thesis 14 - "He could not have come into the world, clothed Himself with human spoils, and openly confessed God in this body, and again without conflict and a long course of obedience contended for heaven. For such a state under the law and bondage is that of wayfaring men, not of the Son of God abiding in a human body and merely showing Himself upon earth. But that He now assumed the person of a wayfarer, that was by reason of His love for the human race and an ineffable goodness. Since, therefore, He performed everything for us, whatever He did in that state is ours." Our Calvin most fully agrees with this position of the Reformed Church in Institutes 2.17.1: "But to inquire whether He merited for Himself is no less foolish and impertinent than it would be unbecoming. For who would undertake to determine the amount of merit belonging to the Judge of the whole world?...And the counsel of God is clearly set forth, that He bestowed His Son upon us in order that He alone should be glorified in Him; and Christ plainly declares the same, saying, 'Glory be to Thee, O Lord' (John 17:5)." He could have lived a most holy life in the love of God and neighbor, yet would not properly have been subject to the law; but He "was born under the law" (Gal 4:4), sent by God the Father into the flesh to be born of a woman, that He might be "under the law" (Gal 4:4), to redeem by the covenant and compact those who were bound to the obedience and penalty of the law. For Christ, this subjection to the law was determined to a certain and definite time, and "as long as He lived in the days of His flesh" (Heb 5:7), He associated with sinners "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom 8:3). But if He had been bound only to obey God the Father as the beloved Son, or as a holy and righteous creature, what need would there have been for God to send His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh as a sin offering, that because of the weakness of the flesh He might condemn sin in our flesh, that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who could not walk according to it? It was on account of Christ's subjection and obedience that God anointed Him with the oil of gladness above His fellows (Heb 1:9 from Psa 45:7), not for Himself alone, but also for those whom the Father had given to Him, that He might discharge the debt for them. "The glory which You have given Me, I have given to them, that they may be one, just as We are one" (John 17:22). He, Himself shining with peculiar glory and sitting at God's right hand, is the Leader and Prince of those who are to be saved, the Firstborn among many brethren (Rom 8:29). "We see Jesus, who was made for a little while lower than the angels, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, in order that by the

grace of God He might taste death for every one. For it was proper for Him, for whom and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to perfect the Author of their salvation through sufferings" (Heb 2:9-10). Did not the first Adam sin unto himself and his posterity in one and the same sin? Why then should not the second Adam, Christ, subject to the law, be able to fulfill the law unto Himself and His elect, and by fulfilling the law acquire righteousness? "He came to fulfill the law" (Matt 5:17), that He might free those under the curse of the law. He is "the end and fulfillment of the law" (Rom 10:4), since He fulfilled it for us, and imputes that righteousness to us. Hence St. Paul glorifies himself in God and ascribes the grace of faith and obedience to Christ: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and of death" (Rom 8:2). "For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the One the many will be made righteous" (Rom 5:19).

XIV. But this righteousness of Christ, both active and passive, becomes ours by imputation alone, because God imputes it to us as ours, and we by faith apprehend it as ours. Now this imputation comprises two distinct but not diverse parts: remission of sins, and adjudication of eternal life. For our salvation required not only deliverance from death, but also the gift of life; nor would remission of sins have been anything if possession of life and perpetual communion with God had not been restored. Hence that notable argument of the Apostle: "And inasmuch as it is appointed for men to die once and after this comes judgment, so Christ also, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to bear sin, to those who eagerly await Him for salvation" (Heb 9:27-28). As not only death lies upon sinful men, but also judgment after death, so Christ not only bore sins, but He is also to appear a second time glorious in His Father's kingdom, which they who await Him for salvation shall possess with Him.

XV. That remission of sins is a part of Christ's imputed righteousness, St. Paul asserts in 1 Cor 5:19: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not counting their trespasses against them." Therefore, the remission of sins consists in their not being imputed, and so by justification the inherent sinful qualities are not taken away, but the sins themselves are not imputed to us on account of Christ's satisfaction, and are covered over: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered" (Psa 32:1, Rom 4:7) - which is as it were an expunging and oblivion of sins: "I will not remember your iniquities any more" (Isa 43:25, Jer 31:34) - a vindication from the penalty of sins. "In Him we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (Col 1:14). But sins, both past and future, are remitted to man. For he who is once justified is free from all condemnation: "There is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom 8:1); "Who will bring any charge against God's elect? God is the one who justifies" (Rom 8:33). For the sting of death is removed from even the sins that the justified may commit, and we are purified by the blood of Christ from all sin (1 John 1:7). "Much more then, having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through Him. For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life" (Rom 5:9-10). The guilt of sins is so remitted to man that he is freed from having to discharge any penalty whatsoever hereafter - since the condemnation, which is nothing but an adjudication of penalty, is no more in believers

by the accepted grace of justification, and Christ's satisfaction for them is not such that it must still be fulfilled in part by them. For it is a full remission (Rom 3:24-25), a blotting out, a taking away of sins (Isa 43:25). Christ has entirely expunged and obliterated that handwriting which made us guilty debtors liable to the penalty of sins (Col 2:14). But now, the handwriting having been discharged, the debtor is no longer bound to satisfy it. Nay, if after the handwriting has been blotted out, one should still attempt to discharge it, would he not accuse Christ's most sufficient payment of imperfection, and by an impious endeavor make himself a co-adjutor of Christ in blotting out his own sins? Indeed, even the justified believer fills up the remaining afflictions of Christ in his flesh (Col 1:24); he bears the cross of Christ with a patient and placid mind, suffers any adversities and hardships for Christ's sake - not, however, that by these sufferings he may satisfy for sins committed, but either that through fatherly chastisement he may be admonished of faults committed, and of the flesh sometimes predominating over the spirit, that he may henceforth restrain it with a tighter rein; or that by trial and dokimasian he may be confirmed in steadfast faith and obedience; or even that by the testimony borne through his own blood and death undergone, the glory of Christ and of the Holy Spirit most efficaciously working in him may be manifested, and the doctrine of the Gospel confirmed. Therefore, the expiation of guilt and the cancellation of debt is ours from Christ alone, who "has set free as many as were held in bondage all their lifetime by the fear of death" (Heb 2:15). Nay, so far are the faithful from being able to satisfy by temporal penalties, that Christ must succor them when afflicted (Heb 2:18) and sustain the weak in their sufferings. And although the remission of sins is frequently ascribed solely to the death and blood of Christ (1 John 1:7, Rom 3:25, 1 Pet 1:19), yet the merit of obedience is not excluded, but is comprehended under it as the complement and end of His whole mediatorial work: "I write to you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you on account of His name" (1 John 2:12), that is, on account of His righteousness acquired by obedience and death, and imputed to us.

XVI. The other part of Christ's imputed righteousness is adjudication to eternal life and entrance into heaven. "But the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom 6:23). "We have confidence to enter the holy place (that is, eternal life, of which the holy place was formerly a type in the Old Testament) by the blood of Jesus" (Heb 10:19). Compare the words of Christ expiring to the thief: "Today you shall be with Me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43).

XVII. But we become partakers of this righteousness of Christ through faith alone. For faith is the means by which the Holy Spirit makes Christ's righteousness and obedience our own. But this faith is not a bare assent to the truths revealed to us in the Word of God; for besides not being peculiar to those who are to be justified, it has no power in itself to justify. But it is a fiducial love and inclination toward Christ and His merit performed in our stead; and by this we are justified, being fully and certainly persuaded that all our sins are blotted out and we are reconciled to God. Hence St. Paul concerning the justifying faith of Abraham: "Being fully persuaded that what He had promised, He was able also to perform; wherefore also it was imputed to him for righteousness" (Rom 4:21-22). And although this full persuasion always accompanies faith, yet believers do not have it in an equal degree, nor with the same vigor at all times. For it may be obscured through various temptations and perturbations of judgment, yet without any detriment to justification. For the life-giving roots of faith are such that they can

never dry up, though its fruits and leaves may at times droop by the malignant blast of temptation, by which its acts are interrupted. But faith itself, though veiled in darkness, ever seeks to break forth again, and like the sun to disperse the denser and grosser clouds by its confident and heaven-aspiring rays.

XVIII. This faith, then, which is "confidence toward God through Christ" (2 Cor 3:4), lays hold of Christ's righteousness, accepts His merit, promises itself thence the remission of sins, and undoubtedly believes the divine promises. For it is the "substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb 11:1). Hence we so often hear the exhortations of Christ and the Apostles to this faith. Christ to the ruler of the synagogue (Luke 8:50): "Only believe, and your daughter shall be saved." Philip commands the Eunuch to be baptized to "believe with all your heart" (Acts 8:37). St. Paul to the Philippian jailer desiring eternal salvation (Acts 16:31): "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you shall be saved." So also the Gospel promise reads: "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). But we are justified by this faith, indeed by this alone: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law, but through faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal 2:16). It is by this faith alone that Christ's righteousness and satisfaction are imputed to us: "for the righteousness of God is through faith in Jesus Christ, upon all those who believe" (Rom 3:22); cf. Rom 4:13 - by faith, not on account of faith; by faith, not as a work, but as the instrument laying hold of Christ's righteousness, apart from works (Gal 2:16), that all boasting in works may be excluded: "Where then is boasting? It is excluded, by what kind of law? Of works? No, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from the deeds of the Law" (Rom 3:27-28). For in justification by faith, man can claim nothing for himself by his own powers, since he offers nothing to God, but receives the grace of redemption offered by God. Or what could a dead man do for himself unto life? But we were dead in sins, drank in iniquity like water; what quickening and purification from sins then shall we expect from ourselves? You might more easily get water from a pumice stone than a good work from an unregenerate man. Is there not life outside of the Son of God? And those alienated from Christ "walk in the lusts of the flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind" (Eph 2:3). But "the mind set on the flesh is death, indeed, it is hostile toward God" (Rom 8:6-7). Who does not see man's boasting in being justified by works of the Law hence lying shattered? "Not unto us, O LORD, not unto us, but unto Your name give glory on account of Your grace" (Psa 115:1). "He who boasts, let him boast in the Lord" (1 Cor 1:31). The Apostle most severely reproaches the Jews for expecting justification by the Law, when they so continually transgressed it: "You who boast in the Law, through your transgression of the Law do you dishonor God?" (Rom 2:23). Our justification is gratuitous, not of debt: "But if it is by grace, it is no longer by works, otherwise grace is no longer grace" (Rom 11:6). "For this reason it is by faith, that it might be in accordance with grace" (Rom 4:16). "And if it is by works, it is no longer grace, otherwise the work is no longer work" (Rom 11:6). For if our works merited justification, the reward would be reckoned to us not by grace but as a debt; but we are not justified by debt, but by grace - not a quality infused into the soul by whose aid we can perform good works, but "the grace of God which brings salvation" (Tit 2:11) and "has appeared to all men" (Tit 2:11); and consequently not by works, for then it would not be grace; our works therefore do not have the nature of merit in our justification. "By grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not by works, so that no one may boast" (Eph 2:8-9). The

Apostle's way of putting faith and works in opposition to each other, by which he means to reject the former and confirm the latter in this matter, is repeated again and again: "Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith?" (Gal 3:2). Nay, he expressly teaches that if righteousness could be given by the Law, then faith would be vain and the promise made void: "For if an inheritance is by the Law, it is no longer by promise" (Gal 3:18); "For as many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse" (Gal 3:10); "You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the Law; you have fallen from grace" (Gal 5:4); nay, "Christ died in vain" (Gal 2:21). What then do the Tridentine Fathers mean by denying that faith alone justifies, and asserting with most impudent mouth that justification is nowhere ascribed to faith alone? When the Apostle has expressly said that a man is justified "not but through faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal 2:16). Why do they prefix other dispositive virtues to faith, such as fear, penitence, baptism, charity? When faith alone, and fiducial love toward Christ alone, can lay hold of and apply to itself Christ's righteousness. But these virtues do not precede justification, but follow the justified man, and are effects of justification. The fear of the Lord causes the justified to avoid sins and study holiness and reverence toward God. Hope rests on the imputed righteousness of Christ as its sole anchor for the future, and is the firmest prop of consolation to the believing man in every affliction. Penitence is the first act of the renewed life and likewise a fruit of justification. Baptism does not dispose to justification, since it has no physical virtue of disposing, but only seals and confirms the grace of Christ offered. Finally, though charity is conjoined with faith by an indissoluble bond, and faith is no faith without charity, yet charity arises from faith, and faith enkindles the heart of the believing man with a sincere love of God and neighbor. Nay, the Tridentine prelates err still further, with whom faith is a certainty of conscience in expecting a reward from God, and the divine grace by which we are said to be justified gratis is the Holy Spirit aiding us to the study of holiness, who is thence poured forth and inheres in their hearts; and they strike with the thunderbolt of anathema all those who teach that man is justified by the grace and charity alone which is poured forth and inheres in their hearts. What do they contend for but, by opposing the doctrine of the Apostles, to introduce justification by works, and while seeking their own righteousness, to reject the righteousness of God? Do they not hunt after praise from good works and merits, when yet all boasting is excluded by the law of faith? And even the most holy of the regenerate would supplicate the judgment of God, nor would they supplicate it if they had the perfection of good works from which they could expect merit from God. And although they do indeed willingly concede that good works, which proceed from faith and the aid of God, deserve merit de congruo (that is, not by the rigor of justice, but by equity alone), yet even this merit cannot be acknowledged; for God loves us as such as we shall be by His gift, not by our own merit. We are justified by the imputed righteousness of Christ, while we lay hold of it by faith, nor is any place left for good works to justify us by them, although we are acknowledged to be justified by them.

XIX. But faith is so opposed to works in this matter, that it excludes even itself as a work justifying of itself. Utterly absurd and altogether erroneous is the opinion of the Socinians, who consider faith as the condition of the new covenant, and determine that a man endowed with faith, if he adds obedience to the Gospel precepts (though imperfect and incomplete), will obtain eternal life; and thus they impiously teach that obedience rendered to Christ's precepts on account of faith in His promises and doctrine is well-nigh the cause of justification - contradicting

diametrically the doctrine of the Apostle, who, rejecting the righteousness that is by works of the Law, commends to us the righteousness of Christ alone through faith. These men are grievously injurious to the mediatorial office of Christ, entirely subverting His most perfect satisfaction and ransom price. For if finally we are justified by faith as a justifying work, Christ's righteousness will contribute nothing to our justification, which is the most absurd and blasphemous thing that can be devised. Nor can that acceptilation by which they feign our faith to be accepted by God as just have any place in God. For God can no more recede from His right than depart from His holiness in any respect. God cannot deny His righteousness, which would certainly happen if without any satisfaction He accepted as most just what is unjust. But in order that satisfaction might be made for our sins, Christ the Mediator had to discharge the most perfect ransom price to divine justice, to crush the serpent's head, to destroy the works of the Devil, and to take away our sins (1 John 3:5, 8). Moreover, it is harsh when they fabricate a twofold covenant of works, one rigid, the other tempered, and thus teach that God's immutable holiness and righteousness are varied. Nor do they grant justification by faith in Christ to the believers of the Old Testament, but say that they were accounted worthy by God of their own works and the innocence of life out of mere mercy, beyond and contrary to the Law. But let such Christ-less Christians hear the Apostle's doctrine concerning the justification of Old Testament believers, fully explained in Rom 3:21ff: Where he says that justification is witnessed even by the testimony of the Law and the Prophets, and pronounces all to be justified freely by God's grace through the redemption accomplished in Christ, and finally concludes: "There is one God who will justify the circumcision (the circumcised Jews) through faith, and the uncircumcision (the uncircumcised Gentiles) through faith." How could Christ be called "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev 13:8) unless He was set forth in the sacrifices of slaughtered cattle offered in faith? "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever" (Heb 13:8). "We believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they" (Acts 15:11), that is, the Old Testament believers. Therefore, as many in the Old Testament applied Christ's righteousness to themselves by faith, they were justified in the same way with the believers of the New Testament. For the economy of the covenant does not distinguish the substance of justification, but only a certain mode of it. "God made no distinction between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith" (Acts 15:9). The doctrine of the Socinians is therefore impious: it destroys and overthrows the holiness and righteousness of God, the religion and hope of the ancients, the glory and office of Christ, the nature of faith, and re-introduces works, though under a different scheme, and finally proposes an execrable mixture of Law and Gospel. "What shall we say then? That Gentiles, who did not pursue righteousness, attained righteousness, even the righteousness which is by faith; but Israel, pursuing a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Why? Because they did not pursue it by faith, but as though it were by works" (Rom 9:30-32). And how shall they escape "the neglecting of so great a salvation" (Heb 2:3), nay, "the treading under foot the Son of God, and the profaning of the blood of the covenant" by which they were sanctified (Heb 10:29)?

XX. But true and saving faith either precedes our justification, while the sinner assents to all the general and special promises made in the Word of God through Christ as most worthy of faith, and believes that the remission of sins and grace through Christ is offered not only to all in general but also to himself, and hungers and thirsts more and more after righteousness (Matt

5:6); or it accompanies and coexists with justification, when with hand outstretched toward Christ and His merit it embraces Him with fiducial love, and sweetly leans and rests upon Him as an anchor, rock, and horn of salvation. Hence the Apostle's admonition: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water, let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering" (Heb 10:22-23). And it follows justification when it perceives the sweetest fruits from Christ's righteousness, is affected with a sense of divine grace, and can glory in justification and salvation now attained: "But now having been freed from sin and enslaved to God, you derive your benefit, resulting in sanctification, and the outcome, eternal life" (Rom 6:22). Wherefore the faith that justifies is not that faith which can only attain some appearance and semblance of true faith and feign some confidence, yet able to fall away at a slight cause, be overturned by some small adversity, and change in a moment; nor that miraculous faith which, moved by the rarity of miracles, deserves rather to be called amazement and admiration at the novelty of the thing, coupled with an evanescent assent enduring no longer than the miracle itself; nor that dumb and dead faith of the Pontificians which they call the charcoal-burner's faith, which is the blind assent of blind leaders, by which unhappy guidance both fall together into the pit of errors. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Rom 10:17), the Apostle teaches; but they impiously teach, in diametric opposition to St. Paul, that faith comes by assent and assent by human tradition. But saving faith does not rest on bare assent, but is supported by fiducial and filial love toward Christ, and being confirmed by the sense of Christ's reciprocal love, it endures like a rock and immovable cliff; and though at times obscured, it immediately breaks forth again and is reduced, as by an Ariadne's thread, through Christ and His merit, that the faithful may "taste and see that the LORD is good; blessed is the man who takes refuge in Him" (Psa 34:8).

XXI. But God decreed our justification by faith from eternity: "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith" (Gal 3:8). From eternity, God the Father made a covenant and compact with the Son, whereby He gave Him as the Lamb and Redeemer of the elect people. But the Son in turn would present Himself for the execution of this. Now God has made this decree known in time. He promised the Protoplasts in the Protevangelical proclamation concerning crushing the serpent's head and putting enmity between his seed and the woman's seed (Gen 3:15). "He preached the Gospel beforehand to Abraham" (Gal 3:8), as also to all the remaining Patriarchs and the seed that followed them, "at many times and in many ways" (Heb 1:1), that they might become heirs by faith (Heb 11:7). But when "the fullness of time came" (Gal 4:4), "the completion of the appointed time" (Gal 4:2), God sent His Son (John 3:16) out of that eternal "counsel of peace" (Zech 6:13) into the flesh, that by making a purification of our sins through Himself (Heb 1:3), He might satisfy God the Father as the Sponsor of the new covenant for the sins of the people whom He claimed as His own (1 Pet 2:9), and discharge the ransom price. He also, by the innocence of His life and the penalty of His death, acquired for us redemption, the remission of sins (Eph 1:7), through the cross having reconciled us in one body (Eph 2:16), and "through His knowledge He will justify the many" (Isa 53:11). Therefore, as soon as a man receives Christ and His merit with fiducial love, which is a certain faith, he immediately receives justification from God: "Son, your sins are forgiven you" (Mark 2:5). And although he may not at once have the sense and experience of justification accomplished, which can

sometimes manifest itself only after some time, yet the justifying sentence of God has already been passed, and is gradually intimated by the Holy Spirit in the innermost hearts of believers, testifying to them that by the righteousness of Christ they are sons of God and have received the adoption (Rom 8:15-16). Hence by the exercise of faith and love they confirm it, and testify to others that through Christ's righteousness they are justified and adopted into the number of His sons.

XXII. The ground of our justification therefore consists in God, who as soon as He has once pronounced us righteous through the righteousness of Christ, though various degrees may be admitted with respect to the justified according to which he has a greater and greater sense of it, and as often as he is led by repentance, lays hold of the remission of sins by faith. Hence in the Lord's Prayer he is commanded to ask daily for the remission of sins, that the execution of that sentence which is pronounced in justification may be hastened and promoted. Our justification is also perfect and absolute, "that we may be cleansed by the blood of Christ from all sin" (1 John 1:7), redeeming us from all iniquity (Titus 2:14) - immutable and irrevocable. For it is God's gift (Rom 5:15-16), and "the gifts and calling of God are irrevocable" (Rom 11:29), the action of Jehovah's immutability (Mal 3:6, James 1:17). It is certain, indeed most certain, being a firm "full assurance and full conviction of faith" (Rom 4:21, Heb 10:22). It is a "confession of hope unwavering" (Heb 10:23), leaning on the faithfulness of the Promiser, and upheld by the very testimony of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers (Rom 8:16-17). And finally it belongs to this present life. For sins must be blotted out "before the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord" (Acts 3:19). A man is justified in this life, that by the righteousness of Christ he may appear righteous before God the Judge, and be purified from defilements, that he may be admitted into the new Jerusalem "into which nothing unclean or abominable shall ever enter" (Rev 21:27), and may occupy the dwelling prepared by Christ in the Father's house. But in the other life there will no longer be place for the remission of sins, but "as the tree falls, so it shall lie" (Eccl 11:3) - the faithful in the bosom of Abraham (Luke 16:22), the unbelieving in outer darkness (Jude 1:13) shall remain eternally.

XXIII. Finally, justification belongs to the righteous or regenerate man, whereby the believer justified by God through Christ proves the infallible certainty of his justification by the exercise of faith and love. For from the imputed righteousness of Christ communicated through faith, inherent righteousness necessarily follows as effect from cause, fruit from tree, which is "the soul, vivified, sanctified, and regenerated by the life-giving Spirit" (these are the words of the distinguished Praeses in his Disputation on Evangelical Beatitude, III, Section 21), "purified and sanctified by the prior merit and efficacy of imputed righteousness," a righteousness begun indeed in this life, but to be consummated and perfected in the other. For Christ merited for us not only righteousness by which the penalty of sins might be discharged, but also "that being freed from sin and enslaved to God, we might derive our benefit resulting in sanctification" (Rom 6:22). Thus the Apostle calls Christ the "purifier" (Titus 2:14). "For He gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify for Himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works." Hence to the covenanted of the new covenant of grace it is promised that "God will put His laws upon their minds and inscribe them upon their hearts" (Heb 8:10),

that "they shall be holy, even as He who called them is holy" (1 Pet 1:15). They are bound to work righteousness, that is, righteous works; for then only do they prove themselves to be of God and driven to holiness by the Holy Spirit through the imputed righteousness of Christ (1 John 3:10), since Christ is made to them not only righteousness but also sanctification (1 Cor 1:30). For saving faith is not an idle faith, but one "working through love" (Gal 5:6) and efficacious. Wherefore also love is called greatest among faith and hope (1 Cor 13:13), not that love precedes faith, but because faith without love is no true faith, and faith is only truly acknowledged where the exercise of love takes place and "faith works through love," which hope or confident expectation supports. For whatever one believes, one also certainly hopes for, since faith is "the substance of things hoped for" (Heb 11:1). And by this very thing true believers distinguish themselves from hypocrites, who puffed up with an ostentatious show of their own faith enormously boast and vaunt it, and like the ancient Pharisees justify themselves before men (Luke 16:15), when meanwhile they are vain and empty (James 2:20), "a noisy gong and a clanging cymbal" (1 Cor 13:1). But the believer, on the contrary, does not boast himself, but as the faith of the hypocrites is dead, being without works, so he shows his faith by his works (James 2:18). Already justified by Christ's imputed righteousness, he is still justified (Rev 22:11, 1 John 3:7), and renders to God the obedience of faith due to Him (Rom 1:5), being "filled with the fruits of righteousness which are through Jesus Christ" (Phil 1:11). For our justification is not a bare relation, as the Antinomians falsely calumniate, but it is an imputation of Christ's righteousness, which also works in us a zeal for good works and immediately paves the way to sanctification: "For our old self was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves to sin" (Rom 6:6); "For if we have become united with Him in the likeness of His death, certainly we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection, knowing that our old self was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves to sin...But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him" (Rom 6:5, 8). Nay, if being justified they still lived according to the flesh, it would follow that they must die (Rom 8:13), and would be "slaves of sin leading to death" (Rom 6:16). "But how shall we who died to sin still live in it?" (Rom 6:2) Hence there the holy Paul requires of the justified that "just as they formerly presented their members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness, resulting in further lawlessness, so now they present their members as slaves to righteousness, resulting in sanctification" (Rom 6:19). What more does the Apostle James urge but that works should testify concerning the justifying faith, without which it is dead, nay null? "That faith might be shown by works" (James 2:18), since even "our father Abraham...was justified by works" (James 2:21), that is, declared and acknowledged righteous, when he offered his son Isaac upon the altar - for the righteousness of Christ was imputed to him while he was still uncircumcised (Rom 4:10). And why should not the Savior Himself, "Jehovah our Righteousness" (Jer 23:6), desire faith to shine forth through works: "Let your light shine before men in such a way that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt 5:16)? Hence we are not only most frequently incited and stirred up to the exercise and study of good works, but good works are also said to be most necessary for justification, inasmuch as they are fruits and signs of it, and by them faith is made perfect and consummated (James 2:22). From this an easy reconciliation between Paul and James now follows. For St. Paul excludes good works as meritorious causes of justification. But James asserts them as necessary fruits of justification. The former denies that they precede the man to

be justified; the latter affirms that they follow. The former treats of the justification of the sinner before God's tribunal; the latter of justification before men. The former from prior causes, the latter from posterior signs and effects. The former of the imputed righteousness of Christ; the latter of internal sanctity wrought by the Holy Spirit in the justified man. The former of the justification of the sinner; the latter of the justification of the righteous man. But since the distinguished Praeses has most solidly elucidated these things in his own full disputation, I shall not dwell on them further.

XXIV. Let Zion therefore exult in the righteousness of her Savior (Zeph 3:14-15). To God the Father, who sent His only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him (1 John 4:9). To God the Son, who deigned to become our Surety and Mediator, to empty Himself and reconcile us to God the Father. And indeed to God the Holy Spirit, who bears witness to our souls that through Christ's righteousness we are adopted sons - let unutterable and everlasting praises and thanksgivings resound! Singing that new song, we shall celebrate our Savior (Rev 5:9-10): "Worthy are You to take the book and to break its seals; for You were slain, and purchased for God with Your blood men from every tribe and tongue and people and nation. You have made them to be a kingdom and priests to our God." "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and unfathomable His ways!...For from Him and through Him and to Him are all things. To Him be the glory forever. Amen" (Rom 11:33, 36). Therefore, let this be our pious prayer and continual vow:

"Let the heavens above rain down righteousness,
Let the clouds pour down the righteousness of God!
Let the earth open and bring forth salvation,
And let righteousness spring up together;
Let it come to pass, let it happen!"

Acclamation of Friends
To the Learned Respondent Doctor

I.
My dear Hellene-friend! To you, with only German-minded brothers,
I send German-minded songs, to celebrate your praise and honors.
German mouth and German mind should go together so,
German heart and chaste behavior hate all falsity's vain show.
Though the false-taught world deceives now one, then another soul,
And in shameless heaps of error foulest lies and slanders roll -
Those whose first Order's father is th'old lying spirit base,
That condemned man-murderer, stranger to all truth and grace,
Who by warfare has so ruined man, that from flesh and blood alone
He inherits naught but evil, as his lamentable own;
Who iniquity drinks deeply like a river or a flood,
Having now no part that's healthy, wholly evil, ill with blood -
Ill indeed, and dead in trespasses. But our gracious Father (see Gen 3:15)

Had not then His Son commissioned, who that old deceiving,
Serpent crushed, her head down-treading, by His death's o'ermastering might (Rom 5:10),
And for us, so far from favor, brought our pardon into sight;
That our evil deeds no longer should be charged against our score,
But as just and good He grants us life eternal evermore.
Of this faithful Mediator teaches my learned friend indeed,
When from Scripture's sacred readings he instructs that from guilt
And sin alone, through Christ's own death, we are pronounced made whole and right,
He who sin's power has broken and has crushed hell's tyrant might.

Further, he has taught us rightly how the soul can never die;
Therefore by his learned writings he inscribes it for the sky.
Fare thee forward, worthy friend! For those who teach with skillful lore
Shall, like heaven's radiance shining, beam among the starry store;
And by teaching so well-grounded (to that ancient serpent's shame)
You shall profit Christ's own Churches with no little wholesome aim.

II.
Virtue unrestrained finds no restraining way,
By which she may not lead her eager devotees where they would go;
There is no need of many examples to prove this;
Let this one instance of yours suffice.
Having entered Virtue's path wherever you wished,
You were able to finish: your deeds prove this.
Recently, as a lover of Wisdom, by learned reasoning you proved
That the soul animated is not doomed to mortality.
That you have also mastered Theology well, this present Work
Bears sufficient witness, as do your past deeds.
Now diligently and intrepidly proceed, and glory shall arise;
At last, for your achievements you shall bear worthy rewards.
This token of his love
Abraham Melesius has set forth.

III.
O noble one, where do you hasten? Where does Virtue's honor
And great reward draw you, her illustrious nursling?
What wars do you wage, to what contests does your
Intrepid breast prepare you with a courageous spirit?
With what stride, what course do you strive and hasten
To scale the sacred Mountain's lofty heights?
May the Deity prosper your noble struggle and assist your daring,
Granting you power to attain your desired goal.
Whatever deficiency there is in this token of his love for the most learned Respondent,
His singular friend offers it, boasting more his mind than his verse.

DISSERTATION On DETERMINING GRACE, Or, as it is called, PHYSICAL PREDETERMINATION.

Which,
aspiring benignly by the breath of the Divine Spirit;
UNDER THE PRESIDENCY OF
The very Reverend, Most Celebrated,
Most Learned,
Dr. JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER,
Doctor of Sacred Theology, and Professor of Christian Ethics among the people of Zurich,
Patron and Supporter to be eternally honored and loved,
will be defended,
by
BARTHOLOMEW ZUBER-BUELER,
from Herrliberg, on the 9th day of July, at 10 o'clock,
in Zurich,
In the Year 1687.

To the very Reverend, Most Excellent,
Most Distinguished, Most Learned
Dr. JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, Doctor of Sacred Theology, and Professor of Christian Ethics in the most celebrated Academy of Zurich, most diligent President. Dr. SEBASTIAN HOEGGER, most meritorious Rector of the Gymnasium of St. Gallen, formerly most honored host. Dr. JOHN ZOLLICOFFER, most vigilant Pastor of the Church of Herrliberg.
And also
To the magnificent, most noble, most distinguished, most prudent MEN
Mr. BARTHOLOMEW SCHIESS, Prefect.
Mr. SEBASTIAN SCHIESS, Leader of the local militia.
Mr. CONRAD SCHIESS, Captain.
Mr. LAURENT TANNER, Standard-bearer of the local militia and leader of the Herrliberg assembly.
Mr. JACOB SCHIESS, Assistant.
Mr. CONRAD MEYER, former Prefect in the Rhine Valley.
Mr. CONRAD SCHIESS, Captain in Tobel.
Mr. JOHN JACOB ZUBER-BUELER, Senior.
Mr. LAURENT TANNER, most meritorious Tutor.
Mr. JOHN MEYER.
Mr. JOHN SCHIESS.
Mr. JOHN JACOB ZUBER-BUELER, Junior,
Notary of Herrliberg.
And to the other most distinguished Associates of the Senate of Herrliberg.

To the most prudent Senators of the illustrious Republic of Herrliberg and its external communities.
To my patrons, supporters, hosts, relatives, I, with due respect and reverent worship, inscribe and dedicate this work of my studies,
Bartholomew Zuber-Bueler,
The Respondent.

Here is a translation of the text into English, without making a summary:

I. The occasion as well as the subject matter for this little treatise of ours was provided by the recently published and submitted to scholastic debate in the neighborhood Augustinian-Thomistic Resolutions concerning Physical Predetermination, explaining its nature, powers, and functions. The author of those Resolutions handled that subject quite learnedly and soberly, more so than most, and indeed the more eminent, in the Papistic School; and, what is most important, with some zeal for the truth. I have deemed it a good thing to say something on that matter also; and indeed with a spirit so much the calmer and more composed, as those Resolutions approach more closely to our catholic sentiment. But in order that some plan of order may be followed in a subject quite difficult enough, first we shall set forth the very status quaestionis or state of the question; then we shall rehearse, after the manner of a synopsis, the divisions of opinion which have long exercised the Papistic School concerning this question; next we shall draw forth some salutary admonition, as we trust; and finally we shall put each opinion to the immovable test of Scripture. May that ever-flowing and perennial Fount of grace be present!

II. The state of the question concerning prevenient grace is: Whether in the work of our conversion, and therefore in all supernatural acts of believers, there precedes such an efficacious operation of divine grace that, this being posited, the effect predetermined and predefined by God infallibly follows? Those who defend the affirmative opinion dignify that most efficacious operation of divine grace with the term Physical Predetermination. And indeed they call it predetermination, because grace so anticipates the operation of the creature as to determine it antecedently, that is, not simply to move and incline it, but to attain its effect by a kind of imposed necessity. But they call it Physical Predetermination because grace works physically, that is, by real and true efficiency, not merely by moral persuasion, which can attain or not attain its effect at the choice of the will. The Scotist Camerarius, in his Select Disputations p. 1 q. 9, states the question a little more obscurely, according to the usual manner of the School: "Whether besides the simultaneous concurrence of God, which is nothing other than the very action of the second cause insofar as it proceeds from God, there is given a prior concurrence or some motion completing and determining the active power of the creature to act?" The Bishop of Ypres, Cornelius Jansen, states it more clearly in his work On the Grace of Christ the Savior, Book VIII, 1: "Whether the nature of efficacious divine grace consists in such a motion or impulse, which of itself efficaciously determines the will to consent, so that this being posited and passively received in the will, its consent is immediately present, nor can it simultaneously dissent?"

III. Concerning this most serious and well-nigh capital question, the greatest zeal of contenders has long been exercised in the Papistic School. But two families especially, namely the Dominicans and the Jesuits, have taken opposite sides, first indeed at Salamanca and Valladolid, then at Rome, in Belgium and other provinces of Europe. And the Jesuits in public Disputations held at Salamanca rejected Physical Predetermination as so inimical to Free Will that they can by no means coexist. For if grace so predetermines the will that it cannot resist, but by a kind of insuperable necessity must consent, how can the will remain so free that, all prerequisites for acting being posited, it can act or not act? They confess that God concurs with free causes. But that concurrence is general, consisting not in some motion predetermining the will, but in a certain illumination of the intellect and motions of the will by which God entices the will that it may will, grants it powers for willing, and at the same time concurs with the will if it shall will. But whether with those aids it wills or resists them does not happen by any predetermination of God to this or that part, but by the free choice of the will, which, however much grace may entice and flatter it, consents or dissents if it wills. God does not therefore precede (for they shudder to hear the word "pre-," as the Resolutions intimate) as a leader and guide who by Physical Predetermination premoves and most invincibly permoves the will to act freely; but He concurs as an associate and companion. Moreover, what the free will would will or do with any grace whatsoever, were it given, they determined that God explores through a conditioned or middle knowledge devised for that end; and the free will being thus explored, that grace is given with which the will is foreseen to be about to act, by God's Decree predefining that such an effect shall come to pass. Thus the Fathers of the most sane Society.

IV. But to that doctrine as if novel and previously unheard-of, the Dominican Bañez, then Primary Professor at Salamanca, manfully and generously opposed himself in a book published to the world. For he so vindicated Physical Predetermination as to show at the same time the manner in which it can be reconciled with the freedom of the human will. Whatever was objected to him by the Jesuits, he dismissed with the single distinction of the compounded and divided senses. For it is not necessary, he said, that with all those prerequisites the will should act or not act, but only that it may not act. For in free will, howsoever prepared and even determined for acting, and in the very act of operating, there is found a simultaneous potency for operating and not operating, not indeed a simultaneous potency, as if it could act and not act at the same time. That is, to say it more clearly: in free will there is a power to opposites, not however to having opposites together. Therefore for the freedom of the will it suffices that the will, all prerequisites for willing being posited, even the predetermining grace and heavenly delectation, simultaneously stands in such position that it can not will, not however that it simultaneously not will. For the potency of not willing does not clash with all those prerequisites for willing, but only the actually not willing. In the divided sense, the will can not do that which God works in it by efficacious and predetermining grace; but in no wise in the compounded sense. Thus Bañez endeavored to untie the knot which they considered insoluble.

V. But by this means of contention being thrown into the midst, the Jesuits did not acquiesce but proceeded more boldly against it. And indeed the Jesuit Molina, perceiving that his Sect was being suppressed, published a book opposing Bañez's doctrine with the utmost zeal. Shortly after, Antonio de Padilla, Professor of Theology at Valladolid, seconded Molina, defending his

doctrine as probable in public conclusions. Bañez and his followers first brought the matter before the Royal Senate, then in 1597 before Clement VIII, then Supreme Pontiff, by whose command the matter was long disputed concerning it by Theologians of both families, first in a committee of Cardinals, then before the Pontiff himself. But whether deterred by his forthcoming death, as the Pontificians endeavor to persuade, or, which seems more likely to me, by dread of such powerful parties, he did not pronounce any definitive sentence. He being removed from life, the controversy broke out anew under Paul V, Clement's successor, who finally decreed that the authors of each opinion, that is, both the denying and the affirming Predetermination, should defend their own opinion, without however censuring the contrary party, until something on this matter should be determined by himself or his successors. But neither he nor his successors have hitherto dared to settle the ambiguous fates of these disputes so long agitated by a decisive sentence. The dissensions have grown immensely, and the exasperation of minds has become inflamed. Even Francis Suarez was summoned from Spain to Rome, that he might put a muzzle on the Predeterminists, as Thuanus records in Book 131 for the year 1604. So far was the Papal composition from calming that swelling tide of fierce spirits, that after many quarrels the Academy of Salamanca finally compelled all subject to its jurisdiction, the Jesuits vainly snarling, to swear in set terms to the words of Augustine and Thomas. And the public defense of this oath was undertaken by Basil Pontius, published at Rome and Douai. Francis de Arriba endeavored to reconcile the two opinions in his Conciliatory Work on Grace and Free Will. But his conciliation, according to the testimony of the Scotist Camerarius himself, was so improbable that it found not a single patron among all the Sorbonnists.

VI. But the matter did not stop within these two sects, namely the Predeterminists and the Foreknowledgists (by which latter name the Jesuit opponents of Predetermination are designated). For Jansen introduced a third sect, differing no little from each of those two. And indeed he thus far praises the Foreknowledgists, that they make the grace which determines congruously to be a vital act, being (as Augustine calls it) an ineffable delight of sweetness; but he severely censures them for suspending grace on the impulse of free will, as it were hanging in some way on the choice of the electing will, that it may will or not will. But he both praises and blames the Predeterminists in part. He praises them for teaching that the consent of the will is powerfully predetermined. But he blames them on more than one count: as that they make Physical Predetermination a virtuous motion which has a certain incomplete being, and exists in the will in the manner that colors are in the air and an impetus in the thing impelled; that they make it not a vital act of the mind, but something else to which the will is only passively subject; that they make it such that in whatever circumstances it is placed, it always makes one act, and works its effect, overcoming all resistance; that they establish it as necessary for all agents by virtue of the second cause, which as much in operating as in its being is essentially subordinated to the First Cause, by which it must be premoved to act. All these things Jansen confidently pronounces to be diametrically opposed to Augustine's doctrine concerning grace and free will, which he undertook to defend, and to be Aristotelian rather than Augustinian. Therefore what they call Prevenient Grace, he with Augustine calls Christ's aid and God's medicinal assistance. He denies that this aid of Christ is merely a virtuous motion which has an incomplete being, and asserts that it is a most true motion of the will, namely the ineffable delight of the object proposed, which with the greatest pleasantness ravishes the whole mind

upward. But he also makes Christ's assistance a true and vital act, and (as he calls it with Augustine) a victorious delight, by which the soul is affected and moved toward God no less than when by a similar delight it cleaves to earthly things – contrary to the Predeterminists, who deny that predetermination is a vital act of the mind. Finally, he denies that divine assistance is necessary except for the wounded will, and that solely on account of the wound which the audacity of the sinning will has inflicted upon it – contrary to Physical Predetermination, which is established as necessary for all agents by virtue of the second cause which is essentially subordinated to the First Cause.

VII. We have therefore around the same subject three discrepant sects of the Pontificians, namely the Predeterminists, the Foreknowledgists, and the Jansenists. But as for the Jansenists, they are set no differently than the Megarensian oracle, since by the Papal definition of Innocent X they have been condemned and severely proscribed. Nevertheless, they constantly deny that they are condemned, and boldly appeal from the ill-informed Pope, who expressly denied that he was a theologian, to one better informed, nay to a Council itself. They deny that their propositions have been condemned in the sense intended by them. But whatever may be made of that matter (for we interpose our censure in another's court, as the saying is, without authority), this is most certain: that the debate of the two sects, the Predeterminists and Foreknowledgists, still thrives in the Papacy, and no one of the Popes has hitherto sustained the courage to put an end to this controversy by peremptory decision and distinguish the causes of the parties. But this too is most certain: that the controversy is not about a mere shadow, as the saying is, or camel's wool, but a most serious matter pertaining to the foundation of salvation. For it is contended concerning grace and the will of the created will, and the question comes down to this: whether the glory of our conversion is to be attributed to God or to man? Whether man is to make God his own strength, as the Prophet speaks, or rather to have the strength of divine grace as his shield and protection? If the Predeterminists prevail, of their adversaries it may truly be said, as Augustine said of Cicero extolling the strength of human will too highly, that while they make men free, they make them sacrilegious, since they steal from the treasury of divine grace – the way Augustine also speaks concerning the Pelagians. And hence it is that they accuse each other of the crime of heresy on both sides. For the Predeterminists do not hesitate to reproach the Jesuits with Pelagianism, while these reproach them with Calvinism. The Jesuits say that they labor lest they appear to have destroyed free will; the Predeterminists, lest (as Jansen says) they deny the truth of Christian grace. Wittily too does Leonard Lessius, in his Tract on Grace, Free Will, etc., say that he was never able by thought to comprehend how Prevenient Grace really differs from Calvinism. But it is agreed among the Pontificians that there is no heresy more heinous than either Pelagianism or Calvinism. If therefore the reproaches with which they tear each other are true, it can certainly be inferred by necessary deduction that the whole mass of the Pontificians consists of and is compounded from these two contrary heresies, namely Pelagianism and Calvinism, at least in this most serious article. It conforms to this that the very author of the Resolutions, abusing the Holy Scriptures with some license in ch. 1 th. 5, compares the Masters of the Dominican family, the vindicators of Predetermination, to the twenty-four Apocalyptic Elders who, clothed in white robes and wearing crowns on their heads, cast them before the throne, saying: "Worthy are You, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honor and power, for You created all things, and because of Your will they existed and were

created." By which very thing he sufficiently argues that his adversaries the Jesuits take away glory, honor and power from God, and do not cast their crowns before God's throne. Than which sacrilege, indeed, I do not have it to say what could be more heinous.

VIII. Since therefore that controversy agitated among the Pontificians is most serious and truly fundamental, the very hinge on which turns the divine glory which God with most ardent zeal denies that He will attribute to anyone else, an admonition must now be drawn forth, which the Pontificians are to be entreated to ponder earnestly in their souls. It consists in this, that they respond sincerely to us: By what right they prove the truth of their Church among other things by this criterion, that there flourishes in it the utmost consensus of Doctors of every age and Order concerning the heads of faith, and the easy termination of all controversies by the infallible supreme judge the Pope with a Council? For so Lessius boasts on p. 48 of his Consultations; so Bellarmine; so all the Jesuits universally. But neither condition obtains, neither the utmost consensus of Doctors, nor the easy termination of controversies by the visible judge. Not that consensus, because in a most serious matter it is not private Doctors who dissent, but entire families or Religious Orders as they call them. Nay, all Pontificians universally are either Predeterminists or Foreknowledgists. Not that termination, because the Popes, to whom they wish the supreme arbitration of religion to be sacred, have hitherto remained more mute than fish, and as idle spectators either by their negligence, indulgence or timidity, do not break but rather nourish, feed and intensify the forces of the parties contending about this capital controversy, not repressing them by some peremptory decision such as becomes the supreme judge, especially of spiritual matters. These things being so open that they cannot be eluded by any pretexts or sophisms, the Pontificians now necessarily have one of two things to confess to us: Either they must confess that their Church is not the true Church of Christ, since it is destitute of the greatest criteria of the true Church which they themselves have established, namely the concord of the parties and the easy termination of controversies by the visible judge; or they must grant to us that neither concord of parties nor termination of controversies by a visible judge is a proper criterion of the true Church. If they confess the former, we have that for which we have hitherto fought and waged the wars of God. If the latter, it will follow that they do not have certain and established criteria of the Church's truth; that a visible judge of controversies is not required in the Church; that the judgment of the Holy Spirit applying the sentence of the Word of God to each one's heart suffices for anyone; finally, that there is no surer sign of the Church's truth than the analogy and consonance of its doctrine with the Word of God. If the Pontificians grant this to us, though they cut down their own vineyards, they build up ours.

IX. Now one thing remains, that we examine those conflicting opinions of the Pontificians concerning Prevenient Grace by the Lydian touchstone of Scripture. But we shall begin from the Foreknowledgists, who by far depart most widely from the sentiment of the Divine Word and the true and Catholic Church. I shall not touch on what is opposed to them by the Author of the Resolutions. For these are mere leaves plucked from the inmost parts of Scholastic Theology. The trees must be turned against them from God's indubitable and absolutely unexceptionable Word. They deny, therefore, that the grace of God predetermines the will by true and real efficiency, either in the work of our conversion or in our subsequent spiritual acts; and they

assert that the grace of God is His general aid by which the will is so determined morally through inspirations, counsels, inward exhortations, presentation of the object, and its commendation – yet in such wise that these and other prerequisites for acting being posited, it can act or not act, consent or dissent, obey or resist. But at least in the work of our conversion, Scripture sufficiently argues that grace ought so to predetermine the will that there is not even place for free will, much less that the will can procure its own conversion by the consent of that general aid of grace, or reject it by dissent. For Scripture calls man, who is not yet converted, "a slave of sin" (Rom 6:20), "sold under sin" (Rom 7:14), by nature "a child of wrath" (Eph 2:3), "conceived in sin" (Psa 51:5), one who "drinks up iniquity like water" (Job 15:16), "whose thoughts from his youth are only evil continually" (Gen 6:5, 8:21), who has "a heart of stone" (Ezek 36:26) and "perverse above all" (Jer 17:9), "hostile toward God and His law, so that it cannot even subject itself" (Rom 8:7), who "can do nothing without Christ" (John 15:5), "dead in trespasses and sins" (Col 2:13). Such being the condition of unconverted man, how can he by free choice do good or not do it, procure his own conversion or reject it, without prevenient, predetermining and special grace? He who is a slave of sin, how can he be free? He who is sold under sin's dominion, by what reasoning can he finally assert himself into the freedom of the sons of God? He who by nature is so a child of wrath as to be at the same time dead in sin and trespasses, by what motion can he be borne toward the good? He whose heart is stony, with what sense can he be affected, with what motion aspire to the fountain of true good? What? Since this operation of grace which God uses in conversion is called in Scripture a creation (Psa 51:10), the mortification of the old man (Rom 6:2), vivification (Eph 2:5), regeneration (Eph 4:23), the taking away of the heart of stone and the giving of a heart of flesh (Ezek 36:26); nay, since the action of the grace converting us is said by Paul to have proceeded "according to the working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ, in raising Him from the dead" (Eph 1:19-20) – than which what could be said more efficacious and powerful for grace, not simply moving and bending by various counsels, persuasions, inspirations, and so indeed predetermining that free will is neither presupposed as existing nor as aiding, but the will alone as passively receiving it – I certainly do not see. For if in the conversion of man God uses that power which He used in the vivification and resurrection of the dead Christ, and therefore simply divine and infinite power, how can the will resist? How can free will determine grace by its own consent? How, finally, can free will have any place at all where the very omnipotence of God is required for the effect? It is sufficiently clear from this that in the work of our conversion, the part of grace is that of the giver, that of the will only the receiver; and that therefore no operation of human powers at all intervenes in this work, no concurrence of grace and free will, much less any prevalence and victory of free will.

X. And this is not only the case in the work of our conversion, but also in the perseverance of the converted man, where some liberty is now given to the will to pursue the good with joy and spiritual delight, grace has the chief parts, and is therefore both predetermining and promoting. For in conversion the seed of God is implanted in the believer, to whose life-giving faculty the whole praise of our perseverance must be attributed. If it were suspended on the powers of human will, there could be no reason given why we would not perish every moment, such is the inconstancy and levity of our will. Therefore there is no cooperation of free will with grace after our conversion, if it so pleases, but a mere subordinate operation, so that we indeed work out

our salvation, but it is God "working in us both to will and to work according to His good pleasure" (Phil 2:13). Scripture attributes our whole perseverance and all the spiritual acts subsequent to our conversion, then to the Holy Spirit who dwells in believers and is stronger than the world (1 Cor 3:16), then to the faithfulness of God, who does not allow His own to be tempted beyond their strength, but with the temptation gives the way out (1 Cor 10:13), then to the power and prayers of Christ which can by no means be in vain (John 10:29, 17:11, 11:42), and finally to our union with Christ our Head, than which none can be conceived closer or firmer.

XI. And how absurdly, I ask - not to say impiously - is such a concurrence of free will and efficacious grace established, that grace being posited, the will can will or not will, do or not do, strive or resist? For if the parts of grace and the Holy Spirit are only to persuade morally, as they say, to incline, to counsel - but of free will to assent and obey - then to obey God, who acts both parts here, will belong to free will, but to admonish that it may act, to grace. Therefore that we may be good will belong to free will, not to grace. For we are not good because we are admonished and aided by various counsels and inspirations, but because we obey right admonishers and counselors, leaving the glory of obedience solely to ourselves. Nay, in this way grace gives nothing, by this very fact that nothing can be given by way of persuasion. He who persuades me to run and instigates me to run does not give the very running itself, nor the powers for running. Moreover, that opinion makes man, and indeed human strength, to be God - but the true God a mere assistant to man. For will not he be God who makes us good, who makes us obey the right admonisher? But will not that one be a mere assistant to man whose office is so to minister persuasions and counsels to man that their whole efficacy hangs uncertain and slippery on man himself? By that common grace God does not give more to the faithful than to hypocrites and unbelievers if these equally have obedience from themselves as those disobedience. For what is common, God gives; but what is peculiar, proper, excellent, and on which their whole salvation turns, He does not give, but man already has it. What? On this view will man choose God, not God man? Will man be the potter of his own salvation, God the clay? But will not the whole difference between the sons of God and the sons of this world proceed not from grace but from free will? For the sons of God are those who rightly use grace; of the world, those who disdain to use it rightly. But if we believe these men, rightly to use grace belongs not to grace but to free will. Finally, such a concurrence of grace and free will engenders pride in man, that he may think more magnificently of himself than is fitting; it impairs faith and consolation, since they do not rest on the confidence of a mind reclining on God alone, but on the flaccid pipe of free will; it removes and enervates the study of prayers, since we have no cause to ask of God what we have in the bosom of our own will; finally, it suppresses thanksgiving, because we must not attribute to grace what we render to hypocrites, but to the innate powers of free will.

XII. Now that very definition of free will also, that it is the faculty by which, all prerequisites for acting being posited, man can act or not act - for the sole vindication of which, as a sort of Helen, the Jesuits wage such mighty wars against Prevenient Grace - is plainly absurd and equally impious. For if this is received, not only will the effectual motion of grace be excluded (since with such indifference it cannot stand), but also the determinate and peremptory decree of God concerning future things. And indeed those men are not ashamed to overthrow God's

efficacious and definite decrees, that this indifference of the human will in every state to either of opposites may remain intact and inviolate - in which they at the same time condemn, or at least disdainfully reject, the most weighty consensus of the whole Scripture and of sincere antiquity. But to say nothing of God's decree, let them explain to me how the determination of the will by the judgment of the practical intellect and by the ultimate end, which most of them admit, can stand with such indifference of the will. And not to press this too strongly, long ago Jansen opposed seven absurdities to this definition from which the Indifferentists, however acute of wit and straining every nerve of sagacity, have never hitherto freed themselves, nor ever will be able in the future. They are, to collect them briefly, as follows: First, he adduces the operation of grace, diametrically repugnant to this indifference. Indifference is like a balance which can be impelled to either part by the slightest nod or motion. If therefore you add even a little weight to one part, indifference and equilibrium cease. But if grace is true grace, it must add something at least to the will, whereby it may be borne rather toward good than evil. And by this very fact it takes away indifference. Second, he urges the motions of concupiscence, equally at war with indifference. For concupiscence causes him who before its motion was indifferent to acting or not acting, by that very motion of lust to be impelled to one part like an equilibrium to which a weight is added. Of this everyone's conscience thoroughly convinces him - not to say anything of the testimonies of Scripture. Therefore, the very least motion of concupiscence being posited, that indifference will be dislodged from its balance. Third, he objects all habits and dispositions of mind, whether good or evil, as directly repugnant to the equilibrium of that indifference. For the proper function of habits is to bring facility of operation to the faculty, and so also difficulty to the opposite operation. Nor can the facility of one part increase without the facility of the other decreasing. Whence we see it happen that the avaricious man can exercise any act of liberality only with the utmost difficulty. The same also holds in the remaining vicious habits. And so Augustin rightly calls such evil habits the necessities of sinning, the forfeiting of freedom or indifference. Fourth, he hints that by this reasoning the good actions of the Saints are discolored, and the evil actions of the wicked have their demerit greatly diminished, because that indifference in which they place the essence of liberty is very much lessened by whatever thing draws it to determining toward either part. But liberty being diminished, the rewards or demerits are also diminished. Fifth, he infers that Christ the Lord and the blessed have altogether lost all liberty for fulfilling the natural and positive precepts by the force of beatific love, if liberty is placed in indifference. For he who necessarily loves God by the force of beatific love is not indifferent to loving or not loving, and so also is not free, if liberty consists in indifference. Sixth, he further deduces this absurdity, that no counsel as counsel is fulfilled by the blessed with the indifference of liberty - because for those blessed minds loving nothing but God above all things, it is not free to prefer the counsel of God concerning better things. Seventh and finally, he thinks it probable that all things to be done by the blessed minds, even to the utmost fibers of circumstances, are prescribed them either by commanding or counseling from the immutable Truth. Which if it is true, it will follow that the blessed denizens of heaven are destitute in all their actions and omissions of that philosophical liberty, that is, indifference of acting or not acting. He who shall have solved these arguments forged by a Pontifical Doctor and hurled against the Jesuits - Indifferentists, will truly be a great Apollo to me, and alone possess Phyllis.

XIII. Furthermore, nothing fights so much against that indifference of liberty as the eternal foreknowledge of God, which they have not hitherto been so utterly absurd as to dare to call into doubt. For if God has infallibly foreknown from eternity all acts, even the most contingent, of the human will, how does man remain indifferent to acting or not acting, this foreknowledge and these prerequisites being posited? To untie this knot, the Foreknowledgists, I know not what inept and irrelevant wedge they have found. For they have devised a middle or conditioned knowledge, by which God from eternity, from the altitude and infinity of His wisdom, has known which way the indifferent will would incline itself, any condition and circumstance being posited. And so they have thought that foreknowledge is preserved safe for them, as well as the indifference of the human will. But since all knowledge rests on some certain and solid foundation, they have not hitherto been able to demonstrate to us what is that foundation on which that middle knowledge of God rests. The indifference of the will can by no means be the foundation of certain knowledge. Nor does the infinity or loftiness of the Divine Wisdom supply this defect. For all God's wisdom, even the loftiest, is conjoined with reason. But there is no reason from which it can be inferred that, for example, between two wills placed in entirely the same conditions and circumstances, one from its innate indifference will bend itself to the right, the other to the left. Therefore it is established by most certain arguments that the foreknowledge of future contingents is founded on the will of God. Whence it follows that free and contingent effects of the will have already been willed and decreed beforehand. Which if it is true, as it is most true, it can in no way be that the will remains indifferent to opposites.

XIV. Hitherto we have engaged not hand but pen with the sect of the Foreknowledgists. Now concerning the Predeterminists, a few things. And indeed they are not to be defrauded of their praise, that having exploded the moral and uncertain determination of grace, as also general concurrence and the indifference of the will to act and not act all prerequisites being posited, they have subjected the human will to the Most Powerful Will of God. For in this way they have far more rightly spread their sails to the glory and honor of God than their adversaries. But in their opinion too we desire the following things: And first indeed the very term Physical Predetermination is not altogether pleasing, because it is not only obscure but also of ambiguous meaning. When we treat of theological matters, it were better for us to use the terms of Scripture, which has "words taught by the Spirit" (1 Cor 2:13). It is by no means to be endured that in matters so sublime and sacred, new, unusual and barbarous terms should be substituted, lest we fall into the fault with which they are accused in Jer 23:36: "You have perverted the words of the living God." And at the same time it were to be wished that those who write on sacred subjects would use not only the terms but also the arguments drawn from Scripture itself. Now Scholastic Theology patched together and padded from human, obscure philosophical arguments carries all weight and authority, from which we who are devoted to purer Theology rightly shrink. How much better would those who abundantly enjoy the most kindly aroma of the monasteries spend their time reading and understanding the Scriptures, that they might attain minds exercised in them! Second, the Predeterminists are to be censured also in this, that in the very work of our conversion they subordinate free will to Predetermining Grace. When yet before conversion and at its beginning there is absolutely no free will to good in man, unless perhaps with Augustine we may call it in that state the free and righteous will enslaved to sin. And this we have already proved above. Third, they err in making the whole of grace consist in

that Physical Predetermination such as is necessary for all agents by virtue of the second cause, which both in operating and in being is essentially subordinated to the First Cause. And in this way they take away the difference between the entire and the wounded will, as well as the necessity of that twofold aid with one part of which Adam was able to will and stand, and the angels did will and stand in reality, but fallen men cannot will and stand without the other part. This Jansen also rightly objects to the Predeterminists. Fourth, they take away and obscure the true root of the necessity of Christ's grace, nor can they explain its true nature, while they make that predetermination alike necessary for all. And thus they are compelled to do no little violence to many sayings of Scripture which predicate the singular grace of God working our acts. For the same Scriptural phrases by which the singular grace of Christ is circumscribed could also be applied to merely natural, civil and outwardly moral acts. For if Christ said "Without me you can do nothing" for this reason, that without that general predetermination we can do nothing, there is no reason why we should not also utter the same for that aid toward natural and (so far as the material goes) evil acts, because neither can we do those without such a predetermination. For the same reason Christ ought to have said, "No one can plant a vineyard, no one preside over a state, no one disburse money for alms, unless my Father draw him" - if truly the grace of Christ consists in such a predetermination as is required on account of the essential dependence of the second cause on the First, by which it must be premoved to act. For predetermination equally has place in such acts as in spiritual ones, such as believing, coming to Christ, and other like acts. All of which if true, efficacious grace of God will not differ from that predetermining concurrence by which God also concurs with natural and civil acts. Which error is truly enormous and intolerable. Fifth, this is not sufficiently sound either, that they so declare this Physical Predetermination of the power of the will for operating as to be something having incomplete being, after the manner in which colors are in the air and the power of art in the instrument of the artist, which is produced by God alone in the second cause - and they think this can properly be called "virtuous motion." Thus the author of the Resolutions, though others put it differently. For the Predeterminists themselves are not altogether in accord with each other. But Christ's grace is not like color in the air, or the power of art in an instrument, or some intentional form having not complete and permanent, but transient and incomplete being, as they say; but just as a most true and most real affection of the will is accustomed to have being in its connaturally proper subject. For by His grace Christ lives in the regenerate, and "they themselves live by faith, the sons of God, who loved them and delivered Himself up for them" (Gal 2:20). And "he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit with Him" (1 Cor 6:17). Hence also the seed of God is said to "remain" in the regenerate (1 John 3:9). If it remains, therefore it is not an intentional transient quality or merely virtuous motion, but a permanent quality having real, firm and complete being. Hence also St. Augustine everywhere defines the grace of Christ, which he calls medicinal, as the most true motion of the will, namely the ineffable delight of the object proposed, which with a certain great pleasantness ravishes the whole soul upward.

XV. To the arguments which can be woven against the Predeterminists is added this, that they are held bound with the Jesuits in the reconciliation of grace with free will. For if free will is to be placed in such a faculty that, all prerequisites for acting being posited, the will can act or not act, I do not see how Prevenient Grace can stand with it. Nor do they extricate themselves by explaining that definition concerning simultaneity of potency, not potency of simultaneity, and in

the divided sense, not the compounded - in the way this is explained in Thesis IV. For I cannot comprehend how this explanation of the definition given differs from the opinion of the Jesuits. For they can understand nothing other than simultaneity of potency. For potency of simultaneity, that is, the potency of acting and not acting simultaneously, or the power of having or exerting opposites simultaneously - since it implies contradiction, I would not believe it to be admitted by them. But whatever may be the case concerning that, certainly simultaneity of potency cannot consist with Predetermination. For if the will, for example, of Peter is predetermined by grace to believe the promises of the Gospel, and so indeed predetermined as not to be able not to believe, not to be able not to consent to grace, by what reasoning will the potency of the opposite, the potency of not believing, still remain in the will? Certainly any potency ought to be argued from the acts which are accustomed to lead to its apprehension. If therefore the act is predetermined, the potency also will be predetermined, because the will cannot act otherwise the Predetermination obstructing it. And the very Author of the Resolutions intimates clearly enough that it is most difficult to understand "how God efficaciously determines to one part as to the mode in which He operates, and yet at the same time gives the mode of liberty and indifference on the part of the thing operated." He does indeed respond that the determination to one part on the side of the act is not a determination opposed to the active and objective indifference of liberty, but to privative indifference and suspension. Therefore God can make something determinate in fact to be done, and the suspension taken away, yet not make it be done determinately, that is, without potency to the opposite. But these are mists which can be dissipated by easy effort. For that suspended and privative potency will plainly be entirely frustrate if it is not reduced to act. And I ask, how can he not believe who necessarily believes on account of the most powerful predetermining concurrence of God, so that he cannot not believe? To me, truly, that potency opposed to the determinate act seems rather to be called impotency, since it is so constrained and shackled as to be able to do nothing. Nay, by what reasoning a determinate act can be done not determinately, we who have not been educated in this school of subtlety cannot understand. To be able to uphold predetermining grace, then, they must send notice dismissing that usual definition of free will, and substitute another which can be more commodiously reconciled with it.

XVI. There remains the third sect, namely that of the Jansenists, certainly far removed from those two former ones. For those truly most learned men, and most tenacious of the doctrine of St. Augustine, diligently distinguish the grace of Christ from such a common physical predetermination; and they derive the necessity of that grace not so much from the essential subordination of causes, as from the wound and injury inflicted on nature by the sin of Adam. Moreover, they deny that grace is an intentional transient quality of that sort, or a virtuous motion, as they call it. And although they are not far from the true and orthodox opinion concerning Grace and Free Will, yet there is a place where they deflect from its lines. For not only before man's conversion, but even at the very beginnings of conversion itself, do they subject free will to Medicinal Grace. They teach indeed that it is overcome by that victorious delight, as they call it; yet they contend that it persists. In which they neither sufficiently explain the necessity and highest dignity of divine grace, nor set forth the condition of human nature corrupted by sin in accordance with the Word of God. For human nature considered theologically and spiritually, not physically and naturally in its integrity, is not only wounded and

hurt, but utterly dead in trespasses, and therefore killed by sin. Whence that grace by which man is converted and arises from that death of sin ought to be regarded not merely as medicinal, but as life-giving, regenerating, creating.

XVII. Since therefore not only the Foreknowledgists, but the very Predeterminists and Jansenists too are oppressed by manifest absurdities and are held bound by no slight errors, nothing seems to remain but that leaving that confusion of discordant parties prevailing among the Pontificians, and that skirmishing and conflicting with shadows, they should come over into our camp and send notice of divorce to that quarrelsome and fluctuating Church. And this they will most willingly do if they shall have induced their souls to consult seriously the honor and glory of God, by the zeal for which they wish to appear led. For our opinion is such as to teach solidly from the Word of God the misery and disaster of corrupted nature, the necessity and efficacy of Divine Grace, and finally the condition of free will, in such wise as most efficaciously to illustrate the glory of God and His honor both from our unworthiness and from the amplitude of His grace. And that we may briefly unfold the doctrine which has hitherto by God's grace sounded forth with utmost consensus in our Churches: Above all we distinguish the State of Sin, in which the unconverted and as yet unregenerate live, from the State of Grace and Conversion, in which sinful men either are being converted or have already been converted. And in the former state indeed, we deny that man, as being a slave of sin, dead in sin, a child of wrath, drinking in iniquity like fishes water, perverse above all things, so repugnant to God and His law as in no way to be able to subject himself to it, possesses any true liberty to good. For those cannot be truly free whom the Son has not set free, as the Truth Himself testifies (John 8:32, 36). For that voluntary choice of evil by which the unregenerate are borne into sin is wont to go in the Scriptures not so much by the name of liberty, as of servitude. For what liberty, I ask, is it to be so constrained by the shackles of sin and Satan that you cannot be borne by free mind toward the good and soar up toward God? Nor must it be feared that the denial of free will simultaneously destroys human nature itself, as well as the whole system of virtue and vice, good work and sin, praise and reproach, reward and punishment - which its heralds are accustomed repeatedly to re-echo. For human nature in its physical or natural integrity continues permanently, though it has lost its spiritual integrity. For it retains the essential faculty of understanding and willing. It retains "a living soul, endowed with reason" (1 Cor 15:45). But the powers of those faculties for pursuing saving good are useless, because "the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2:14). Nor will the distinction of virtue and vice, good work and sin, therefore perish, as if forsooth sin could have no place unless the will has full choice of good and evil. It is abundantly sufficient for the definition of sin properly so-called that the sinning will is neither compelled nor determined to sin by any natural or inward necessity of primal nature, but acts advisedly and with premeditation. Otherwise not even in God, nor in the Blessed Angels and glorified Saints, confirming whom in grace, could there be any place for true virtue, since they do not possess such a free choice of good and evil. But there can also be place for reproach with Him who has brought the necessity of sinning upon himself by his own fault, and once this is brought on is borne into sin by a will fully free and unbound. How can he deservedly be reproached who, having contracted a habit of sinning, can neither abstain from sin nor perform anything praiseworthy? And for the same reason there can be place for punishment, free will for spiritual good being taken away, because the unregenerate

man sins voluntarily, not compelled, not driven by any necessity other than what he has voluntarily contracted against himself. What? Shall we judge the devils and the hardened, whose will is confirmed in evil, as undeserving of punishment even for those sins which they have committed after their first fall, merely because they have a will fixed on evil?

XVIII. In the latter State then, namely of conversion and grace, we carefully distinguish the Beginnings of that gracious change or conversion from its Progress and Perseverance, its Effects and Consequences - the Foundation and Root from the edifice thence rising and the Branch thence sprouting and budding forth. The beginning, foundation, root of our conversion is that first production in the human heart, in the will and affections, of a new and holy quality and propension by which the heart formerly dead in sin begins to be made alive with that spiritual life, which in a way corresponds to that natural vivification and animation of the organic body by the advent of the natural form, that is, the soul. And this beginning, foundation and root depends entirely on the life-giving, regenerating, creating grace of God, so anticipating free will as not to presuppose it either as existing or as operating, but to effect and produce it at last as the cause its effect. We therefore have ourselves as mere passive in that operation of grace, as the matter receiving, as the subject of such life, and receiving that gracious operation of the Holy Spirit. Nor yet is any compulsion here to be imagined. For that power and efficacy of the Holy Spirit or converting grace so regenerates the intellect and will, so handles and moderates the reins of the affections, that the will as it were arising from the dead follows its Creator with a kind of exultation and spiritual joy spontaneously. And so the Spouse addresses the Bridegroom Jesus Christ in Song 1:4: "Draw me, we will run after you"; and Jeremiah 31:18-19: "Thou will convert me, and I shall be converted, for thou art Jehovah my God...Surely after I was turned, I repented." And in ch. 20:7: "O Jehovah, thou hast persuaded me, and I was persuaded." By which phrases the nature of the converting action of grace is clearly intimated as being far removed from force and compulsion.

XIX. Much less has moral persuasion any place here, which the will may resist. For although there may be granted a persuasion so powerful as to command the willing, that they would prefer to suffer anything rather than not will what they will, yet properly so-called persuasion has no place where there is need of vivification, regeneration, new creation. For this operation of grace is simply a new generation (John 3:5), from which the regenerate man is called a son of God (1 John 3:10), of whom therefore God wills to be called Father (Isa 63:16). Nay, God vindicates this generation to Himself (Isa 66:9): "Shall I who gives birth to others not give birth myself?" And in ch. 61:11 He so speaks concerning the regenerate: "The branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." And in ch. 43:7: "Everyone who is called by my name, and whom I have created for my glory, I have formed, I have even made him." To pass over so many illustrious passages of the New Testament. Since therefore the beginnings of our conversion proceed by the mode of a new generation, the will cannot resist those beginnings any more than that which is newly born in nature can resist. But if it could prohibit God the Regenerator, it could prohibit Him either because they are unwilling to be regenerated, or because though willing it, they do not bring it to completion. But each is absurd, because God Himself works in them "both to will and to work, for His good pleasure" (Phil 2:13), and so takes away the unwilling will and Himself brings to completion what is impossible for the will. Is it

moreover credible that God acts more remissly in softening than in hardening? But He so hardens that no one can resist the Hardener (Rom 9:19). So He must also soften in such a way that no hardness of the will can resist the Softener. But what, since the Apostle in Eph 1:19 so magnificently extols the power of this divine grace that he can scarcely satisfy himself? For he calls it not only power, but the immensity of power; nor only this, but the supereminent immensity of power; not only this, but also the supereminent immensity of the strength of His might - by which words, as if consciously anticipating these future disturbances and controversies in the Church, the Apostle wished to signify such power and efficacy of grace as breaks and overthrows the pride of the human will and reduces the contumacy of nature against God to order. Nay, to signify the force of this energy, the same Apostle in Eph 2:10 uses the term "creation," affirming that "we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works."

XX. They say they fear groundlessly, lest in affirming that in the beginning of regeneration man has himself merely passively and can in no way resist regenerating grace, they make him like a trunk or stump. For in this they are not so much contemptuous toward us as toward the Holy Spirit. For He attributes to man not yet regenerate and renewed a "heart of stone" (Ezek 36:26), which is no less rigid than a trunk or stump; He calls him "dead in trespasses" (Eph 2:1), and therefore in spiritual things no less devoid of spiritual sense than a trunk, stone or stump. But the fount of error is that carried away by party zeal, they do not distinguish the natural or animal man from the spiritual man, which the Scriptures diligently do. For indeed man both before regeneration and at its beginning is, in spiritual things, as being dead in sins, altogether devoid of spiritual sense, and so far not unlike a stone or trunk. Yet because he has not lost his natural and animal integrity, retaining the faculty of understanding and willing, which he employs most vigorously especially for evil, he simply cannot be called a trunk or stone. For Scripture, and therefore we too in accordance with it, regard man as stupid for good, but of keenest sense for evil; nay, as dead for good, but living, vigorous and mighty for evil - so that he raves with reason, and only through the intervention of judgment and choice spurns what is truly good. Therefore this stupor of mind and death of soul differ very much from the stupor of body and death of flesh, in that this stupor and death have conjoined to them most efficacious life for evil.

XXI. The Progress, Edifice, Branch of our conversion, regeneration and sanctification are all those effects which immediately and directly follow the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit, and therefore that first quality implanted in us in regeneration which is as it were the soul of the new man, and which manifest that quality to us first, then also to others - corresponding in a certain proportion to that natural union of body and soul, and the vivification or animation of the organic body immediately following. Included here are those holy motions, thoughts, desires by which we choose, will, desire and think that which is truly good. And the Holy Spirit works these not only in us, but also through us. Therefore in these the human will is not only the subject insofar as the Spirit of God deigns to work in us as the principal efficient, but also the instrument, since He deigns to use our intellect, will and affections in producing these acts. For He causes us ourselves to think, will, seek and desire those things which are holy and well-pleasing to God. And so in that progress and perseverance the human will does not merely have itself passively, but being moved and acted on efficaciously by the Spirit of God, it also itself acts and moves us

to pursue the good and flee from evil. In which sense it can be said, when revived to life, not so much to cooperate with God as to be operated through - since in this state too the grace of Christ discharges the first and chief parts, but the will performs the whole office of minister and handmaid. As therefore free will is generated and made alive in the beginning of our conversion, so in the progress of the same it operates according to the measure of its feeble powers and the degree of the Holy Spirit, until finally, having put off mortality, the full and ineffable liberty befitting the sons of God now dwelling in the household of the Father, and therefore that liberty of the glory of the sons of God, shall succeed.

XXII. But if it is now asked what is the efficacy of Divine Grace in this progress of our sanctification, and in what way it can be reconciled with the freedom of will which now in some measure flourishes, the response will be easy. For it is certain that grace so anticipates the operation of free will as to move, premove and predetermine it. For just as the essence of the will, so also its operation depends on God. Whence Paul says that "in Him we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17:28). Which has place as much in natural operations as especially in spiritual ones, in which without the grace of God we not only languish but sink down and perish utterly. We do not indeed dare, as we are led by reverence towards God's infinite majesty, to define how great the dependence of the second cause on the First is. It suffices for us, provided it does not in any way ascribe even the slightest stain of our sins to God, to affirm that it cannot be posited as too great. For that superiority by which God transcends us is simply infinite, and whatever and how great we are, we are from Him, through Him and for Him. But however great the dependence of free will on grace, it is certain that each is most aptly fitted to the other, nor is any violence at all done to free will by grace. For since we do not place true liberty in that flexible indifference, but rather in the deliberate and advised choice of good, and also in immunity from a threefold necessity - of compulsion, determination by matter, and determination by sense - hence it is sufficiently clear that however great the determining of grace, it can in no way impair the liberty of free will.

XXIII. And this doctrine of ours concerning Grace and Free Will was also held by St. Augustine, who, if anyone, had in this subject a mind exercised in the Scriptures - whose followers too those with whom we are dealing profess to be. For he so speaks concerning Grace and Free Will in ch. 17: "God works in us to make us will, when He begins; He co-works when we will, for He follows up that He may perfect what He began working. For which reason the Apostle says, 'Being confident of this very thing, that He who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ' (Phil 1:6). Therefore that we may will, He works without us; but when we will, and so will that we may do, He works with us, yet without Him either working that we may will, or co-working when we will, we can do nothing for the good works of piety." By which words the most holy Father has expressed the doctrine of our Churches in the most concise and vigorous way possible, so that it cannot be set forth more briefly and forcibly. Let the Author of the Resolutions see then with what right he has dared to brand Calvin and Luther, who are prepared in good faith to subscribe to these words of St. Augustine, as echoes of the ancient heretics in this doctrine of Free Will.

XXIV. It is now our part, according to the most weighty admonition of the Apostle in Rom 11:22, to "behold the goodness" of God, and therefore with utmost submission to acknowledge and proclaim "the riches of His glory" or excellence of His grace, and willingly and gratefully with whole heart to attribute and assign to it alone our whole life, salvation, righteousness, renewal, willing and working good, and our entire hope. And we must strive the more ardently for the praise of Divine Grace, as through the same we have been more mightily delivered from the more than Cimmerian darkness of Paganism and Pseudo-Christianity than many Nations, lest after the example of the Jews and all those who have not glorified God, we be cut off from the olive tree into which we have been once graciously ingrafted and implanted (Rom 11:22). With this sole mind and zeal we have hastened to treat of Grace and Free Will, cherishing the good hope that the learned man who provided the occasion for this exercise will not only not take it ill or offensively, but rather, pondering in the fear of God what we have said as it deserves, and more clearly acknowledging and beginning to trumpet that grace which he himself has already acknowledged, will in future trumpet it forth more loudly in unison with us. "May the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, grant you a spirit of wisdom and of revelation in the knowledge of Him, the eyes of your heart having been enlightened, so that you may know what is the surpassing greatness of His power toward us who believe, in accordance with the working of the strength of His might which He brought about in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead" (Eph 1:17-20). With this holy vow I bring to an auspicious end.

Acclamations of Friends to the Most Accomplished Respondent

I.
The question has come forth into adverse parts,
Which part the empire of acting man obeys, when he acts.
Whether God determines man's acts to fixed points,
Nor suffers each to enjoy operating free will.
Go forth, O most excellent one, into so great a strife with your most worthy President,
And enjoy your own free will, BARTHOLOMEW.
So may God determine your mind to these first daring deeds,
And grant control and free will to others.
- Ephraim Jonathan Raumer, Master of Liberal Arts

II.
May the grace of highest Jove forever flourish in you,
Concerning which you utter discourses, sweet Friend!
With whole heart he vows it,
- J.H. Hottinger, Doctor of Medicine

III.
You who in sacred Muses' liquid wave untired
Swim, while breath lasts, with studious strokes of industry,
Both whitening and darkening the paper, obedient handmaid -
Blessed journeyer, happily accomplish the remaining course!

Sincerely this monument was erected at Basel by Andreas Wegelinus.

IV.
An Onomastic Trifle:
BARTHOLOMEW draws water from liquid fountains,
BARTHOLOMEW will draw eternal waters;
He will draw celestial streams into his mind's cistern -
This will be the gift of eternal diligence.
- Gordian Zollickofer

V.
Let true grace of God be your ultimate limit,
Aim at this, you will be a friend pleasing to God.
- Wolfgang Werdmüller, hoping all the best

DISSERTATION ON THE FOUNDATION OF SALVATION

In which the Universal Theme concerning Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Articles and Errors is Disputed

Under the Auspices of JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS

Presiding: JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, Doctor of Sacred Theology and Professor

The Respondent will be JOHN JAMES HOTTINGER, Doctor of Divinity

The Opponent will be JOHN CASPAR HOFFMEISTER, Student of Sacred Theology

The Day after the May Synod, at the Accustomed Place and Hour. ZURICH.
Printed by David Gessner, 1676

DISSERTATION ON THE FOUNDATION OF SALVATION

I. Among those captious and insidious questions which the feverish Method (shall I rather say the crafty technic?) of Gonerius, Veronius, and their supporters the Walenburgs of late have obtruded upon the Christian world, to the scorn of all former and retainers of posterior fidelity (I use the words of the great Blondellus), that question which they are accustomed to raise concerning Necessary and Fundamental Articles holds no mean place - by which, like the Pharisees of old with their snares against Christ, they lie in wait to entrap the Church of Christ.

Quite recently too our importunate retiarius has endeavored to make delights for himself by feigning and tragically exaggerating I know not what dissension of Orthodox Theologians around the treatment of that subject, but for others, the more simple especially, to cast a fog over their eyes by his batlike cavils. This has imposed on us a kind of necessity of discoursing briefly on this subject, otherwise not unworthy of our notice, and of dispersing the objected mists in some measure.

II. Above all we premise this, that to that faith by which we apprehend the Word of God there belongs a certain and well-assured knowledge, namely of those things and to that extent that they are revealed. For faith is "the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim 2:4, 2 Tim 2:25, Tit 1:1), "the knowledge of the mystery of God" (Col 2:2), and "the knowledge of the God of Christ, the only true God" (John 17:3). Christ also has been made to us "wisdom from God" (1 Cor 1:30). And those who have the anointing from the Holy One are said "to know all things" (1 John 2:20), though in the meantime they know in part, and see in a mirror and enigmatically (1 Cor 13:12). Faith is therefore the knowledge of the things to be believed, namely the testimony, rule and foundation, as well as of the same things to be piously and soberly investigated, apart from which faith cannot consist with a good conscience, which those who thrust away run the risk of making shipwreck concerning the faith (1 Tim 1:19). St. Bernard rightly admonishes in Epistle 190 to Innocent, from Augustine: "Not by conjecturing or opining does faith reside in the heart, but by certain knowledge with conscience acclaiming" - he who elsewhere also in Sermon 2 on the Three Greatest calls faith "knowing vision," having lynx-like eyes.

III. Nor therefore did Bellarmine learn from Scripture or the Holy Fathers that faith is more rightly defined by ignorance than by knowledge. Forsooth light is contained in blindness, right knowledge in ignorance, and so those creditably and rightly believe who stand stupefied in their ignorance! Indeed Paul in 2 Tim 3:7 severely condemns those who are "always learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." How much greater ignominy do those deserve who affect to know nothing?

IV. It is asked further: In what way is assent given to the Word of God and to what truths as known? Here first of all the Pontificians commend implicit faith, which Gregory of Valencia in his Commentary on II.2 of Thomas, col. 335, thus defines: that it is "when we do not have assent to some truth according to itself, but have it implicit in another act of ours which has another immediate object." To speak more clearly, implicit faith for them is that by which one induces his mind to believe that which the Roman Church, and its idol the Pope, believes - which implicit faith Cardinal Hosius in Book 3 of The Authority of Scripture, p. 261, wonderfully declaims concerning that charcoal-burner compelled by the Devil to make confession of his faith.

V. But in truth such implicit and charcoal-burning faith is nothing other than a voluntary surrender to the obedience of the Pope, without any examination of the things which he, as Dictator of the Faith, enjoins, by the Lydian touchstone of Scripture. And so, to use the words of St. Theodore, it is "an unexamined approval of things undemonstrated and insincere." Which indeed is not so much faith as a defection from faith - that faith which the Scriptures in 2 Thess

2:10-13, 1 Tim 4:1-3, 2 Tim 4:3-4, Rev 13:16 clearly foretell will sometimes come about in the Church.

VI. For true faith resides in the well-assured knowledge of God and Christ, not in reverence for the Church, much less for the Roman Pontiff alone. And this at length is the aim of those who obtrude the mask of that celebrated name "the Church" - that they may debar the people from the study of the truth, and render their souls humble, that they may learn to serve devoted to the Pope, and hang upon his nod alone, not God's and His Word's. To whom, "hastening after another god" (Psa 16:4), there is more rightly attributed not the Spirit of saving faith, but "a spirit of whoredoms" (Hos 4:12, 5:4).

VII. But leaving aside that implicit faith, truly implicated (if I may say so) in a labyrinth, and that charcoal-faith to be marked from the charcoal, by which anything whatsoever, sometimes even the most monstrous errors, are indiscriminately caught up as an oracle by the unlearned masses, provided only they are obtruded under the title of the Church or the Pope - we acknowledge meanwhile that our faith, as long as we sojourn in this world, is truly implicit, not only because many things still lie hid from us, and because surrounded by the fogs of errors we do not attain to all things, so that the utmost wisdom of even the most perfect is to be making progress and striving further by placid teachableness; but especially because of the preparation of faith which belongs to all the faithful.

VIII. For in all those who are saved there is a sincere intention and preparation of mind - in children indeed and the unlearned to seek and embrace the Word of God, and to desire it as the sincere milk (1 Pet 2:2), and so to attain to the knowledge and prudence of the righteous (Luke 1:17); and in those who have already been more fully assured concerning the Divinity of the Sacred Scriptures, to believe the Scriptures as the Word of God in all things revealed through them, and to investigate and search them with utmost endeavor. Thus St. Paul in Acts 24:14 professes that he believes "all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets," though elsewhere (1 Cor 13:9, 12) he testifies that he knows in part and prophesies in part. The same man in Acts 26:27 interrogates Agrippa: "King Agrippa, do you believe the Prophets? I know that you believe." Yet he was certain that Agrippa did not yet know all things, much less assent to all things contained in the Prophets. Nay, the Royal Psalmist David himself in Psa 119:86 acknowledges: "All your commandments are truth." Yet previously in v. 18 he had prayed: "Open my eyes that I may behold wondrous things from Your law." And in v. 33: "Teach me, O Lord, the way of your statutes, that I may observe it to the end." St. John also teaches that those who have the anointing know all things (1 John 2:20), though meanwhile according to the testimony of Paul in 1 Cor 13:12 they know in part. Namely, even teachableness under God's instruction with desire for progress is called by the name of faith. Yet this differs vastly from that perplexing implicit faith of the Pontificians. For unlike it, it does not subject itself to the Church or crowd of men, and in shameful manner sacrifice to that idol which it deems the sole oracle on earth; but being subject to God alone, it hears His words alone. And though it investigates their richness soberly, yet it does not cease to wonder at their abundance, adore their fullness, and search out their recondite and inexhaustible meanings. In a word, the implicit faith of the Orthodox is the intention of receiving all that is demonstrated from the Word of God to the conscience of the

believer; but that of the Heterodox is the intention of receiving all that the Pope dictates, without any examination whether it agrees with the rule or not. The foundation of the former is subjection to the authority of God and His Word; of the latter, subjection to the authority of the Pope and his word.

IX. Furthermore, it is confessed that implicit faith, or rather the preparation of mind and faith, does not suffice for salvation, but that something must be believed explicitly and distinctly which cannot be ignored without loss of eternal salvation. For the Sacred Scriptures assert this everywhere in express words. Thus a distinct and explicit knowledge of God the Father sending, and Christ sent, is established as necessary for eternal salvation in John 17:3. And it did not seem sufficient to Paul in Acts 24:14-15 to believe "all things written in the Law and the Prophets." He also professes an explicit and distinct faith in the resurrection of both the just and the unjust. And St. John in 1 John 5:12 requires an explicit faith in the Son of God, saying: "He who does not have the Son of God does not have life." The same man in John 6:53 intimates that the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ must be held by explicit faith in these words: "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you have no life in yourselves."

X. All things that are contained in the Word of God are necessary to be believed explicitly. For Holy Scripture includes nothing unnecessary or superfluous. For all its contents are such that by them study may be exercised, faith may grow, progress and be strengthened, and wisdom, prudence and every spiritual gift may be increased, confirmed and amplified.

XI. For if it is true what our Savior says in Matt 22:40, that "the whole Law and the Prophets depend on the two commandments, namely the love of God and neighbor," it is clearly inferred from this that nothing superfluous or unnecessary is comprehended in the Law and the Prophets (to which I add the Evangelists and Apostles). Nor for any other reason does Christ in John 5:39 command us to "search the Scriptures," and is the one called blessed in Psa 1:2 who "meditates on the law of the Lord day and night."

XII. There are however undoubtedly degrees of the necessity of faith or of the things to be believed. Nor is "necessary to be believed" understood in one way only. For it either signifies that which is necessary to approve, if it is demonstrated to the conscience, so that it cannot be rejected or denied without sin, nor its contrary held without error and falsehood; or that which must be sought with readiness to receive it, according to every faculty divinely granted, so that it cannot be ignored without loss of knowledge, wisdom and prudence, or neglected without manifest guilt of indolence and carelessness; or that which one who is admitted to the government of the Church, and who is to teach and rule it with a good conscience, ought not to be ignorant of or err in; or finally, that on account of ignorance or retention of whose contrary one ought to be dismissed from the brotherhood, and conversely one sincerely professing which ought to be received as a brother, and being a believer can use the interrogation of a good conscience toward God and enjoy the solid and unashamed hope of eternal life. In a word, that without which one cannot be called a Christian and be saved.

XIII. The Scriptures also disclose to us the difference among believers themselves. For they admit a twofold distinction: Either they are perfect or mature, of whatever kind of people, "who are fed with solid food and have their senses exercised to discern good and evil" (Heb 5:14), in whom "the mystery of Christ has been firmly established" (Col 1:28), concerning whom the Apostle speaks in 1 Cor 2:6, Heb 5:13-14 - among whom the spiritual men ought to preeminate, namely the Pastors and Doctors, who ought to be "fully instructed for every good work, for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness" (2 Tim 3:16-17); or they are babes in Christ, who need milk, and do not go beyond the basics of the oracles of God, concerning whom the same holy Apostle speaks in 1 Cor 3:1, Heb 5:12-13. Such the Scripture also in Cant 8:8 hieroglyphically depicts under the figure of a little sister who does not yet have breasts. And indeed for the former, that is the mature, a knowledge of many things, multifarious erudition, observation, experience is undoubtedly necessary for more deeply explaining all the sayings of Scripture - nay, also a daily progress according to the same analogy of faith (Dan 12:4, 9, 1 Tim 4:15), is not to be doubted. But for the latter it is no less evident that a knowledge at least of that without which they cannot be babes in Christ and sons of God is necessary.

XIV. Nor ought the difference of faith and believers alone, but also of times, to be attended to. For it cannot be doubted that certain things are necessary to be known explicitly by all believers with Christ exhibited, which could not be, at least as to certain circumstances and consummation, the object of faith before He was exhibited, much less necessary to be known. Thus that Christ has come in the flesh, has actually expiated sin, has risen from the dead, the Gentiles are made partakers of grace, believers are freed from the bondage of the Law into liberty - these in the New Testament are necessary to be believed, which in the Old could not even be believed. And the clear revelation of the name of God, or His virtues, namely His mercy and justice wonderfully illustrated in Christ, which was made partly through Christ's preaching, partly through His obedience and passion, resurrection from the dead, and ascension into heaven, concerning which Isa 52:6, John 17:26, Heb 2:12 speak, is among the foremost goods and "better promises" (Heb 8:6) of the New Testament.

XV. Nay, even with Christ exhibited, the knowledge of mysteries accommodated to their proper times in turn has its increases and decreases. Whence the degrees of necessary knowledge ought at least to be judged in respect to the perfect and mature. For when the Holy Spirit was poured out on all flesh, knowledge undoubtedly most ample and copious shone upon the Church. Which, with the Holy Spirit granted in scantier measure, gradually decreasing again, went forth at length into the Cimmerian darkness of the reigning Papacy, until the fog being dispelled, the light of the Eternal Gospel was brought forth again by the angel flying in mid-heaven (Rev 14:6). And concerning this very last period of Gospel times rapidly hastening to its end, the angel in Dan 12:9-10 thus prophesies: "Daniel, the words are concealed and sealed up until the end time. Many will be purified, cleansed and refined, but the wicked will go on being wicked; none of the wicked will understand, but those who have insight will understand." On which words our own Bullinger has this commentary: "These words promise to the studious of the Sacred Scriptures and those not negligent of their own salvation an abundant knowledge of these things necessary to be known concerning the last things of the age, and so show that the godly of the last age will be most studious of the Sacred Scriptures

and diligent in propagating the sound knowledge of the sincere religion, and what pertains to the end of the age."

XVI. These things having been premised - whose accurate distinction sheds great light on both sides in grasping this subject - we do not have it as our determined purpose to decide what things are necessary to be known explicitly by the perfect or mature man, especially the man of God, in each period of time, that he may fulfill the measure of his name. This depends on the measure of the Spirit of faith and the bestowing of light from the Father of lights, imparted according to the seasons from the mere good pleasure of God. It suffices that neither the perfect nor the man of God, especially in this time when the light of the Gospel radiates in full brilliance and the truth of the events lucidly accomplished in the Church is like a beacon for investigating the recondite meanings, especially of the prophecies, can be regarded as one who does not have senses exercised in the Sacred Scriptures for discerning good and evil, who does not search the Scriptures and not put them forth and apply them "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power," who does not have at heart that "his progress may be manifested among all" (1 Tim 4:15) - namely, a progress founded on and built up according to the analogy of faith, and such as Bullinger indicated above; who does not have it as his aim to investigate "the signs of the times" according to the indubitable prophecies (Matt 16:3); and who therefore is one "who for the time ought to be a teacher, having need again for someone to teach him the first principles of the oracles of God" (Heb 5:12) - a sort of men against whom the Prophet Isaiah complains in ch. 42:19-20: "Who is blind but my servant, or so deaf as my messenger whom I send? Who is blind as my dedicated one, or so blind as the servant of the Lord? You see many things, but do not observe them; His ears are open, but none listens. The Lord was pleased for His righteousness' sake to make the law great and glorious. But this is a plundered and pillaged people..."

XVII. But our chief point will be this: What is necessary for every single Christian believer to know explicitly for his salvation? It is plain that it is that which, being believed with the whole heart, justifies and saves. Scripture calls this the "foundation."

XVIII. Now the foundation of faith is that on which every truth revealed in the Scriptures is built, and to which as the one center everything converges; in which man being built up by faith has a firm, unshakable, and immovable status, as one "grounded and settled in the faith" (Col 1:23, 2:7), and without which, assenting to all other things, he can yet be said "not to have the root" (Matt 13:21), and so to be just as if he were utterly ignorant of sacred things and his own salvation.

XIX. Moreover, the foundation of faith is spoken of in Scripture not in a single way. For at one time it denotes Him with whom those who constitute the holy temple of the Lord are so conjoined as their one basis that they are in Him, live in Him, and rest on Him alone for the hope of eternal salvation; at another time, the fundamental axiom or truth, without the knowledge and confession of which no one can believe the Word of God, glorify God and have Him propitious, and therefore call Him his God.

XX. In the former sense, the foundation of faith is Christ, as the Apostle testifies in express words in 1 Cor 3:11, saying: "For no one can lay another foundation than that which has been laid, which is Jesus Christ." And Peter in 1 Pet 2:4: "To Him drawing near, a living stone, rejected indeed by men but chosen and precious with God; you also, as living stones, are being built up as a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices." God Himself calls Him in Isa 28:16 "a tested stone, a precious cornerstone, a sure foundation" - which in Rev 21:19 are called "the foundations of the city, the new Jerusalem," not that it has several foundations, but that its one foundation has all those ornaments which can be signified by the twelve gems. Thus Christ is "the rock of salvation" (Deut 32:15, Psa 95:1), of whom it is also said in Psa 18:31: "Who is the rock except our God?" For Christ is that Rock on which, as the very Rock, He has built His Church (Matt 16:18).

XXI. There are indeed also pillars in the Church, Gal 2:9, Rev 3:12, which both stand firm for themselves and confirm others leaning on them; whence also the Church itself is called "the pillar and ground of the truth," 1 Tim 3:15 - a pillar both on account of the firmness which ought to be referred to the foundation Christ and the truth on which the faithful are built, and on account of the word which as its candelabrum and luminary it bears aloft, puts forth and displays as a banner, Phil 2:16. Nor this alone, but every righteous person is also called "the foundation of the world," Prov 10:25, on account of his permanent state - since on the contrary the wicked passes away like a storm. Nevertheless, Christ alone is properly and preeminently "the foundation," nor can this honor be communicated to any creature. For He alone by the word of His grace and power upholds all things, Heb 1:3. He alone is the supreme witness and refuge, whom the prophecy introduces speaking thus in Isa 45:22: "Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth."

XXII. But since Christ, the one foundation and rock of our salvation, as the apostle and high priest of our confession (Heb 3:1), does not save unless believed with true faith and received, nor can He even be believed without knowledge and assent to some truth or axiom concerning Christ - therefore the other notion of the foundation, by which the fundamental axiom or truth about Christ is meant, comes especially into consideration here. But in this sense the foundation or fundamental truth is that which, being believed concerning Christ, makes us partakers of righteousness and eternal life. For man needs nothing else to possess eternal life than righteousness, by which satisfaction is made to the law - whether he have that righteousness from his own deeds, as he could have had it while still undefiled, had he not sinned; or from the grace and gift in Christ the Surety, who just as He is wholly given to the believer, so especially His righteousness, as the free gift (Rom 5:16), is imputed to him, so that having communion with Christ, he himself is considered to have died, and to have satisfied the Law (2 Cor 5:15, Col 2:20, Rom 8:4).

XXIII. It is clear enough from this, that this fundamental axiom or truth consists in this, that Christ, as the mental image of God, defined by God as the Sponsor and Savior of the world, is the righteousness of all those who have communion with him through faith. Its proof from the analogy of faith is certainly so clear and manifest that no sane person can call it into doubt. For it is indeed acknowledged that every axiom or complex proposition is founded on some simple

one, either one or more. Therefore, the fundamental axiom or truth rests on a simple foundation, as its subject. But the only foundation of the truth necessary for salvation is Jesus Christ, the author and perfecter of faith, as we have proved above. For he is the chief cornerstone. There is no salvation in anyone else. Nor is there any other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved, Acts 4:11-12. Christ, therefore, is the foundation, inasmuch as he is our Savior. But he saves no one except by the acquisition and bestowal of that righteousness by which, being made subject to the law in our place, he fully satisfied it, and finally accomplished this, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit, receiving by faith the righteousness of Christ bestowed, Romans 8:3-4.

XXIV. The same thing is also proved by clear reason and the entire analogy of faith. For God made a covenant with man created in his own image. In it he promised life on no other law and condition than that of rendering the righteousness or obedience inscribed on his heart to the law, according to the formula repeated in the law: "The man who does them (my commandments) shall live by them," Leviticus 18:5, Ezekiel 20:11, Romans 10:5. But man transgressed the law of that covenant and broke faith; and in him all his posterity have sinned, Hosea 6:7, Romans 5:12, etc. By sin the covenant was broken, and the promise was made void, and thus the commandment, which was for life, was found to be for death to man, Romans 7:10. God, wishing to show the exceeding riches of his glorious grace (Romans 9:23), struck a new covenant, namely one of grace, of which Christ was the Sponsor and Mediator, with sinful man, that is, the seed of promise. Moreover, it was incumbent upon the truthfulness, justice, and holiness of God not to promise life to Christ and his seed, the Sanctifier and those being sanctified (Hebrews 2:11), on any other condition than that the Sponsor and Mediator should satisfy the law in our place and fulfill all its righteousness (Matthew 3:15). For how could man, who was under the curse of the law, be freed from it, unless the law was satisfied and thus made propitious to us on account of such satisfaction? After satisfaction was rendered to the law, how could he, in whose place it was rendered, not hope for and receive life and salvation for himself? And with the righteousness of the law fulfilled and given to us through the faith that purifies hearts, what else can be deemed necessary for the life and salvation of believers?

XXV. Hence Christ, born of a woman and made flesh, took the form of a servant, being made under the law, a debtor of that obedience, that righteousness, the delineation and exemplar of which is contained in the law, to be rendered for us. Coming into the world he said: "Sacrifice and offering you did not desire, but a body you have prepared for me (as for a servant to be, you have pierced ears for me). Behold, I come. In the scroll of the book it is written of me, to do your will, O God." In that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. In one offering he has perfected (but what more is required for salvation and life after perfection?) forever those who are being sanctified, Psalm 40:6-7, Hebrews 10:5-6, 14. Hence Christ is also called by God the Father that righteous servant, called in righteousness, Isaiah 42:1, 6, that is, to bring in the righteousness of the ages, Daniel 9:24. Concerning him the same God the Father has said briefly but comprehensively, indeed all: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many," Isaiah 53:11.

XXVI. By this righteousness of Christ rendered to the law in our place, which Paul in Romans 5:16, 18 calls the obedience, the righteous award, the justification unto life issuing from many trespasses, God is justified as the One who justifies, that is, by his entire and inviolate righteousness, justifying the sinner; and he is glorified as abounding in virtues, especially grace, mercy, and righteousness; and he is loved as lovely and good and most worthy of all thanksgiving. Then the sinful man, to whom it is given and imputed by faith, is justified, that is, he is acquitted before the tribunal of God, accounted righteous, just as if he himself had most fully satisfied the Divine law both by acting and by suffering.

XXVII. From this, therefore, an unshakeable proof arises that that fundamental truth is the one by which Christ is proclaimed as the righteousness of the believer. For without any doubt that truth is the only fundamental and necessary one, by the sincere reception of which God is fully glorified and justified, and the sinful man is not only justified, absolved from the curse of the law, considered to have perfectly satisfied the law, and accounted consummately righteous, but is also glorified, that is, made a partaker of eternal glorious life. For what could be more necessary for a sinful man to know, and therefore to be truly regarded as the Gospel, than that by the knowledge of which he is justified, consummated, and glorified, since for life and glory nothing more than righteousness and the consummation of conscience is required? But we have asserted by the testimonies of Sacred Scripture and by the entire analogy of faith that it is a truth of this kind that Jesus Christ is proclaimed as the righteousness of the believer. It follows, therefore, that the truth by which Jesus Christ is proclaimed as the righteousness of the believer is the only fundamental and necessary truth to be known.

XXVIII. But other properties and characteristics of this truth, most worthy of note, which we can find scattered throughout Sacred Scripture and can vividly conclude from it, also demonstrate this very thing. For, first of all, both Christ himself and the church, he as the one conferring righteousness and she as the one receiving the same and shining conspicuously with it, derive their names from this truth. For thus the Lord Jehovah himself says in Jeremiah 23:5-6: "Behold, the days are coming," says the Lord, "when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the earth. In his days Judah will be saved, and Israel will dwell securely. And this is the name by which he will be called: 'The Lord Our Righteousness.'" Compare Jeremiah 33:16. Thus the Branch to be raised up for David is strictly and properly called Christ; and by participation in his righteousness, Israel and Jerusalem, and consequently all believers, are given the same name on the days of that Branch, by which they confess that they seek and expect their righteousness and consequently also their glory and salvation outside themselves, in the Lord Christ alone, as their badge and symbol.

Secondly, that truth is one that must be explicitly and absolutely believed by every adult sinner as precisely necessary for salvation. For that saying is the gospel of salvation, the power of God for salvation, Romans 1:16, concerning which the Apostle says in Hebrews 2:3, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation?" For indeed, "If anyone does not love the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be accursed," 1 Corinthians 16:22. And "This is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent," John 17:3. And not only this,

but it is also marked with a character of preeminence and necessity, namely, as "the trustworthy saying worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," 1 Timothy 1:15, and as "the mystery of godliness which is undeniably great, that God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit," etc., 1 Timothy 3:16.

XXIX. Thirdly, this truth places the believer in the covenant of grace, on which alone the sinner's life and salvation depend. For the one who apprehends the righteousness of Christ by true faith and makes that "It is Christ" his own, has fulfilled the parts that God stipulates from the sinner in the covenant of grace. For just as the covenant of works was made on this one law: "The man who does them shall live by them," so the covenant of grace, with respect to man, was made in these words: "If you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart that God has raised Him from the dead, you will be saved. For with the heart one believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation," Romans 10:9-10.

XXX. Fourth, this truth is laid as a solid foundation under all others, and all the others aim and tend toward it as their center; and thus it is received by faith, not as an ordinary truth but as the capital truth, as the foundation of all truths. The Apostle clearly indicates this in 1 Corinthians 3:10, etc., where, distinguishing between the foundation and the things that are built upon the foundation, he makes Christ the foundation of the spiritual building. Therefore, this truth is the foundation of all the rest, both in theory, inasmuch as whatever man learns and profits from the Sacred Scriptures must be built upon it and agree with it in order to constitute one edifice of faith; nor can one prophesy according to the analogy of faith (Romans 12:6), or judge spiritual things spiritually (1 Corinthians 2:14), except by comparing and harmonizing all truths with this foundation, in which true wisdom consists; and in practice, inasmuch as all believers conform their life to this as to a rule, in which true prudence consists.

XXXI. And hence it is also that, fifth, this truth is regarded as the norm of all other truths, the criterion of right and wrong, the means of judging orthodoxy and heterodoxy, and indeed the undoubted criterion for recognizing the Antichrist himself. Thus St. John says in 1 John 4:2-3, "By this you will know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God, and every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you have heard is coming and even now is already in the world." And a little earlier in 2:22, "Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, he who denies the Father and the Son." Nor does it matter that heretics, and even the Antichrist himself, confess Christ, and indeed as the Savior. Long ago St. Augustine, in his Enchiridion, chapter 5, responded thus: "If those things which pertain to Christ are carefully considered, the name of Christ is found among any heretics who wish to be called Christians; but in reality he is not present among them. It is not the sound of the words in the faith and confession of Christ, but the substance, the value, the reason, and the Divine wisdom."

XXXII. Sixth, this truth is uniquely eternal, constant, catholic, and perpetual. The very notion of a foundation indicates this. And Paul teaches in Hebrews 13:8 that Christ is "the same yesterday, today, and forever." For he has never not been, and never will not be, the righteousness of those who are saved. Nor are any saved in any other way than by him, as many as are saved.

In the Old Testament as well as the New, the heirs of life were saved by the grace of the same Jesus Christ, Acts 15:11. Therefore, in both the foundation was the same; with this sole difference, that he who is the foundation had to be in a different condition in order to be the cause and foundation of the introduction of the New Testament. For since many sons had already been brought into glory, it was fitting for the author of their salvation to be made perfect through sufferings, Hebrews 2:10. But both those who went before and those who followed cried out with one accord, "Hosanna! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord," Mark 11:9.

XXXIII. Seventh, this truth, as the fundamental truth, contains and sustains all other theological truths, just as any building is contained and sustained by its foundation. Hence, he who holds that foundation, that Christ came in the flesh in order to bring in the righteousness of the ages, and thus has the anointing from the Holy One, is said to know the truth and to know all things, 1 John 2:20-21, by virtue of the foundation itself. And for no other reason did the Apostle determine and desire to know nothing among the Corinthians except "Jesus Christ and him crucified," 1 Corinthians 2:2. And for the same reason, the whole doctrine of our salvation is called "the word of the cross," 1 Corinthians 1:18.

XXXIV. Eighth, the same truth is most clearly revealed in the Sacred Scriptures; nor is the perspicuity of Scripture asserted except with respect to that truth necessary for salvation. For what does it say? "The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart"—that is, "the word of faith which we preach: that if you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart that God has raised Him from the dead, you will be saved," Romans 10:8-9.

XXXV. Ninth, no other truth in Scripture is more frequently, carefully, and studiously asserted, demonstrated, and illustrated. This is the one thing aimed at throughout the books of the New Testament. But also in the Old Testament, the Spirit of Christ testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glories that would follow, 1 Peter 1:11. And the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, Revelation 19:10, so that the one aim of that Spirit, by whose breath the prophets prophesied, was to testify concerning Jesus.

XXXVI. Tenth, finally, no other truth is expressed in so many different words and phrases that are consonant in meaning; no other is foreshadowed by so many mystical figures and symbols.

XXXVII. These and other such unmistakable marks can leave no doubt that the fundamental truth is that which we have set forth, concerning our righteousness and thus the one Sponsor and Savior of the sinner.

XXXVIII. Moreover, although that fundamental truth is really one, yet it is also divided into many and various parts, which are commonly called Articles. Between these and the fundamental truth there is no other distinction than that between the whole and its parts. For the latter admits a certain breadth. Hence David says in Psalm 119:96, "Your commandment is exceedingly broad." Moreover, that commandment itself is God's command that we should believe in the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another, as He gave us commandment, 1 John 3:23. Thus, as it were, all truths are reduced to one summary and center; meanwhile, the truths

themselves, or the Articles comprehended in that summary, are both numerous and distinct. Just as there is one tree, although its many branches extend far and wide; one sea, although the rivers flowing out of and returning to it are many in number; so the fundamental axiom is one, although its articles, into which it is divided or subdivided, are reckoned as numerous and quite distinct.

XXXIX. To shed light on the assertion with an example, Christ explains the fundamental axiom with these words in John 3:16, etc.: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." The one foundation of salvation, the one fundamental truth, is contained in these words, consisting in the fact that Christ is the Savior of the world. But the parts or fundamental articles comprehended in this truth are distinct. For contained in it are the articles concerning God the Father, sustaining the role of a judge in the economy of redemption; concerning His eternal love; concerning that love alone as the unique motive that moved Him to elect us in Christ; concerning the eternal generation of the Son; concerning His appointment to procure the redemption of the world; concerning eternal life destined for believers; concerning eternal damnation and destruction decreed for unbelievers; concerning faith in Christ and its necessity for salvation. All these, and whatever else lies implicitly contained in them by their force, are connected with the complete fundamental truth as its parts and members. So in Genesis 3:15, in the Protevangelium, the one foundation of our faith and salvation is set forth. Yet it also includes many distinct fundamental truths or articles, which we have diligently drawn out in Exercitatio III of Volume I of our Patriarchal Disputation.

XL. And here indeed those subtle Sophists, those new men, try to fix a cross for us. For as stern exactors they demand of us that we reveal a certain and definite number of such fundamental articles. Otherwise, they deny that it can be clear to us either that Scripture is perfect and perspicuous in the things necessary to be believed, or the fundamental articles, or that the fundamental articles can be held as the norm for church and fraternal communion and toleration. This is the quibble of the new Methodists.

XLI. But that question concerning the precise number of fundamental articles is entirely futile and aimless. For the Sacred Scriptures nowhere define it, nor anywhere require us to define it. God has not bound our faith to numbers, nor has he confined its object within a certain periphery of words or propositions. Nay, the very Scripture itself sometimes embraces the same fundamental truth in fewer words, sometimes in more words and propositions, sometimes summarily, sometimes particularly and by parts, sometimes in general terms, sometimes in specific ones, as is evident to anyone comparing Genesis 3:15, Genesis 12:3, 17:7, Psalm 2:12, 16:1, Mark 16:16, John 3:16, 17:3, 20:31, Romans 3:25-28, 10:8-9, Acts 4:12, 1 Corinthians 2:2, 1 John 4:2, etc. And the ancient church never instituted or defined a question concerning such a number, but sometimes expressed fewer things, sometimes more things comprehended in those fewer things, as their Symbols differing in words and propositions show, although meanwhile in the fundamental truth they very friendlily agreed from the fullness of the Scriptures, as Tertullian is fond of saying.

XLII. But that futile and rash question also sets limits on the free will of God, His generous mercy, His manifold wisdom, and the wonderful tempering of Divine mercy and justice. On His free will, indeed, because it inquires into the number of those truths without the knowledge of which no one can be saved—an attempt that is contrary to the express testimonies of Scripture in Matthew 11:26, 20:15, Romans 9:15, etc. God has reserved for Himself the measure by which He wills to illustrate the wisdom that is in the mystery and to communicate it to the church. On His generous mercy, because it confidently dares to define what may be the slenderest thread by which the wandering and troubled soul of the sinner can still be connected with its God, with what smallest measure of knowledge, with what ignorance and error, one can scarcely be snatched from present destruction as through fire. On His manifold wisdom, which is unsearchable, the Apostle exclaiming, "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!" (Romans 11:33)—a wisdom that especially obtains in that truth which is the principle and foundation of all the rest. What is feeble man, that he should endeavor to rise up to its height, to penetrate into its depth? Finally, on the tempering of God's mercy and justice, because whoever has labored to find by enumeration those truths that pertain to that mystery must first lay aside any awareness of his own infirmity.

XLIII. It is indeed acknowledged that all believers must necessarily be subject to Scripture as the Word of God, believe in Christ, and repent, and finally be of the same mind and speak the same thing in so far as they have attained. Yet it is no less certain that more or fewer things are necessary according as scandals arise against true faith and repentance, with which we cannot communicate; or also as the truth and will of God is manifested from His Word; or likewise according as aliens and heretics are to be received, or little children in Christ are to be embraced, or adults are to be called and admitted to teach others. Especially, the terms of communion with the invisible church, and thus with Christ and the grace of God, are not to be defined in the same way as the terms of communion with the external visible church. Not to mention that an erroneous denial is judged differently than an erroneous ignorance, and the latter is sometimes pardoned while the former is condemned. All these things expose the emptiness of that definition of number.

XLIV. That argument of the adversaries can also be demolished by one very powerful battering ram. What mortal would undertake to enumerate the number of fundamental errors? Certainly an infinite number can batter against the foundation of faith. How many heresies has the father of lies produced since the beginning of the world, how many more, God permitting, can he still produce? What Oedipus or prophet could recount such things? But it is evident that to each fundamental error its own fundamental truths are opposed. Therefore, since those errors cannot be numbered, it follows that these truths also cannot be numbered.

XLV. Nor can it be concluded from this, as the new Sophistry tries to extort, either that the very perfection and clarity of Scripture labors in regard to the things necessary, or that the norm of church communion is lacking among us. Not the former, partly because Scripture is the most certain witness of its own perfection and clarity, yet nowhere binds our faith to a number of truths; partly because the fundamental truth and the primary truths comprehended in it are most clearly revealed, and can be demonstrated to the conscience without the work of some new

prophet, such as the Pope claims to be, although the keenness of our intellect may not reach to the enumeration of the minutest parts of the fundamental truth; partly because it is sufficient for the thing itself to be perfectly proposed and clearly known, even if an exact census of all and singular parts and particulars of the thing cannot be instituted. Who has ever doubted the perfection and clear knowledge of an architectural foundation, even though he does not have all and singular stones of the foundation present and numbered? The case is certainly the same here. Not the latter, because apart from an exact knowledge of the precise number of truths, the ingenuous confession of the truth itself serves as such a norm, and certain criteria are moreover available by which it can be judged whether a given truth or error is fundamental or not.

XLVI. The ill-omened brood of Socinus also casts a veil here, which does not hesitate to contract the necessary articles in order to widen the narrow gate of heaven, pave the way to the stars for the most wicked, and thus sew pillows for human slothfulness. For it maintains that very few articles are necessary, and perhaps none other than those which can be referred to obedience to the commandments of Christ; while in the meantime, under this crafty pretext, it removes the principal articles of faith and utterly denies the properly so-called merit of Christ, and thus boasts of a hypocritical obedience to His commandments without saving knowledge of Christ.

XLVII. With the same deceit, the Remonstrants also restrict the necessary articles of faith, as is clear from the Examination of their Apology, where they even misuse the testimony of His Most Serene Majesty the King of Great Britain James, whose meaning the most learned man Isaac Casaubon in his Response to the Epistle of Perron has expressed in these words: "But the King considers it to have been most truly written in the Explanation that the number of things absolutely necessary for salvation is not great. But those who are called the few necessary articles, with respect either to the principal parts which are next adjacent to the fundamental truth, or to the Papists, in respect to whom, because they impose all the decrees and determinations of the church as necessary, our men make the fundamental articles few—the same can be said to be many and very many with respect to those parts which are included in the principal ones and by their force, and which are drawn out by division and subdivision, according to the thread of Sacred Scripture, which commends many things as necessary for our knowledge." I am silent concerning the degrees of necessity according to the difference of the things to be believed, the believers, and the times, about which I spoke above. Thus that theologian of the highest estimation, Gisbertus Voetius, still living by the grace of God, speaks in his Select Disputations, Part I, p. 5: "In the Decalogue, those ten words which are necessary for piety and righteousness are contracted; but when they are explained by particular theses, they are not few. Let the virtues and vices in each precept be enumerated. Certainly no one should be received into the communion of the Church who obstinately defends that fornication, or the worship of creatures, or magic, or incest, or theft, or lying is not a sin," etc.

XLVIII. The Scholastics, and others too, though with a different intention, assert that all the fundamental articles are contained in the compass of the Apostles' Creed. This indeed can be accepted, if the articles of the Creed are understood not so much explicitly as implicitly, and then both with respect to those things which are presupposed, and with respect to those things which

lie hidden in the force and power of those expressed. For since in the Creed the very fundamental axiom concerning Christ as the cause of the remission of sins is handed down, and in the bosom of that axiom all the things necessary to be believed are certainly included, there is no reason why we should not consider that Creed, apprehended according to the analogy of faith (and not indeed uttered by word of mouth only, as heretics do, but assailed obliquely, and not so much by hidden mines as by open engines), as the repository of the fundamental articles of faith. Otherwise, we also hold it for certain that it was not composed by the authority of the Apostles, nor has it always been of the same compass. Its first origin is from Baptism, by which, just as Christ commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, so He commanded those being baptized to be instructed concerning this faith and to be interrogated concerning it (Matthew 28:19, Acts 8:37). Hence the faith in God is called the "principles of the doctrine of Christ" in Hebrews 6:1, and the Creed itself is called the "Baptismal Symbol" by the Fathers. But that formula gradually began to be enlarged by new circumscriptions of each Person from their own office and economic operations against heretics, as is clear from Irenaeus, Book 1, chapter 2, and Book 3, chapter 4, as well as from Tertullian in his Prescription Against Heretics, chapter 13. And when it terminated with the Holy Trinity, other articles were added to the Nicene Creed (which is indeed true and genuine) concerning the Church and its benefits, until finally, in the Council of Constantinople, it blossomed into the formula as it is now read. This has been shown by most learned men, such as Ussher of Armagh, Gerhard, John Vossius, Gisbertus Voetius, and others. Yet even thus enlarged, the number of fundamentals is not increased, but the proposition of the same thing first indeed appeared briefer and more summary, then also more expanded and unfolded.

XLIX. Moreover, which are the fundamental articles can be clearly seen from their definition and criteria. Namely, those are undoubtedly the fundamental articles which point out Jesus Christ, by coming to whom men become partakers of life and righteousness, and by affirming which Christ is set forth as our righteousness and the Prince of our salvation, while by denying them the foundation is destroyed and Christ is simultaneously denied to be our righteousness and Savior. Therefore, whatever that fundamental proposition "Christ is the Savior or righteousness of the believer" comprehends in itself, either in formal and naked terms, as the Schoolmen speak, or if we prefer to use the style of Scripture, either by clear speech (Proverbs 1:6, Habakkuk 2:6-7) or by a figurative and involved sense, an obscurer speech, yet intelligible to the attentive and wise and apt for signifying the thing (Judges 14:12-16, Ezekiel 17:2), and without which that proposition does not stand, is rightly called a fundamental article.

L. Thus Christ cannot be acknowledged as the righteousness and Savior of the believer if the Word of God or revelation concerning Him does not exist; if He is not the true and natural God; if He did not pay a sufficient ransom or worthy price of redemption for sin; if He did not perfectly fulfill the law in our place; if He does not have a Father who is the Judge of sin, to whom He may approve His obedience; if He does not have the Holy Spirit, whom He can send and by whom He can sanctify His own; if He does not have a seed whose Vindicator and Advocate He may be; if the human race is not corrupted by sin; if there is no way by which His benefit and blessing in heavenly places may be made known to sinful man; if men remain in the same state and do not receive Christ, nor glorify Him, nor have communion with Him, nor coalesce and are

glued into the same life with Him; if the sinner himself can by his own powers, apart from the grace of God, free and vindicate himself from death; if men are absolved from the precept of God and neighbor; if there remains no hope of the resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, and eternal life, etc. From which it is plain that the fundamental articles are the doctrines concerning the Sacred Scripture, the Holy Trinity, the incarnation of the Son, the Mediator who is both God and man, the corruption of the human race, the impotence of the law for justification, the necessity of grace, the merit and satisfaction of Christ, our absolution in the judgment of God on account of the gifted righteousness of Christ, the necessity of faith for justification, repentance and renovation for sanctification, the Church, the resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, and eternal life, and whatever other things are connected and twinned with these. Thus, therefore, in Christ alone "are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," Colossians 2:3.

LI. The following three criteria also contribute no small weight to the judging of the fundamental articles. The first is that those articles should be considered fundamental whose knowledge is declared by the express testimony of the Holy Spirit in Scripture to be necessary, while their ignorance or denial is damnable. Such is the doctrine concerning God the Father and the Son, John 17:3, 1 John 2:23; concerning Christ, 1 Corinthians 3:11, Acts 4:12, Ephesians 2:12, 13, 1 John 4:1; concerning the Gospel, Romans 1:16-17, John 1:18, Galatians 1:8-9; concerning faith, Hebrews 11:6, Mark 16:16; concerning justification by faith without works, Romans 3:24-25, etc., Galatians 2:16; concerning sanctification, Hebrews 12:14, Matthew 5:20, 1 John 3:8-9; concerning the remaining sin in the regenerate, 1 John 1:7; concerning the resurrection of the dead and the last judgment, 1 Corinthians 15:12, etc., 1 Timothy 1:19-20, 2 Timothy 2:17-18, etc.

LII. The second is that those articles should be considered fundamental which contain either the necessary causes or the necessary conditions of obtaining salvation through Christ, both expressed in the Scriptures or inferred by the collation of spiritual things with spiritual things from the foundation and analogy of faith. And the principal causes of salvation obtained through Christ are asserted in Sacred Scripture to be the grace of God, Romans 3:24; the merit of Christ and justification through it, Romans 3:24-25, Galatians 2:16; the sanctifying and regenerating Spirit, John 3:3-6, Titus 3:5-6. The instrumental cause is the justifying faith, John 3:16-18, Hebrews 11:6. The conditions of salvation, such as repentance from dead works, Hebrews 6:1, Luke 13:3; the conversion of man to God, Matthew 3:2, etc., Romans 6:1, etc., and the ensuing good works.

LIII. The third criterion, finally, is that those articles should be considered fundamental to which the opposite assertion destroys the foundation. For that by the demolition of which the whole house falls is undoubtedly fundamental. In this way, not only are the truths opposed to all heresies, both named and unnamed, and those which Satan has already put forth and can put forth, included in the enumeration of fundamental articles, but also those articles which are not fundamental in themselves can become such per accidens and by an external force, because they run into a fundamental place on account of the coherence and connection of those places or articles with one another. Thus circumcision, the Passover, baptism, and the Lord's Supper

are not in themselves fundamental articles of faith. For they do not constitute faith, but are only symbols, seals, and pledges of faith; nor do they have an absolute necessity as a means, but only a limited necessity as a precept. Yet they can become fundamental per accidens, if indeed they are either despised or constituted as necessary causes of salvation and propitiatory sacrifices for sins—as circumcision is defiled by the Jews, and baptism and the Lord's Supper by the Papists, with pernicious dogmas of this kind. For by this means both the authority of the Divine precept and justification by faith alone, which are absolutely fundamental articles, are utterly shaken and overthrown. And the case is similar with other such passages.

LIV. It may also seem that this should be established as a criterion of fundamental articles: that those should be acknowledged as such which come under the express notion of a "fundamental principle" in Sacred Scripture. In this way, under the name of a "foundation" or "principle" in Hebrews 6:1-2 are included the articles concerning repentance from dead works, faith toward God, the doctrine of baptisms, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal life. However, just as it cannot be doubted that those heads enumerated by the Apostle are to be included among the fundamental articles as to their inner sense intended by him, some indeed primarily and per se, others secondarily and per aliud; so it also seems certain that it was not the Apostle's purpose here to recensit, in a strict sense, the fundamental articles that must all be explicitly believed, but rather to go over the rudimentary, catechetical first principles—and not even all of those absolutely, but omitting those which were common to the Jewish religion and had been properly known and preserved by them beforehand—only those which were distinctive and proper to Christianity insofar as it was opposed to erroneous Judaism, and which had to be interjected before the extremes could come under consideration. Thus, then, the "foundation" and "principle" of repentance from dead works is opposed to those Jewish errors that a man can be justified by the merit of his own righteousness, that external righteousness is sufficient for salvation, that a work done according to the ritual law is a part and supplement of righteousness; the foundation of faith in God the Justifier, namely through an intervening ransom, is opposed to the Jewish error denying the satisfaction of the Messiah; the doctrine of baptisms opposed the denial of the coming of the Messiah and His resurrection from the dead, of which the former was sealed by the baptism of John and the latter by the baptism of Christ; the laying on of hands argued for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on all flesh and the bestowal of full liberty, in opposition to the Jewish error concerning legal bondage; the resurrection of the dead opposed their impious error concerning only the particular resurrection of the righteous, and that before the end of the world; and finally, eternal judgment opposed their foolish error that all Israelites retaining the Aaronic priesthood would be partakers of the world to come. Which observation greatly contributes to the understanding of both the present argument and the Apostolic text.

LV. But be that as it may, the criteria set forth above certainly present a very clear light for discerning which articles are fundamental and which are not, while at the same time repelling the insolence of the new Methodists, who object that they have nothing certain concerning the fundamental articles, and that the Evangelicals fluctuate and disagree about them in an intolerable way. It is certainly surprising that those who object such things to us either do not at all consider their own festering sores, or dissemble them with a wicked shame! Those among

whom ignorance is honored and a collier's faith is prized, with what face do they insult others? But what do they unanimously pronounce concerning the fundamental articles? If you depart from this one thing, that there is no other fundamental than the oracle and spittle, or even the very spittle, of the Pope? Of so great moment, indeed, was it to decide this intricate question! Of no greater moment, surely, than if the Sibyl of old, or Muhammad who sold himself as the Paraclete, had pronounced from their tripod that only that is necessary to be believed which they themselves demand to be believed. For the rest, concerning the fundamental articles and the necessary truths of faith, those Myrmidons furiously battle with one another, nor has the Pope decided anything on the matter to this day. They dispute, for example, whether anything besides the implicit collier's faith must necessarily be explicitly believed by the common people; whether it is sufficient for the laity to explicitly believe the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed; whether it is necessary to believe the fourteen articles proposed by the Theologians; what is the substance of each article of faith to be believed; whether, if a layperson believes falsely (for example, that God the Father is older and more senior than the Son), he is excused, provided that he implicitly believes whatever the Church believes. These and many other such things they try to adjust to the Academic rule of Probability and the plumb line, and moreover they engage in open combat with one another concerning innumerable matters, both primary and most serious, whether as to their truth or as to the necessity of believing them. Our celebrated Hottinger has said many excellent things on this matter in Disputation VIII of his Gymnasium Theologicum, which we here summarize.

LVI. But if their dissension, which they constantly reproach our theologians with in this argument, is compared with that, it is certainly mere jest and play. For it does not stick in the bark of words, but consists in the diversity not of knowledge, but of the mode of knowing and the order or method. Certainly the fundamental dogmas are therefore called such because they really and virtually contain the rest, just as the building is contained and supported by its foundation. If, therefore, one statement, such as the single article concerning Christ our righteousness or the justification of the sinner (the critical issue for the standing or falling of the church), can be so conceived as to contain the remaining truths of faith, just as that one foundation is enunciated in Scripture in various formulas; and if, moreover, two or more statements into which that foundation is first divided, or other many into which those primary parts are subdivided, can be formed; and all these indeed according to the thread and course of Scripture itself, which sometimes expresses one truth, sometimes two, sometimes more, and sometimes comprehends many in the force of a few, sometimes expressly names many and elsewhere adjoins others to them—what reason is there for them to feign a dissension among us, which does not exist, and to insult us still with such fictitious tragedianism? For the same reason, let them insult the Sacred Writers, who sometimes dispatch the matter with few words, sometimes with more, but are nevertheless uniform in substance.

LVII. For that diversity of forms arises from a different mode of conceiving and speaking, and also from the varying genius of men, some of whom only weigh those parts in the whole which are the greater, respecting only those conclusions which follow immediately from some principle, while others, on the contrary, look to even the smaller particles, pursuing even the remoter consequences, penetrating to the marrows of the inmost sense and the joinings of reasons

which are found in the living Word of God, Hebrews 4:12, as the celebrated Claubergius wisely observes in his Select Disputations, p. 313.

LVIII. For the rest, the very harmony of our Confessions in necessary things would ensure our consensus; and the fact that our Adversaries cannot produce examples of articles which some among us affirm to be fundamental while others deny them, the due laws of opposition being observed. Those who do not express a truth comprehended in more general terms do not therefore deny it. At least, those who accuse us do not ignore our unanimous consensus in rejecting the fundamental errors of the Papal Church and in rendering the most just causes of our separation.

LIX. As to the necessary mode of knowing the fundamental articles, this must be held: that they can be known in three ways, namely, as to the substance or subject-matter of the statement in which they are contained, as to its more abundant declaration by which they are distinctly explained in the Scriptures for the edification of faith, and finally as to the difficulties and scruples which can be raised concerning them. But for salvation, knowledge of the fundamentals according to substance alone is sufficient. Thus, for example, it is sufficient for salvation to understand that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one God; that Christ is the Son of God and true man, even if nothing is understood concerning the essential distinction and unity of the natures and persons. But the rest, namely, the more abundant declaration and the solution of scruples, falls to those whose duty it is to feed and teach the Church, who ought to be able "both to exhort with sound doctrine and to refute those who contradict," Titus 1:9. When, therefore, faith is grounded, scruples can be safely rejected by the simple, in the unraveling of which even the skillful sometimes stumble or are perplexed. Here that saying of Augustine applies against the Fundamental Epistle: "For the crowd, not the liveliness of understanding, but the simplicity of believing, is most safe." And also that of St. Athanasius in his 4th Sermon against the Arians: "Let the simplicity of faith be preferred to curious probability." He who knows in whom he believes, and what he believes, ought to be certain that nothing can subsist contrary to the Divine truth, and that falsehood does not come from the truth, 1 John 2:21, although he may find difficulty in untying and unraveling the knots and snares which Satan weaves to ensnare those who do not love the truth. Thus Nathanael, by the greater argument of faith, overcame his own reasoning, which he had made, "that nothing good can come out of Nazareth" (although for a time he could not unravel it), John 1:47-48, etc.

LX. Moreover, there are two kinds of fundamental articles, affirmative or positive ones, and negative ones. By the former, a fundamental truth is positively set forth and asserted; by the latter, a falsehood or error opposed to the fundamental truth is denied and rejected. The affirmative ones are: that God exists, that He alone is to be worshiped, that He is one in nature and three in persons; that the Son of God was incarnate, died to expiate sins, was raised from the dead, sits at the right hand of God; that a sinful man is justified by the free grace of God through the obedience of Christ, etc. The negative ones are, for example: that the host, saints, and images are not to be worshiped; that the saints are not mediators; that the Pope of Rome is not the head of the Church; that man is not justified by works, etc. Between these truths, this difference intervenes: that articles of the former kind are a necessary object of faith to be

distinctly known from the Word of God, and then to be proved to the conscience both of ourselves and of others when required in confession; but those of the latter kind are not so, unless perhaps some other necessity imposes the same knowledge of them upon us. Just as, indeed, for a man to lead a natural life, it is sufficient for him to partake of good and wholesome foods, nor is it necessary for this that he know hemlock, aconite, and other poisons and toxins, so the case stands here. That we may obtain eternal salvation, it is sufficient to believe and embrace the salutary mysteries Divinely revealed. But that we should specifically know those poisons which the devil has belched forth from the abyss of his lies—there is no need for that. Nay, rather, to admit and not be ignorant of them is lethal.

Here is the continuation of the translation:

LXI. Nor can the new Methodists rightly infer from this that faith therefore never and in no way pertains to denying, or believing to be false, that which is shown to be false by collection from Scripture and the foundation of faith. Hence, moreover, the notable architects of sophisms like Walenburgius argue that we have rashly deserted the communion of the Roman Church. For if such articles can be ignored without loss of salvation, then communion of faith can also flourish with those who openly profess them, as Rome does. It is certainly the duty of all the faithful both to remain in those things which they have learned and about which they have been assured, and to beware of seductions, and not to obey men; and on account of the love of God's glory and the salvation of their neighbor, to rebuke those in error with all gentleness. Sometimes it is also necessary not to admit certain persons as brethren on account of their error, lest we communicate with another's sin and in order to keep our own conscience inoffensive before the teachers. Indeed, just as no one can have faith without the knowledge of Christ, so in those errors which are opposed to Christ and His righteousness, as soon as that contrariety has been demonstrated, it can by no means occur that both the truth and the error are held simultaneously. Whoever mixes truth with falsehood is ignorant of Christ, insane, and a malicious seducer and impostor. "For what partnership is there between righteousness and iniquity? Or what fellowship does light have with darkness?" 2 Corinthians 6:14.

LXII. It is of the same rude and most vile bent that these newest Sophists demand of us that we prove the negative articles from Scripture in so many words, and indeed not only as true but also as necessary. They cry out to weariness that we should show such propositions verbatim from Sacred Scripture: "There is no Mass," "There is no purgatory," etc. "It is necessary to believe that there is no Mass," etc. And when it is responded to them that it is strict justice that the denying party take up the burden of proof, they oppose us as if we were soldiers fighting for possession, prescription, presumption, and other such smoke screens, and I know not what Medusa heads. Which are certainly more worthy of braggarts than of ministers of God and are the most certain arguments of a desperate cause. Nor will they ever obtain any place until it is established either that truth is a hereditary possession and patrimony of men, and indeed of such men as Veroni, Walenburgius, and the like, who provoke us to captious disputations; or that infallibility is owed to men who speak aside from Scripture and contrary or beyond Scripture; or that Scripture does not teach that which is in the power, validity, and significance of words; or that in matters of faith, wisdom and prudence avail nothing, nor is there any judgment

or conscience in men by which they can discern truth from falsehood. Which postulates are so monstrous and insipid that it is surprising the Methodists were not ashamed to propose such things to men who are not utterly beasts.

LXIII. After we have discussed what seemed necessary concerning the fundamental articles, there is no need to discourse at length concerning fundamental errors, since the knowledge of opposites is the same. And beyond any doubt, that is a fundamental error by which the fundamental truth or axiom itself, and any other fundamental truth, is not simply touched and to some extent besmirched while still remaining unshaken, but is utterly overthrown. Thus, for example, those who deny that Christ is man, or God, or our righteousness, do not merely touch and stain the fundamental axiom, but shake and overthrow it.

LXIV. But there are two ways in which it can happen that a fundamental truth is overthrown, either directly, so that it is immediately and entirely (πάντως) attacked, both in words and in sense, against a necessary article of faith; or obliquely and by consequence, so that that is asserted or denied by the assertion or denial of which the fundamental truth is consequently not merely shaken but falls. Thus, for example, the doctrine concerning the adoration of the host, images, the crucifix, the invocation of saints, etc., directly overthrows the fundamental truth that God alone is to be worshiped and invoked; the doctrine concerning the righteousness and merit of works, personal satisfactions, purgatory, the mass, etc., overthrows the fundamental truth concerning the merit of Christ and His righteousness; the doctrine concerning the infallibility of the Pope, the sacerdotal and sacrificial power of the mass, the power of the Pope, etc., does not indeed directly and in crude words, but obliquely and by consequence, overthrow the fundamental truth concerning the prophetic, sacerdotal, and regal office of Christ, because doctrines of this kind are utterly irreconcilable with that fundamental truth. And in this way most of the Papal errors are constituted. For, that seduction might be more ready, it has pleased them to profess with their mouth the words of the foundation, but then by adding heterogeneous additaments, as if intoxicated with poison, they destroy it and strip it of all power for procuring salvation and life for those who would profit by it.

LXV. Meanwhile, we do not deny that, especially among those who in good faith retain the foundation of salvation on both sides, pious caution and prudence are necessary, lest in stumbling upon a fundamental error and thereby rupturing the bonds of ecclesiastical peace, such consequences are either feigned, or twisted, or exacted too severely and rigidly. For here, judgment, conscience, equity, and charity are most greatly needed—judgment, lest anything be rashly and negligently peddled as a consequence when it is not; conscience, lest such a dogma be imputed by consequence to any man or church which, by a constant and serious protestation, it removes the charge of from itself, and from which the very mind of the imputer, all things being exactly weighed, would be compelled to absolve it; equity, that the rule of Christ be religiously observed: "Whatever you want men to do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets," Matthew 7:12; and finally, charity, lest, wherever the weaker judgment of a neighbor, who otherwise religiously preserves the fundamental truth, either does not succeed in grasping a consequence rightly deduced from the premises, or at least forms a legitimate judgment concerning it, such infirmity be condemned by too severe a censure and what belongs

to weakness be imputed to malice or obstinacy. For although the faithful know in part in this life, yet they also prophesy in part, 1 Corinthians 13:9.

LXVI. Here, indeed, there is a different consideration for the consequences that are drawn from the words of God and those drawn from the words of men. The former are always necessary and must be imputed. For since in God there is "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God" (Romans 11:33), and the Spirit who searches all things, even the deep things of God (1 Corinthians 2:10), and thus infinite wisdom, certainly He has never said, nor could He say, anything without knowing what might flow or be deduced from it. Therefore, whatever follows from the Word of God exists in its power, validity, and significance, and is thus the very Word of God itself. But human wisdom is finite and distinguished by various degrees. And there are very many among them who are ignorant of the "depths of Satan." Nor does it always occur to anyone, however discerning, what another more discerning person may deduce from his words by the keenness of his judgment. "For in many things we all stumble. If anyone does not stumble in word, he is a perfect man," James 3:2. Therefore, not everything which is a consequence from one of their assertions, especially if they have given certain proof of their sincerity in retaining the foundation, and have moreover kept undefiled the heavenly doctrine and deposit, can be imputed to them while preserving charity, which "does not act unbecomingly, but bears all things," 1 Corinthians 13:5, 7. If any show themselves too much in this, and are puffed up with the pride of their own perspicacity, it can rightly be said to them: "Do not climb up, you boor, fix your ladder, and ascend into heaven," as Constantine the Great once reproached the man Novatus, according to the testimony of Gelasius of Cyzicus in the Acts of the Nicene Council, p. 170. Although, meanwhile, the same charity and equanimity demands that to those erring, so that they may be more easily led back into the royal path of truth and as it were stumble with fear, the danger of such consequences should be repeatedly recalled to their minds.

LXVII. And these things said concerning the fundamental truth and articles may suffice. From which it also immediately follows what the non-fundamental articles and errors are. Those, namely, are the assertion or denial of which does not so cohere with the foundation that, without it, the foundation cannot be held and its sincere confessor be saved.

LXVIII. It is certainly established that those who hold the rule and foundation can be ignorant of some things that pertain to the adornment of the foundation and are contained in Scripture. And how few in this mortality can boast that they have apprehended "that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus," Philippians 3:12? And it is no less established that some can err or opine falsely without Divine authority, not attending to the rule and the wiles of Satan. Thus the very Apostles of Christ erred in some things from the truth, as the Scripture clearly testifies in Acts 1:6, etc.

LXIX. Not badly, therefore, does Melchior Canus in Book 12, Section 11, distinguish Catholic truths which so pertain to the faith that, these being removed, the faith itself is also removed, from those by whose removal the faith is shaken but not overturned.

LXX. Hence, moreover, the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 3:10-11, etc., expressly mentions "wood, hay, straw" built upon the enduring foundation. But just as the foundation there denotes the fundamental doctrine concerning Christ, and the "gold, silver, precious stones" denote precious and conspicuous doctrines built upon that foundation, so by logical consequence the "wood, hay, straw" carelessly heaped upon the foundation denote vile, erroneous, ill-advised, injurious doctrines, idle questions leading to strife, the vain babblings and contradictions of what is falsely called "knowledge"—and yet not overthrowing the foundation itself. Concerning which the Apostle pronounces that, although they are indeed noxious and bring damage, yet of the person building such things upon the foundation he asserts, "He himself shall be saved, yet so as through fire," that is, as it were through the fire of Divine judgment, probation, and the examination of his own conscience, and especially of that decisive and ultimate trial "in which the frigid threads of life are broken, and the purple hue forsakes the late glowing cheeks," by which dregs of doctrine are purely and thoroughly wiped away.

LXXI. Yet certain cautions must be observed even here. And first indeed, all the faithful must strive to religiously avoid any errors, even those which seem trifling, and not allow the foundation of faith to be burdened with wood, hay, and straw. For the Apostle there also hints that these are perilous when he expressly mentions "loss." But the peril can easily be discerned if some reductive affinity of such non-fundamental errors with some fundamental error is investigated by the logical path of inevitable consequences. For although one erring in this way may explicitly confess the fundamental article itself, yet there is danger lest, if he dotes upon his opinion with an impotent love, his affection being gradually alienated from that fundamental truth of the faith which he experiences to be so hostile to his sentiment, he may at length lapse into fundamental heresy, and thus his false opinion may become in him a root of bitterness; or if he is of a turbulent genius, he may stir up tumults in the church. Even errors themselves have consequences. For "from one absurdity being granted, the rest follow." And the Wise Man skillfully calls erroneous words of a man's mouth "deep waters," Proverbs 18:4. For the depths of errors are profound. Error is the rule of error. On account of one error, many truths are ignored, and many falsehoods are uttered. Therefore, as much as possible, all error must be abstained from with religious caution. "A little leaven leavens the whole lump," Galatians 5:9, 1 Corinthians 5:6.

LXXII. Secondly, it must be held that there is a great difference between ignorance, when someone cannot be convicted on account of dullness of intellect, rudeness, scrupulosity, etc., and stubborn denial; between a false opinion held as plausible and useful, and as necessary to be held and believed, or even to be posited as the foundation or a part of the foundation. The judgment concerning these diverse things is diverse. Especially, he who holds any error whatsoever as the foundation, and proposes it to be embraced under the necessity of salvation, errs perilously and gravely.

Hence, in passing, the diversity of the Papacy before and after the Council of Trent can be discerned. For before that Council, most errors, both graver and lighter, prevailed as plausible, not as absolutely necessary to be believed. Hence a certain liberty breathed for the faithful. But after that fatal Council, swollen with so many dread anathemas, the whole aspect of affairs was

utterly changed, and an immense bondage ensued with all liberty removed. And the way to salvation, which before was difficult, after that was utterly precluded in the Papacy.

Thirdly, finally, it must be observed that one who is free from theoretical fundamental error can fall into practical fundamental error, if indeed, being destitute of charity, he condemns and slays those whom God does not wish to be condemned and slain. And the condition of that church is far worse which is so inflated and puffed up by the splendor of its golden superstructure (not to mention perhaps its vain image and deceptive appearance) that, neglecting charity, laying aside equanimity, trampling on Christ's law, it disdainfully contemns, charges with heresy, fastidiously rejects, and delivers to destruction those churches which are orthodox in the foundation, on account of the straws of false opinions built up on the foundation; as if those churches which, retaining the foundation, though inferior in knowledge and weak in faith, yet excel in invincible charity, did not rather follow in the footsteps of the blessed Cyprian, who, according to the testimony of Augustine in Epistle 48, in that very matter in which he thought differently, decreed that his colleagues who thought otherwise were neither to be judged nor removed from the right of communion, and covered over that blemish, as it were, of his most candid breast with the full flow of charity, while he most copiously defended the unity of the Church growing throughout the whole world and most perseveringly retained the bond of peace. Concerning which great man, the same Augustine writes in Book 1 of Baptism Against the Donatists, chapter 18, that the reason the Lord did not open his mind in the matter in which he erred was "that his pious humility and charity in salutarily preserving the peace of the Church might be made known, not only to the Christians of that time, but might also be signalized for the medicinal knowledge of posterity."

From those things which we have hitherto discussed concerning the fundamental and non-fundamental articles and errors, a criterion can be instituted without any difficulty, both concerning the hope of eternal salvation for ourselves and our neighbor, and concerning ecclesiastical communion and confederation either to be denied to those who deviate from the foundation of faith and build their house upon the sand, or to be sacredly instituted and cultivated with those who, the foundation of faith remaining intact and secure, suffer infirmities, and either are ignorant of many things or are imbued with some errors, yet preserving charity towards those who think all other things, and docility and preparedness to believe the Word of God, if it shall be demonstrated.

Many things could be said concerning this, but I bid you embrace them briefly from that Apostolic injunction of Jude 22-23, namely, that it belongs to the sincere and fearers of God to avoid, flee from, and perfectly hate some, no less than a garment defiled by the flesh; but to charity, to have compassion on some with discretion, and to save some with fear, plucking them as brands from the fire. May God grant that, according to that saying of the Wise Man (Proverbs 30:26, compared with Matthew 7:24-25, etc.), emulating the industry of the coneys, we may build our house not on the sand but on the rock, and thus (1 Timothy 6:19) "laying up in store for ourselves a good foundation against the time to come, we may lay hold on eternal life" through Jesus Christ, the sole Prince and Perfecter of that same salvation!

THE END.