

THEOLOGICAL THESES:
In which is explained
The Doctrine of the Roman Church
Concerning The Veneration and Adoration of Images

Thesis I

In the Roman Church, many, especially those who are more thoughtful among the common people, and even some Doctors, complain that they are slandered when they are said by Protestants to worship the images of God, Christ, and even the Saints who have died. They profess not only themselves but also their Church to be entirely opposed to this worship, and they do not attribute the worship of adoration to anything except to the one true God. Therefore, we thought it worthwhile to carefully inquire into the true doctrine of the Roman Church and School regarding the veneration and adoration of images, so that no one might attribute a foreign opinion to it, and also to see whether the Reformed justly accuse the Roman Church of the adoration of images.

II. In order to be certain of the true doctrine of the Roman Church concerning the veneration of images, we must first consult the Councils that are considered General in that Church and approved by the Roman Pontiff. Moreover, we must see what is the universal and accepted practice of that Church. Finally, we must examine what the common consensus of the Doctors received in that Church states about this matter: for from these three sources can be drawn the true and genuine Doctrine of the Roman Church. And what is defined in the General Councils of the Roman Church, confirmed by its universal practice, and held and embraced by the common consensus of its Doctors, can safely be held as a doctrine of Roman faith.

III. Furthermore, there are three Councils that the Roman Church considers Universal, which deal with images and their veneration. The first and oldest is the Second Council of Nicaea, held in the year of Christ 787, during the reign of Constantine and his mother Irene. The second is the Council of Constantinople, held in the year of Christ 869, during the reign of Basil. The third is the Council of Trent, held over several years in the sixteenth century, as is well known.

IV. Regarding the Second Council of Nicaea, which in the Roman School is called the Seventh Universal, its consistent and manifest doctrine is that the images of Christ and the Saints are to be venerated. For in the letter of this Council to Constantine and Irene, these words are found towards the end: "In this confession and without any doubt, we believe that the depiction of venerable images is accepted and pleasing before God, and that those who display the images of our Lord Jesus Christ and also of the undefiled Virgin Mother of God, indeed of the glorious Angels, and of all the Saints, should venerate and greet these images. But whoever is not so disposed, but labors and doubts concerning the adoration of venerable images, our holy and venerable Synod anathematizes him." Tom.3. Conc. Edit. Cologne Edition of 1606, page 391, letter A.

V. In the same Council, in the second session, after the reading of the letter of Pope Adrian to Tarasius, the Pope's legates asked whether they agreed with it or not; among other things, Tarasius responded, "We agree and confirm the power of the letters read, and according to the ancient tradition of our fathers, we receive and desire these images, to venerate them in the name of Christ our God, and of our undefiled Lady the Mother of God, the Virgin, and of the holy Angels and all the Saints." To these words of Tarasius, the Synod itself added, "The whole holy Synod so believes and so teaches." Same volume, page 313, letter B.

VI. Furthermore, the Fathers of this Synod distinguish that adoration, which they believe should be given to images, from veneration, as something that imports more than simple veneration. For they condemn those who confess that they venerate images but refuse to adore them: as seen in the fourth session, where, after reading certain words of Anastasius, Bishop of Theopolis, Tarasius the Patriarch speaks thus: "Therefore all who confess that they venerate the holy images but refuse adoration are rebuked by the holy Fathers as hypocrites. For since they truly refuse adoration, which is a symbol of honor, they are known to do the contrary, namely, to revile the holy ones." Same volume, page 335.

VII. However, this Council carefully distinguishes the adoration it commands to be given to images from a certain worship which it wants to be peculiar to God; which worship it sometimes simply calls Latria, and sometimes even Latria in spirit, because it chiefly consists in the internal acts of faith, hope, trust, invocation, and similar things. Thus, Tarasius, after the cited words, in which he professes to agree with the letters of Pope Adrian and to adore the images of Christ, the Virgin Mother of God, and the Saints with him, immediately adds, "But we openly testify that we refer and attribute Latria and our faith only to the one true God."

VIII. Similarly, in the fourth session, the words of Anastasius, Bishop of Theopolis, are reported and approved: "Let no one be offended by the word adoration. For we adore both men and holy Angels, not, however, that we render Latria, that is, divine worship. For Moses says, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him only shall you serve': where you will carefully observe that in the latter statement (namely Latria) he added 'only,' but did not add it to the former. Therefore, it is allowed to adore, but by no means to serve with Latria. Nor is it permitted to render Latria, which properly means to worship God."

IX. These are consistent with what is read in the seventh session in the Synodal Letter to the Emperors, which we cited above: "The divine Scripture says, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him only shall you serve': it places worship absolutely, and does not add 'only' to signify the different notion and equivocation of the words. But it said 'you shall serve only,' which is why we attribute Latria only to God and refer it to Him."

X. The adoration, which they think should be given to images and is distinguished from Latria worship, they call honorific and teach that it is an emphasis or demonstration of honor, as found in the words of Anastasius, Bishop of Theopolis, mentioned above, "For what else," he says, "is the adoration of anyone than an emphasis of honor shown to them?" They constitute this emphasis of honor in certain external signs and testimonies of honor, which if anyone refuses to give to the images of Christ and the Saints, they consider him a hypocrite, even if he otherwise

professes to venerate them, that is, to regard them reverently. This is seen in the words of Tarasius, which follow the words of Anastasius and were previously related by us.

XI. As for what these testimonies of honor are, due to the images of Christ and the Saints, the Synod explains in various places. Namely, according to the Synod, they are such as kisses and embraces, as well as the offering of lights and incense. This can be gathered from what is read in the definition of the Synod, which is found at the beginning of the seventh session. There it says that the images of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mother of God, and all the Saints should be dedicated and placed in Churches and other public and private places: not only that all who contemplate them may be brought to the memory and recollection of the prototypes and their desire, but also that they may offer them veneration and honorific adoration, not (it says) according to our faith, true Latria, which belongs only to the divine nature, but as we approach the type of the venerable and life-giving cross, and the holy Gospels, and other sacred objects, with the offerings of incense and lights, as has been piously accustomed among the ancients. For the honor given to the image reflects upon the prototype, and whoever venerates the image also venerates the subject depicted in it." Same volume, page 386.

XII. These are consistent with what is read in the first Synodal Letter to the Emperors: "These, namely the images of Christ and the Saints, are also to be venerated, that is, to be kissed and loved; for in the ancient Greek dialect, the words adorare (to adore) and φίλειν (to kiss) and ἀγαπᾶν (to love) mean the same. The preposition πρὸς signifies desire, as in προσκυνεῖν. Hence the letter concludes that the word προσκυνέω signifies embrace and intense love." Same volume, page 390.

XIII. The doctrine of this Synod is confirmed by the Council called the Eighth General, held, as we said, in the city of Constantinople, in the year of Christ 867. For in the tenth session, this is its third Canon: We decree that the sacred image of our Lord Jesus Christ is to be venerated with the same veneration as the holy Gospels. For just as all obtain salvation through the syllables pronounced from the Gospel, so also the learned and unlearned alike derive benefit from the images painted and depicted in colors. For what the speech expresses through syllables, this the painting represents and teaches through colors. Therefore, whoever does not venerate the image of Christ the Savior, shall not see His face at His second coming. In the same way, we venerate and adore the image of His undefiled Mother, and the holy Angels, as they are depicted in the pages of the Holy Scriptures, and of all the Saints. Whoever thinks otherwise, let him be anathema. But that this Council compares images, in terms of the worship of veneration, with the Gospel, refers to the custom of the Greeks, who venerate and adore the very codex of the Gospels with certain rites, as they do with the image of the cross.

XIV. Finally, the Council of Trent subscribed to and sanctioned the decrees of those prior Councils, teaching indeed that images do not possess divinity or any power for which they should be worshiped, nor should any trust be placed in them, but nevertheless they deserve veneration and honor, and that they should be kissed, and that the head should be uncovered and prostrated before them; because the honor given to them is referred to the prototypes they represent; so that through the images we adore Christ Himself, and venerate the Saints whose

likenesses they bear. The words of this Council are in the twenty-fifth session: Further, that the images of Christ, the Virgin Mother of God, and the other Saints should be held and retained in Churches, and that due honor and veneration should be imparted to them, not because any divinity or power is believed to reside in them, for which they should be worshiped, or that anything should be sought from them, or that any trust should be placed in the images, as was once done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols. But because the honor given to them is referred to the prototypes they represent, so that through the images we kiss and uncover our head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the Saints whose likenesses they bear, which was sanctioned by the decrees of the Councils, especially the Second Nicene, against the opponents of images.

XV. From these it is clear, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church and the decrees of its Councils, first, that some worship, honor, and veneration are due to the images of Christ and the Saints. Secondly, that such worship is legitimately shown by kissing the images, saluting them, embracing them, prostrating oneself before them, and uncovering one's head, and offering incense and lights to them. Finally, that this worship is rightly expressed by the word adoration; but not that images are to be adored as gods, and worshiped with Latria, that is, with the highest and absolute adoration, which is reserved for the one true God alone; but that the adoration that should be shown to them is to be understood as relative and referred to the prototypes, and terminated in them. Therefore, nothing is to be asked of the images, nor is any trust to be placed in them, nor any divinity or power attributed to them.

XVI. However, what and what kind of adoration, according to the mind of the Roman Church, is due to the images of Christ and the Saints, cannot be more certainly gathered than from the solemn and universal practice of that Church. By this name, the worship that is openly exhibited to images in the churches of the Roman Church, known and seen by all, through certain solemn and public ceremonies, in which the Roman people constitute a part of their piety, is rightly considered meritorious; not objected to or disapproved of by the ordinary pastors, bishops, or the Pope; but on the contrary, it is publicly approved and defended by many Doctors and Bishops, while others silently consent by their silence and not speaking against it.

XVII. Such is not only the custom of saluting, kissing, and bending the knee before the images of Christ and the Saints, and also offering incense and lights to them, which, as we have seen, are expressly approved by the Councils of the Roman Church; but also the accepted custom of placing images on altars, adorning them with precious garments and ornaments, carrying them in solemn procession through public streets, dedicating vows to them, consecrating gifts to them, and undertaking religious pilgrimages to them.

XVIII. These things are done throughout the whole Roman Church, and are not publicly disapproved of by any who are eminent in authority, doctrine, or dignity in that Church, and who are considered orthodox, but on the contrary, are publicly approved and defended by many. For example, by Jesuit Coster in his "Enchiridion of Controversies" in the chapter on the use and veneration of images. Therefore, he says, Christians who adore and pray to Christ in His image with knees bent, heads uncovered, and hands joined, asking for mercy, help, and assistance from

Him, are not to be reprehended. Nor are those who adorn the images with garments, ornaments, and similar things. Nor is the custom of Christians reprehensible, but commendable, by which they light candles before the images in honor of the Saints. Finally, the custom of carrying statues and images in processions is approved by ancient usage and rightly commendable.

XIX. Similar things are seen in John Molanus, the theologian of Louvain, who in his book on the history of sacred images, defends and promotes their public procession, placement on altars, and the practice of adorning them with precious garments. For in the second book, chapter thirty-four, the title is, "The Procession of Images in Supplications is Defended against Superstition." And the title of chapter thirty-nine is, "The Images of the Saints are Not Profaned and Pagan, but Religiously Adorn the Altars." And the title of the following chapter is, "The Images of the Saints are Rightly Covered with Gold and Silver, and Adorned with Crowns or Precious Garments."

XX. But in some, the practice of the Roman Church seems not to be in full agreement with the decrees of its Councils. For as we have seen above, the Second Nicene Synod, along with Anastasius, teaches that it is not allowed to ask anything from the image. And similarly, the Council of Trent teaches that nothing is to be asked from the image. Yet in the public use of the Roman Church, there are some prayers directed to the images themselves.

XXI. For in the Breviary of the Roman Church, established according to the decree of the Council of Trent and published by the command of Pope Pius V, there is found this prayer directed to the cross, as distinct from Christ: "O Cross, more splendid than all the stars, famous throughout the world, much beloved by men, holier than all, which alone was worthy to bear the ransom of the world, sweet wood, sweet nails, bearing a sweet burden, save the gathered company praising you today." On the Feasts of May 3rd and September 14th.

XXII. In the hymn which begins, "The royal banners forward go," and which is customarily sung on the Saturday before Passion Sunday and on other solemn days, the cross is adorned with various praises which distinguish it from Christ, and it is called "Beautiful and bright tree, adorned with the purple of the King, chosen to touch so holy limbs. Blessed is the wood on which hung the price of the world." Then this prayer is conceived: "Hail, O cross, our only hope, in this time of the Passion, increase the grace of the pious and grant forgiveness to the guilty."

XXIII. And Thomas Aquinas, the chief of the Roman School, recognized that this prayer is directed to the cross, as distinct from Christ. For from this he concludes that the cross is to be worshipped with Latria, using this argument: "We offer Latria to that in which we place our hope of salvation; but we place our hope of salvation in the cross of Christ: for the Church sings, 'Hail, O cross, our only hope, in this time of the Passion, increase the grace of the pious and grant forgiveness to the guilty.' Therefore, the cross of Christ is to be worshipped with Latria." The conclusion of the article is conceived in these words: "The cross of Christ, on which Christ was crucified, is to be worshipped with Latria both because of its representation and because of the contact with the members of Christ; but the image of the cross in any other material is to be

worshipped with Latria only because of its representation." In the Summa, part three, question 25, article four.

XXIV. However, those who, to avoid this absurdity, today want to interpret the cross by a certain metonymy as referring to Christ Himself in such prayers, do violence to the very words. For what laws of speech allow the cross to be taken for Christ crucified in those places where it is opposed to Christ, and is distinguished from Christ, and is celebrated as ennobled by the contact of Christ's body?"

XXV. There is also a certain prayer, said to have been issued by Pope John XXII, with the concession of ten thousand days of indulgences for those who devoutly recite it while gazing at the Veronica, to which this prayer is directed. The Veronica is called a certain image of the face of Christ imprinted on a cloth, which is said to be kept in the church of Saint Peter in Rome, as well as in a certain city in Spain, according to Marineo Siculus in the fifth book of his "De Rebus Hispaniae." This image is called Veronica by the name of the woman to whom the cloth is said to have been given, which was applied to the face of Christ, stained with blood and sweat, and retained His likeness. Furthermore, this is how the prayer, which is read in the book titled "Antidotarius Animae," goes:

Hail, holy face of our Redeemer,
In which shines the appearance of divine splendor,
Imprinted on a cloth of snowy whiteness,
Given to Veronica as a sign of love.
Hail, glory of the age, mirror of the Saints,
Which the spirits of heaven long to see;
Purify us from all stain of vices,
And join us to the company of the blessed.
Hail, blessed image of the Lord's face,
Marvelously adorned with eternal grace:
Shed light in our hearts by your given power,
And take away the bonds from our senses.
Hail, strength of our Christian faith,
Destroying the heretics who are of vain mind:
Increase the merit of those who truly believe in you,
The image of Him who is the King from the bread.
Hail, our joy in this harsh life,
Fleeting and fragile, soon to perish:
Lead us to our homeland, O blessed figure,
To see the pure face of Christ.

XXVI. Moreover, the Council of Trent decreed that it should not be believed that there is any power in images for which they should be worshipped. But the practice of the Roman

Church presupposes the opposite; not only in the aforementioned prayer, in which the image of the face of Christ is attributed the power to shed light in hearts, but also in others that are more solemn and customary in that Church. For when the Bishop blesses a cross made of stone or metal, he has a prayer addressed to our Lord Christ, which is included in the Roman Pontifical under the title "On the Blessing of a New Cross." In this prayer, contrasting the true cross on which Christ was affixed with the cross made of metal or stone, he asks Christ the Lord to sanctify the cross to be consecrated with the holiness of His true cross and to grant that, by the merit of this stone or silver cross, the souls of the servants of Christ may be free from all committed sin. The words of the prayer are:

You owe no other more fitting service than that which the dedication of the body affixed to you then offered; nor is there any offering more familiar to you than that which was consecrated by the familiar extension of your hands. Therefore, receive this cross with those hands with which you embraced that other one, and sanctify this one with the holiness of that one; and just as through that cross the world was cleansed from guilt, so may the souls of your most devout servants, by the merit of this cross, be free from all committed sin; and by the intercession of your true cross, may they shine with perpetual triumph.

XXVII. There is also a prayer directed to God the Father, in which the Bishop asks that the sign of the cross which he holds in his hands may be a saving remedy for the human race and a protection and defense against the darts of the enemies. The prayer is conceived in these terms: We ask you, holy Lord, almighty Father, eternal God, that you deign to bless this sign of your cross, that it may be a saving remedy for the human race; the solidity of faith; the progress of good works; the redemption of souls; and a comfort and protection and defense against the fierce darts of the enemies, etc. Those who have such a prayer to God, if they trust that they will be heard, must necessarily believe that this stone or metal cross thereby receives power from God, through which it can procure various blessings for men, both temporal and spiritual, contrary to the definition of the Council of Trent. For otherwise, how could it be said that it was made, as the prayer asks, a saving remedy for the human race and a defense against the fierce darts of the enemies?

XXVIII. The same applies to those wax images, commonly called the "Agnus Dei," which the Pope is accustomed to consecrate in the first year of his Pontificate, and also afterwards, every seventh year, to serve as symbolic images of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the true Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. For while the Pope consecrates them, he repeatedly prays to God with many prayers, asking that those images may receive power against diabolical deceptions, against storms, against pestilence, against epilepsy, and other evils and inconveniences. This can be seen in the book of sacred ceremonies, in the chapter titled "On the Consecration of the Agnus Dei." Among many similar prayers, one is in which the Pope, after some prefatory remarks, addresses God thus: Just as that Lamb, whose blood was used to anoint the doorposts and lintels of houses after it was sacrificed, delivered your people from Egyptian

persecution at midnight: and just as that innocent Lamb, immolated by your will on the altar of the cross, Jesus Christ, your Son, delivered our first parent from diabolical power, so may these spotless lambs, which we offer to be consecrated in the sight of your Divine Majesty, receive power. May you deign to bless, sanctify, and consecrate them, so that, sanctified by your abundant blessing, they may receive the same power against all diabolical deceptions and the wiles of the wicked spirit, so that no storm may prevail against those who devoutly carry them, no adversity may dominate, no pestilential aura or corrupted air, no epilepsy, no storm at sea, no fire, nor any iniquity may dominate or prevail against them; may mother and child be preserved in safety, etc."

XXIX. Indeed, Pope Urban V. was quite confident that his prayer had been heard when he sent three Agnus Dei to the Greek Emperors, along with these verses, which are transcribed at the end of the already cited chapter:

Balm and pure wax, with the water of chrism,
Make the Lamb, which I give you as a great gift,
Sanctified through mystical waters as if born from the font.
It drives away lightning from above, all malignant
Sin it breaks, as Christ's blood does, and it assuages.
The pregnant are preserved, and childbirth is delivered.
It grants gifts to the worthy, destroys the power of fire:
Carried purely, it rescues from the waves.

Given these facts, according to the mind of the Pope, who is the head of the Roman Church, these wax lambs are to be excluded from the number of images, which the Council of Trent declares have no power for which they should be worshipped.

XXX. Regarding the Doctors of the Roman Church, some of them seem to teach contrary to what we have found defined by the Councils of that Church. For there are those who simply deny that images should be worshipped and claim that it is a slander to say that they worship the images of Christ and the Saints, as we have already observed above. Yet the Councils of the Roman Church, namely the Second Nicene and the Constantinopolitan, which is called the Eighth General, approved by the Council of Trent, have anathematized those who say that adoration is not to be given to images. However, the intention of these Doctors is not to condemn the already mentioned Councils or in any way depart from their doctrine. For when they deny that images are to be worshipped, they mean this in terms of the highest and absolute adoration, which is given to something as the ultimate end and first principle and primary author of all good, which adoration they acknowledge to be due only to God; but not in terms of relative or inferior adoration, which they do not deny can be given to images, and which the Councils of the Roman Church sanction as to be given to images alone.

XXXI. On the contrary, among those who are eminent in the Roman School, many do not simply teach that images are to be worshipped, but insist that the images of God and Christ are to

be worshipped with latria, which the Roman School usually designates as the highest worship, proper to God alone. However, the Councils of the Roman Church carefully distinguish the adoration they want to be given to the images of Christ and the Saints from latria, as we have shown above. But even they do not wish to appear to disagree with these Councils and think that their view can be easily reconciled with the definitions of their Synods. They say, namely, that the images of God and Christ are indeed to be worshipped with latria, but not for their own sake, but because of the prototypes, and thus that latria is not absolute but relative; or at least that latria is given to them not per se, but per accidens, as they are considered together with the prototype, constituting one entity with it. And the Councils, which do not want latria to be given to any images, are to be understood as speaking of absolute latria, not of relative; or of latria per se, not of latria per accidens.

XXXII. Therefore, the Doctors of the Roman Church, although they speak somewhat differently, nevertheless agree among themselves regarding those things which have been sanctioned and defined by the Councils of that Church. First, namely, that images are to be held and retained in churches not for mere commemoration, but that some worship and honor are due to the images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and other Saints, and can rightly be given to them. Secondly, that this honor can rightly and sensibly be expressed by the word adoration. Thirdly, that the signs of reverence and submission shown to those images by uncovering the head in salutation, kissing them, bending the knee before them, and finally offering incense and lights, are legitimate marks of honor and by no means blameworthy.

XXXIII. Consequently, Vázquez rightly asserts, according to the mind of the Roman School, that it is a Catholic truth that adoration should be given to images, that is, signs of servitude and submission, by embrace, lights, offering of incense, uncovering the head, etc. And so, he does not simply classify as erring those who, in the time of the Seventh Synod, judged that images should be retained everywhere, not just for decoration, but also to arouse the memory of the exemplar among the faithful, so that they might venerate the exemplar in front of the images, but who did not show any sign of honor or submission to the images, neither by kissing, nor by bodily inclination, nor in any other way, because they said this was idolatry. Therefore, they did not kiss the images, nor bow their bodies to them, nor offer incense; but standing straight before them, being reminded of the exemplar, they directed their minds to it alone. For this reason, they were condemned in the Seventh Synod, and against them it was defined in that Synod that it is not enough if one says he venerates images unless he also adores them. In the third part of Thomas, vol. 1, disputation 106, chapter 1 and 2.

XXXIV. However, from this error Vázquez in the same place defends Holcot, Durandus, and Pico della Mirandola, whom he shows did not deny that we should embrace images, salute and kiss them, and uncover the head before them; even if they said that images are only improperly adored by this, and that it is not properly adoration of the image but of the exemplar. Therefore, at the end of the second chapter of the aforementioned disputation, he affirms that it is a crime and an intolerable error to judge that images should not be adored in any way.

XXXV. But although the theologians of the Roman School by common consent acknowledge that images are to be worshipped and adored in some way, and that it is pious and laudable to devoutly kiss them, burn incense to them, light candles before them, and bend the knee or prostrate oneself before them, they do not agree among themselves on what the nature and character of this worship should be. This is observed by Vázquez in the already cited disputation 108, chapter 1. For while all Catholics, he says, against the Iconoclasts easily agree that some worship, adoration, is to be given to images, they vary in the manner or very nature of the adoration.

XXXVI. To better understand this disagreement, first of all, we need to note and explain certain distinctions commonly used in this question to clearly explain their position. First, they observe that something can be honored either *per se* or *per accidens*. Something is honored *per se*, they say, when it is the subject in which the reason for veneration resides; *per accidens*, when it is something connected with the thing that is worshipped but is not itself the reason for worship. For example, when a king is honored, the person who is the king is honored *per se*; the royal robes and other adjuncts and accidents are honored *per accidens*, except for the royal dignity which, although it is not the thing that is honored, is that by which the person is honored. Thus, the person is honored *per se*, as is the royal dignity, while the other things are honored *per accidens*.

XXXVII. Secondly, they say something can be honored either for its own sake or for another reason. It is honored for its own sake, they say, if it has within itself a reason for veneration that does not depend on anything else; and in this way, only the nature of reason is venerable. Something is honored for another reason if it has within itself a cause for honor, but that cause entirely depends on something else. And in this way, the signs of sacred things are venerable; they have in themselves a relationship of resemblance or representation of a sacred thing and hence some excellence, but that excellence depends entirely on the sacred thing itself.

XXXVIII. Thirdly, they note that something can be honored either properly or improperly. Something is properly said to be honored when it is truly honored for its own sake. It is said to be honored improperly when it is honored in place of another. An ambassador of the king is sometimes honored as an ambassador, and in that case, he is properly honored, even though he is honored for another; sometimes he is honored in place of the king with the honor proper to kings, and in that case, he is improperly honored; properly, the king is honored in him. This becomes clearer when a funeral is held in the absence of the body, around a statue, and all the actions that would be done around the body are done around the statue, etc. All these distinctions are found in Bellarmine's second book on the Church Triumphant, chapter twenty.

XXXIX. With these observations in mind, the Roman School inquires whether images are to be properly adored or only improperly. There were some among the old scholastics who acknowledged that images are to be adored in some way, and that it is lawful to kiss them, bow

before them, and perform other signs of honor around them, but they did not thereby consider images to be properly but only improperly and abusively adored because these actions, although done around images, are not done in honor of the images but in honor of the prototype, and the images are not the terminus to which that adoration is referred.

XL. This opinion is attributed to Durandus, Holcot, and Pico della Mirandola, but it is generally rejected by more recent scholastics and is considered rash. This can be seen in the works of Vázquez, Suarez, Bellarmine, Gregory of Valencia, Puteanus, and others who commonly assert that images are properly and truly to be adored.

XLI. Although recent theologians agree that images are properly and truly to be adored, they nevertheless dispute among themselves about the manner and nature of this adoration. They all admit that images should not be adored for their own sake but only for the sake of the exemplar they represent and whose likeness they bear. But the question is whether, although the image is adored for the sake of the exemplar, it can still in itself be a complete object of adoration, so that it is adored with an adoration different from that given to the exemplar, and which thus terminates in the image itself, making the image alone, not the exemplar, the proximate and immediate material of the adoration. Just as the ambassador of the king is honored for the king, whose name he represents, but can still be honored in a way that terminates directly in himself, with a different and lesser honor than that due to the king himself

XLII. Some, like Gabriel Vázquez, reject this manner of adoration as superstitious and foolish because, they say, it is foolish for a rational creature to subject itself to an irrational creature and exhibit servitude to it. Therefore, they contend that an image, per se and without the prototype or separate from it, cannot be licitly adored; not only because it must be venerated for the sake of the exemplar as the remote reason, just as the ambassador is honored for the king, but also because whoever adores an image must venerate in it and through it the exemplar as the terminus and proximate material of veneration. These are the words of Gabriel Vázquez in volume one on the third part of Thomas, disputation 109, chapter 3.

XLIII. However, many others teach that it is licit and proper to adore images without at the same time adoring the exemplar, so that the images themselves are the proximate and complete terminus of adoration. Among these is Francisco Suarez, who affirms that although it is true that images can only be adored for the sake of the exemplar, they can nevertheless be properly adored in themselves without directly adoring the exemplar as the object. Volume one on the third part of Thomas, disputation fifty-four, section 5.

XLIV. Likewise, Bellarmine holds this view, stating that the images of Christ and the saints are to be venerated not only per accidens or improperly but also per se and properly, so

that they themselves terminate the veneration as considered in themselves and not only as standing in place of the exemplar. The Church Triumphant, book two, chapter twenty-one.

XLV. This is also the doctrine of Puteanus, who acknowledges that the image of Christ, and therefore the image of any saint, can be adored so that the material object of our adoration is the image alone. In the third part of Thomas, question twenty-five, article three.

XLVI. Among these theologians who teach that images can be adored without at the same time adoring the exemplar, and with a peculiar worship that terminates in the images themselves, there is a question about what kind of worship this is and what it should be called. According to Bellarmine, the worship properly due to images is a certain imperfect worship that analogically and reductively pertains to the type of worship due to the exemplar. He explains it this way: Images are not properly subject to latria, hyperdulia, dulia, or any other kind of worship given to rational nature. A lifeless and irrational thing is not capable of such worship; rather, it is a certain inferior and varied worship according to the variety of images. Therefore, the worship due to images of the saints is not properly dulia but a lower form of worship, which can be called dulia in a certain respect or analogically and reductively. Similarly, the worship due to images of the Blessed Virgin is not simply hyperdulia but hyperdulia in a certain respect or analogically and reductively. Finally, the worship due to images of Christ is not true and simple latria but a certain inferior worship, which is nevertheless reduced to latria as the imperfect to the perfect. The Church Triumphant, book two, chapter twenty-five.

XLVII. According to others, it should simply be said that the image of Christ, when adored alone and separately from the exemplar, is indeed owed latria, but relative, not absolute. This is the first conclusion of Puteanus on article three, question twenty-five, cited above. When the material object of our adoration is only the image of Christ, and the reason for adoring is Christ alone, represented by that image, this adoration is not properly latria, or as others say, it is not absolute latria. Rather, it is latria that is given because of the created excellence that exists in the thing worshipped, not because it is a created thing, but because it has some relationship to the uncreated excellence.

XLVIII. Moreover, according to this doctrine of Puteanus, it should similarly be said that the images of the Virgin Mary are to be adored with hyperdulia, not absolute but relative; and the images of other saints are also owed relative, not absolute dulia.

XLIX. Furthermore, there is a question among the Doctors of the Roman Church about whether the image and the exemplar can and should be adored simultaneously with one and the same act of adoration, namely, while considering the exemplar as clothed in the image and the image as containing the exemplar, and as if animated by it, so that in the mind of the adorer the image and the exemplar constitute one thing. Some Doctors of the Roman School do not acknowledge this mode of adoring images and consider the adoration of the image to be always a different act from that by which the exemplar itself is adored. This is the opinion of Martin Perez

de Ayala in his book on Traditions, where he deals with the cult of images, and of Ambrosius Catharinus in his singular work on the adoration of images, as testified by Vázquez and Suarez in the frequently cited disputations.

L. However, many Doctors of the Roman Church are of the opinion that an image can and should be adored with the same adoration as the exemplar, so that the image is adored for the sake of the prototype, and the prototype is adored in the image with one and the same act, of which the adequate object is both the exemplar and the image together. This opinion is extensively supported and explained by Francisco Suarez, in his first volume on the third part of Thomas, disputation fifty-four, frequently mentioned before. To clarify his position, Suarez observes that although the image does not really contain the prototype in its own being, it does contain it representatively. Therefore, when a person is presented with such an image, they apprehend the prototype as if it were truly present in the image and conceive both together as one. Thus, with this apprehension, the worshipper's mind is carried by one act of adoration, primarily towards the prototype and concomitantly towards the image, so that by kissing the image, they adore Christ himself; not through deception, since they do not judge the image to be Christ, but through the simple and vivid representation of the prototype in the image, as if it were present.

LI. Vázquez, on the other hand, believes that the image can indeed be adored with the same act as the exemplar, but he contends that images cannot be adored except with the exemplar, and must be adored with it. "The widespread and ancient theological opinion, which I consider true," he says, "is that the motion of adoration towards the image passes into its prototype and exemplar so that they both fall under the same veneration, and the image cannot be adored by itself, without the exemplar, or separated from it." He further teaches that not only can the image be adored with the exemplar in the same act of adoration, but also that the image in itself, unless it contains and is joined with the exemplar, is not capable of any veneration or adoration and therefore is to be venerated only with the exemplar, which together with it constitutes the complete and proximate terminus of adoration. Disputation one hundred and eight, cited above, chapter three.

LII. The foundation of his opinion is that no inanimate or irrational thing without a rational element is capable of honor, worship, reverence, or adoration in itself. This is because adoration is the will to show a sign of submission due to some excellence. Now the mind's submission and servitude are directed only towards what one apprehends as superior and endowed with greater excellence, which, in relation to humans, an image without the exemplar cannot be considered. He elaborates on this in chapter nine of the aforementioned disputation. He also asserts that anyone who venerates an image in itself, without the exemplar in it, can be accused of folly or idolatry: either because they subject themselves to an irrational thing and

exhibit servitude against right reason, or because in submitting to it, they attribute to it some divinity, dignity, or virtue, which is a heathen error, not a Christian religion.

LIII. Moreover, as can be gathered from the aforementioned points, Vázquez notes that an act of adoration consists of two parts. One is the external sign of submission, such as kneeling, bowing the head, etc. The other is the internal affect of submission, by which one, from an apprehension of excellence and dignity, desires to show that sign to someone as excellent. Without this, the external sign would not be adoration and worship; it could be done in jest or mockery. The external sign and the internal affect of submission are not two adorations, but from both, one act of reverence and honor is constituted, just as in general a virtuous act is constituted by the internal and the external.

LIV. Again, therefore, the question arises whether, when the image and the exemplar are adored together with one and the same act of adoration, both parts of that act, i.e., both the internal affect of submission and its external sign, pertain and are terminated not only to the exemplar but also to the image. Vázquez, consistent with his stated foundation, believes that when the image and the exemplar are adored together, only the external sign of submission pertains and is terminated to the image, while the internal affect of submission is directed only towards the exemplar and regards only it. For in chapter seven of the frequently mentioned disputation 108, he states that it is manifestly gathered from various testimonies of Councils and Fathers that the adoration of the image and the exemplar is one and the same, not as theologians usually think, but in such a way that there is one act of submission which is directed solely towards the exemplar, while the external sign of it regards only the image and, through it, the submission passes in thought and desire to the exemplar itself.

LV. Francisco Suarez, however, asserts that when the image and the exemplar are adored together with one and the same act, not only the external sign of submission but also the internal submission of the mind is directed towards the image and that submission regards not only the exemplar but also the image with the exemplar: so that the entire and complete object of that adoration is the image, not just what is external and sensible in that adoration. "It must be said," he states, "that it is rightly possible for the prototype in the image and the image for the prototype to be adored with one interior and exterior act." Volume 3 in the 3rd part of Thomas, disputation 54, section 3. And he adds that when someone apprehends the image and the prototype as one object, the person is carried to worship that object with a single movement of the body and a single act of the will: it is not necessary to distinguish formal reasons in such an act. He concludes from this that the image is also adored not only with an external act, which is insufficient for adoration, but also with the internal movement and intention of the worshipper, not merely abusively, but truly and properly.

LVI. Furthermore, from this hypothesis, that the image can and should be worshipped with one and the same act of adoration as the exemplar, it follows that images can and should be

worshipped with the same kind of worship as the exemplar. Therefore, the images of saints can be worshipped with *dulia*, which is the worship proper to saints; the images of the Blessed Virgin can be worshipped with *hyperdulia*, which is her proper worship; and the images of God and Christ can be worshipped with *latria*, which is the worship due to God. This is also acknowledged and taught by many scholastics with Thomas Aquinas.

LVII. The theologians of the Roman School attempt to show in various ways how an image can be worshipped with *latria* without committing the crime of idolatry. First, Bellarmine says that sometimes the image serves as a substitute for the exemplar, and what is done around the image as if it were present is done around the image with the mind fixed only on the exemplar, not on the image, and then it can be said that the image is worshipped with the same worship as the exemplar, not properly but improperly. Thus, according to him, on Good Friday, when the crucifix is gradually unveiled and presented for adoration, many acts pertaining to the worship of *latria* are done around the image of the crucified, but all those acts are understood to be offered to Christ himself through the image: at that time, properly speaking, the honor of *latria* is not given to the image but only to the exemplar, yet it can be said that the image is also honored with *latria* improperly.

LVIII. Moreover, he teaches that the image of Christ can be worshipped with *latria* not only improperly but also properly, though accidentally, not *per se*: if someone worships Christ as he is objectively present in his image, and venerates him thus represented and as if clothed in the image. Then necessarily, the image is worshipped with the same worship as Christ himself because the image is at that time conceived as conjoined with the exemplar being worshipped. Whoever worships someone also worships all that is conjoined with them; just as one who worships a robed king worships both the king and the robes. But this worship is accidental, not *per se* because in that case, the image is neither the suppositum that is worshipped nor the reason for the adoration but something adjunct. Bellarmine believes that it is forbidden to worship the image with *latria* properly and *per se*, but not to worship it with *latria* improperly or accidentally. However, since what is true only improperly or accidentally should not simply be affirmed, he does not want to say that *latria* is due to images, but rather the opposite, especially if the sermon is to the people. *The Church Triumphant*, book 2, chapters 22 and 23.

LIX. Vázquez, however, addresses this difficulty differently according to his own principles. Although he insists that the image should be worshipped along with the exemplar in one act of adoration and not otherwise, in that act, as already explained, he distinguishes two parts: one is the submission of the mind itself, and the other is the external sign of that submission. He does not want the former, the submission of the mind, to regard the image in any way or to terminate in it, but to be referred only to the exemplar. Only the latter part, the external sign of submission, he wants to be given to the image and through it to pass to the exemplar. Thus, when someone kneels or bows before the image, they do so, according to his opinion, as a sign of servitude and reverence, which is thought to be due not to the image but to the prototype

alone. He interprets the term "latria" to signify not the external sign of submission and reverence in itself, but the affect of subjection, and the sign itself as it is completed by the internal affect of servitude toward God. Therefore, he concludes that the Second Council of Nicaea rightly denies that latria should be offered to images because they are not to be given that internal submission in which latria properly consists.

LX. Nevertheless, he contends that it can be said absolutely that images are adored with the adoration of latria. Although images are not given that affect of servitude, which is called latria, they are worshipped accidentally with latria because they are given external worship through signs derived from the affect of latria towards the exemplar. He considers this sufficient to say that the image is worshipped accidentally with the prototype, not per se, with the adoration of latria.

LXI. Finally, Francisco Suarez, who believes that the image can be worshipped with the exemplar in one and the same act of adoration, both internal and external, not only abusively but truly and properly, also teaches that the image of Christ can be worshipped truly and properly with the adoration of latria. This act, being one and indivisible, terminates both in the prototype and the image. He does not think this contradicts the Councils of the Roman Church, which prohibit offering latria to images or any other creatures. For when the image of Christ is worshipped in this manner, the act of latria primarily tends towards Christ and only secondarily towards the image. Although, in his judgment, a creature cannot be primarily worshipped with latria, it can be worshipped with latria concomitantly; just as the king's robe is worshipped with the honor given to the king. He adds that the same act of adoration, by which Christ and his image are worshipped, is absolute latria with respect to Christ and relative latria with respect to the image. This is because that honor is given to Christ due to his excellence, and to the image due to Christ's excellence, whom it represents. He finds no contradiction in worshipping a creature with latria as long as that latria is relative and not absolute, that is, as long as the worship given to the creature is for the sake of God and not for the creature itself.

THEOLOGICAL THESES ON THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES:

PART TWO.

In which the Doctrine of the Reformed Church is Explained and Confirmed.

Thesis I

From the points raised in the preceding theses, it is evident that the councils of the Roman Church do not indeed teach that any images should be considered gods or that any power should be attributed to them for which they should be worshiped with the highest and absolute worship. However, these same councils consistently state that images, not only of Christ but also

of the Virgin Mary and other saints, are worthy of some form of worship, not for their own sake, but because of the exemplar they represent.

II. We have also clearly demonstrated that the worship which the Roman Church offers to images, according to the common practice of its school and indeed the definitions of the councils to which it submits, can rightly be expressed with the term "adoration." Thus, this worship, according to the teachings of those councils and the practice of the Roman Church, is legitimately and piously rendered to images by bowing, kneeling, uncovering the head, kissing them, and offering candles and incense.

III. From this, it is clear that the doctors of the Roman Church unjustly complain about Protestants attributing to the Roman Church the adoration of images, as if this were a calumny. For what calumny is there in attributing to the Roman Church what its school teaches should be done and what it professes to do in its councils, declaring it rightly and piously done under anathema?

IV. There is no reason for them to say that the adoration they offer to images is not the highest and absolute adoration which they acknowledge to be owed only to God; nor do they consider images as gods, but they only worship them with a certain inferior adoration, which is referred to the prototypes. For when Protestants accuse the Roman Church of worshiping images, they do not intend to attribute to the Roman Church that it considers images as gods, nor do they worship them with another adoration than a relative one and which is below the highest. Moreover, they are so far from that, that they do not even think it can be attributed to the more intelligent and not utterly foolish pagans without injury. For their wise men and philosophers often declare that they do not consider stone or wooden images as gods, nor do they worship them with any other mind than to honor the deities of which they are signs and representations. Since, therefore, Protestants believe and say that images are worshiped by the Roman Church in no other way than that which it approves and professes, it is clear that they do not impute anything to it in this matter by calumny.

V. However, although the whole Roman Church and school agree that some form of worship is to be given to images of Christ and the saints, and that this worship can rightly and appropriately be signified by the term "adoration," it has been shown that the Roman school doctors disagree greatly among themselves in explaining the nature of this worship, diverging into various opinions on this matter. To better understand this variety and briefly present it, it should be noted with Francisco Suarez that adoration can be directed to an image in three ways: first, by directing the whole intention of the mind to the exemplar represented in the image as the object properly, for itself, and solely worshipped, and not to the image; second, by directing the adoration to both the represented exemplar and the image in which it is represented, forming from both together in the mind one adequate object to which it is directed and which is the

adequate material around which the adoration revolves, according to the intention of the worshiper; third, by directing the adoration to the image alone as the matter or thing worshipped in itself, but to the exemplar only as the reason for worship. (Tomus Primus in Tertiam Thomæ, Disputatio 54, Sectio 4).

VI. Some of the older scholastics believe that images should only be worshipped in the first way, that is, it is lawful indeed to bow and kneel before them and to offer candles and incense, but the worshiper should direct his whole mind's intention not to the image itself but only to the exemplar represented by the image as the object worshipped properly and for itself. Hence, they conclude that images are only worshipped improperly and abusively. However, in the more recent school, this opinion is entirely rejected as rash and improbable, and it is established as something certain and indubitable that images are to be worshipped properly and truly.

VII. Therefore, others teach that images can be worshipped not only in the first way but also in the second way, meaning that it is lawful not only to worship the exemplar in the presence of the image but also to direct and terminate the adoration to both the exemplar and the image together, forming one total object from the two in the mind. However, they reject the third mode of adoration as illicit, in which the image alone is worshipped as a thing worshipped in itself, even if it is worshipped because of the exemplar, which is the reason for that adoration.

VIII. Conversely, some reject the second mode of worship, in which the exemplar and the image are worshipped together with one and the same act of adoration as one total object, but believe that images can and should be worshipped not only in the first but also in the third way, so that the adoration is directed to the image alone as the thing worshipped in itself, while the exemplar is only indirectly regarded, namely as the reason why the image is worshipped. Although the image should be worshipped in itself and for itself, it is not worshipped except for the sake of the exemplar, just as a means is loved for itself and in itself, although it is not loved except for the end.

IX. Finally, most theologians of the Roman Church believe that images can be rightly and piously worshipped in all three ways, namely by directing adoration properly and for itself either to the exemplar alone, to the image alone, or to both the exemplar and the image together as one total object.

X. Again, those who believe that the image and the exemplar can and should be worshipped together with one and the same act of adoration differ among themselves in that some think that only what is external in adoration refers to and terminates in the image, while the internal movement of the heart is referred to the exemplar alone. However, many others contend that the image can be worshipped together with the exemplar not only with the same external act of adoration but also with the same internal submission of the mind, as was more fully explained in the previous theses. In these, it was also shown that the worship given to the image, according

to the opinion of many, is of the same kind and nature as that given to the exemplar itself, so that the images of Christ are to be worshipped with latria, those of the saints with dulia, and those of the Blessed Virgin Mary with hyperdulia. According to others, however, the worship that is properly and for itself given to images is of a different and inferior kind and order than the worship of the exemplar itself, but nevertheless is analogically referred to and reduced to it.

XI. But whatever may be said about this diversity of opinions in the Roman school, all its doctors agree on this, as has often been stated: 1. That some form of worship is to be given to images of Christ and the saints. 2. That this worship can rightly be signified by the term "adoration." 3. That this worship is legitimately rendered by uncovering the head, kneeling, and offering lights and incense before the images.

XII. All such worship, by whatever name it is called, Protestants unanimously reject as superstitious and contrary to the word of God. And this is the status of this controversy between the Roman Church and all Protestant Churches: whether it is pious and pleasing to God to bow, uncover the head, burn incense, light candles, and perform similar religious rites before images, whether of Christ or of the saints. This the Protestants unanimously deny, while the doctors of the Roman Church affirm it as something decreed by their Church under anathema and confirmed by its solemn and universal practice.

XIII. Furthermore, what moves the Protestants to hold this opinion is the express command of God contained in the Decalogue and often repeated in sacred Scripture: "You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth; you shall not bow down to them nor serve them." Where, since God simply forbids us to worship or serve any likeness of things in heaven, on earth, or in the waters, they rightly conclude that images of God, or Christ, or the saints reigning in heaven are not to be worshipped with any adoration or service, just as no other images are to be; since both images of Christ and of the saints are among the likenesses that represent things in heaven, to which God's law abrogates all worship.

XIV. To this, the Doctors of the Roman School respond in various ways, but their arguments are not difficult to refute. First, some indeed concede that by this command of God, all worship and adoration of images are prohibited, whatever form they may take, and that it was God's intention that no images, whether of any creature or of God Himself, should be erected and set up for worship in a manner suitable for adoration. However, they contend that this command is positive and ceremonial, and thus was abrogated by the Gospel, like other things that pertained to legal rites, and that the Church is no longer bound to observe it. This is the opinion of Gabriel Vasquez, which he proposes and attempts to defend extensively in the first volume of his work on the Third Part of Thomas, in Disputation 104. This view is also embraced by Jesuit Lorinus,

writing on the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. They follow Ambrose Catharinus, Martin de Ayala, and Dominic à Soto, writers of the previous century.

XV. But if this prohibition, "You shall not make for yourself a carved image, etc.," is a positive law that temporarily forbids any images of God or any creature to be proposed for worship, then indeed it constitutes a particular commandment that should not be confused with the first commandment, "You shall have no other gods before Me," which is a moral commandment and purely natural law. It is clearly different to acknowledge the one true God and have no other gods before Him, and to worship that God in no image nor make any figure for adoration and worship, especially according to the hypothesis of the Roman School, which believes that those who offer adoration and worship to images of God and the saints do nothing against that law, "You shall have no other gods before Me." Consequently, in the Decalogue, not ten but eleven commandments should be counted, and it should be called the Hendecalogue instead of the Decalogue; although Moses named this summary of divine law the ten words, that is, ten commandments. If, as the Roman Church wishes, the law against coveting contains two commandments, one prohibiting the coveting of a neighbor's wife, the other prohibiting the coveting of a neighbor's house, it follows that there are seven commandments in the second table, to which should be added not just three, but four commandments from the first table, since the prohibition against making any images for worship would necessarily constitute a particular commandment.

XVI. But from where do they infer that the commandment by which God forbids any images to be set up for worship is positive and ceremonial? Indeed, we infer from the words of the Apostle Paul, in Colossians 2:16, that there is something ceremonial in the fourth commandment, in so far as it precisely commands the sanctification of the Sabbath, that is, the seventh day of each week, where he advises the faithful not to be condemned in food or drink, or in part of a feast day, or a new moon, or Sabbaths, all of which were shadows of things to come, of which the body is Christ. But where has Christ or the Apostles signified anything similar regarding the prohibition against making any images for worship? And is there a single word in the New Testament that suggests to Christians that it is permissible to worship God and His saints in images, which was not allowed before?

XVII. And certainly, it is clear that this law is not positive, which only concerned the Jews, but moral, which obliges all men universally and always; because the worship of images and their making to represent divinity is reproached to the nations in God's word, as is frequently seen among the Prophets. Nor is it usually blamed on the nations that they transgressed the positive laws given to the Israelite people by Moses; but only that they violated the moral law impressed on the hearts of men by nature.

XVIII. Nor is this only in the Old Testament, but also in the New Testament, where it is a crime against the nations to dare to depict God in images and represent Him under the form of men and various animals. For Paul, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, accuses the wise men of the nations of foolishness in that they "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man—and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things."

XIX. Nor should anyone argue that the foolishness of those wise men from the nations was not simply because they set up images for God, but because they imagined God to be corporeal and distinct with various members, similar to humans or various animals in external form. Whatever might be said of the rude and heathen common people, and the Epicureans attributing to their inert and unworthy God the form of humans, it is certain that those wise men of the nations, about whom the Apostle speaks, who expressed God under various human and animal forms to worship Him, especially the Egyptians to whom he seems particularly to refer, did not think that the images of men or animals consecrated to God were similar to God in external form and bodily features, but only thinly and symbolically represented God and were mere weak likenesses and obscure signs of divinity, as expressed by Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre.

XX. Indeed, regarding the figures of animals, or even the living animals worshipped by the Egyptians, Plutarch in his treatise on Isis and Osiris extensively teaches that various virtues and benefits of the deity were mystically and symbolically represented by them. According to Augustine in his work "The City of God," Varro testifies that the ancients who made images of gods in human form followed this view because they believed that the human soul, which is in a human body, is most similar to the immortal mind, just as if vessels were placed to denote the gods, and an oenophore would be set up in the temple of Bacchus to signify wine, through that which contains what is contained; thus by an image that has the human form to signify the rational soul, since by such a vessel that nature is usually contained, and they wished the gods to be of that nature. (Book 7, Chapter 5).

XXI. These sentiments are echoed by Maximus of Tyre, in his discourse on whether statues should be set up for the gods. After establishing that God is the father and creator of all things, older than the sun, older than heaven, greater than time and age, he adds, "Since His essence surpasses our senses, we seek assistance from words, from men and animals, from figures of gold and silver, etc., to reach an understanding of the divinity through these means."

XXII. From these points, it is evident that the wise men of the nations gravely sinned when they represented God under various figures and proposed to worship Him in those forms, even if they only attributed mystical and symbolic significance to those figures; thus it is not only by positive law but by moral law, which perpetually obliges all men, that the Decalogue prohibits setting up any likenesses of God or anything else for worship.

XXIII. This is why the ancient Doctors of the Church, with common consent, affirmed that the Decalogue contains nothing other than a brief summary of the moral and natural law, to the observation of which all are universally bound, except only the commandment of the sanctification of the Sabbath, or the seventh day; in which they observed something ceremonial, namely, the precise and strict observance of the seventh day from creation and scrupulous cessation from all work: although in substance, and as far as it commands a certain day to be solemnly sanctified to God, it is also moral.

XXIV. This can be seen in Irenaeus, Book 4, Chapter 34, "The words of the Decalogue the Lord spoke to all alike; therefore, they remain with us, receiving extension and increase, but not dissolution through His coming in the flesh." Tertullian, in his book on Idolatry, Chapter 4, speaks of the law forbidding making any likeness of things in heaven or on earth as a law given by God to the whole world: "The divine law proclaims, 'You shall not make an idol'; and adds, 'Nor any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth.' He has forbidden such arts to the whole world." And in the next chapter, he says, "If you observe the same God, as indeed the author of the law, you have His law, 'You shall not make any likeness.'" Similarly, Cyprian refers these words of the second commandment, "You shall not make for yourself a carved image," as pertaining to Christians, in his book 3, to Quirinius, Chapter 59. Especially Augustine explicitly states, "The Decalogue pertains to us primarily, which is contained in those two stone tablets, except for the carnal observance of the Sabbath." (Against Two Letters of the Pelagians, Book 3, Chapter 4).

XXXIV. Nor should it be objected that Jeroboam, about the calves he had made, said, "Here are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt," just as the Israelites in the desert had said about the golden calf. For from what was said before, it is evident, first, that although the words are in the plural form, they nevertheless have a singular meaning, according to the nature of the Hebrew language and the frequent use in Scripture. Furthermore, the name of God was attributed to these calves because they were symbols and images of God, not because they were believed to be the very deity itself that had miraculously brought the Israelites out of Egypt before they even thought of forming the calves. Just as today, those who call a certain image dressed in imperial and papal attire "God the Father" do not therefore believe that image, without any figure and literally, to be God the Father, but only its symbol and representation.

XXXV. It is also trivial that Bellarmine adds, to make it seem probable that the Israelites did not intend to worship the true God in the calf, that they are said to have forgotten their Savior God when they worshiped the calf; Psalm 106: "They made a calf in Horeb and worshiped a molten image. They forgot God their Savior, who had done great things in Egypt, wondrous works in the land of Ham, and terrible things by the Red Sea." For in Scripture, they are said to

have forgotten God, not only when faith and thought of God were utterly erased from their minds, but when they acted as if they did not remember God, openly disobeying His commands, however much they professed to believe in the true God. Thus, in Psalm 90, the prophet severely rebukes thieves, adulterers, and blasphemers, accusing them of having forgotten God: although many who indulge in such vices retain some faith in God and have not entirely erased the memory of God from their minds.

XXXVI. But it can be more plausibly objected that God, through the prophet, reproaches Jeroboam, saying, "You have made for yourself other gods and molten images to provoke me to anger, and you have cast me behind your back" (1 Kings 14:9). How, then, can it be said that by making calves, he made for himself other gods, if he worshiped God in those calves? Moreover, in 2 Chronicles 11, it is said that Jeroboam appointed priests for the demons and for the calves he had made. It follows that in those calves, not the true God, but demons were worshiped. However, according to the Holy Scripture, they are said to serve other gods and demons who usurp worship contrary to the divine will, even if they think they are worshiping God in doing so. Whatever their intention may be, God utterly rejects such worship, and only the devil rejoices in it, as it is by his instigation that they violate God's law and institute worship condemned by it. Therefore, we must distinguish between their judgment and God's judgment: as far as they are concerned, they think they are honoring God; but God, through their disobedience, considers Himself dishonored and sees His adversary, Satan, honored as they obey his will in this matter.

XXXVII. But there are Doctors of the Roman Church who acknowledge that Jeroboam and his successors, as well as Micah and the ancient Israelites in the desert, worshiped the true God in their images. However, they argue that they are not simply reproached in Scripture for this but for two other reasons: firstly, because they imagined God to be corporeal and similar to the idol; secondly, because they sacrificed to the idol, while according to Scripture, sacrifices should be offered to God alone.

XXXVIII. As for the first point, it is a baseless assertion to claim that Jeroboam and his people believed God to be corporeal and similar to a bull in external form. Josephus, the historian who was closer to the time, had a different opinion and could better understand the cult practiced among the ten tribes. When he introduces Jeroboam speaking and persuading his people that it was unnecessary to go to Jerusalem to worship God, he attributes these words to him: "Just as no place is devoid of God's presence, and He is not confined to any place, but hears prayers and vows everywhere and regards those who worship Him" (Antiquities of the Jews, Book 8, Chapter 3).

XXXIX. And indeed, since the Israelites, whom Jeroboam sought to subject to himself and detach from the house of David, had hitherto believed that God was immense and omnipresent, what would be the point of the cunning man trying to persuade them that God was a bull or similar to a bull, when he could more easily achieve his goal without this absurd idea?

And how could he have made such a large multitude believe something so contrary to their previous beliefs in an instant?

XL. Moreover, Jeroboam, when he made the calves to be symbols and images of divinity, imitated, as many believe, the custom of the Egyptians, among whom he had long dwelt, and who worshiped the bull Apis with great superstition. The Egyptians, however, did not regard the bull as the supreme God, as Bellarmine believes; but they venerated it in honor of Serapis, their highest deity, as a symbol of that deity. This is evident from Augustine in "The City of God" (Book 18, Chapter 5), where he says that Egypt, deceived by marvelous vanity, adored the bull Apis with lavish honors in honor of Serapis. This is confirmed by Plutarch, an expert in these matters and acquainted with Egyptian rites, who testifies that the animals worshiped by the Egyptians were not considered gods but only symbols of gods because the wise men of Egypt believed they observed certain divine virtues in them. This is also supported by the author of the "Recognitions," attributed to Clement of Rome. He reports that the Egyptians said the animals they worshiped were figures and allegories of certain virtues by whose aid the human race is governed (Book 5, p. 99).

XLI. Some, not improbably, believe that Jeroboam intended to imitate the cherubim placed on the Ark in the Jerusalem Temple with those calves. For the cherubim are believed to have had the face of a calf, as evidenced by comparing the first chapter of the Prophet Ezekiel with the tenth chapter. In the first chapter, verse ten, the animals supporting God's throne in his vision are described as having the likeness of a man's face, a lion's face on the right side, a bull's face on the left side, and an eagle's face for each of the four. In the tenth chapter, where the same vision is repeated, verse fourteen describes their faces as having four faces: the face of a cherub, the face of a man, the face of a lion, and the face of an eagle. Where in the first chapter it is called the face of a bull, here it is specifically called the face of a cherub, indicating that cherubim were commonly known to have the face of a bull. Therefore, if the calves made by Jeroboam were imitations of the cherubim on the Ark, as Dr. Moncæius of the Sorbonne and Caffarellus after him believed, Jeroboam would have thought even less that the supreme deity was a bull or similar to a bull in form, as these calves were only mystical symbols of divine presence.

XLII. The Doctors of the Roman Church say that even if Jeroboam intended to worship the true God in the calves, he nevertheless gravely sinned because he sacrificed to those calves, as sacrifices should be offered only to God and are a principal act of Latria. However, this reasoning does not align well with their own hypotheses. They teach, as shown in the preceding theses, that nothing prohibits the images of divine persons from being worshiped with Latria, the supreme worship due to God, provided it is done not directly but indirectly, not absolutely but relatively, not primarily but only secondarily and concomitantly. If it is conceded that the Israelites worshiped the true God in the calves, it is evident that all that worship was relative and not absolute; and the calves were worshiped not for themselves but for God, not primarily but

only secondarily and concomitantly. If the images of God can be worshiped with other acts of Latria, both internal and external, in the manner already described, why could they not also be worshiped with sacrifices and offerings of victims in the same way? Namely, improperly, or indirectly, or concomitantly, which is how, and no other way, according to the given hypothesis, the Israelites worshiped the calves.

XLIII. Vazquez, along with other Scholastics, offers a reason why images cannot be worshiped with sacrifices, not even indirectly or relatively; namely, because in sacrifices there is a profession of divine omnipotence and dominion. However, if this reason is valid, as it indeed is, it also follows that other acts of Latria (worship) cannot be offered to images, not even relatively or concomitantly. For no act of Latria exists without including the acknowledgment and profession of some divine power and excellence, without which it could not be called an act of Latria. According to the Roman School's use, Latria differs from Dulia in that Dulia is the honor due to created excellence, while Latria is the honor due to uncreated excellence. If the acknowledgment of some divine excellence, present in other acts of Latria, does not prevent them from being offered relatively to images, why would the profession of divine omnipotence and dominion in sacrifices prevent it?

XLIV. Indeed, the profession of divine omnipotence in sacrifices and the immolation of victims is no greater than in acts of hope, whereby we expect our salvation from God. Yet, according to Thomas Aquinas, the principal teacher of the Roman School, we place our hope of salvation in the cross, which is a type of image. He proves that the cross on which Christ was crucified, and even its representations, are to be worshiped with Latria because we offer to it the worship of Latria, in which we place our hope of salvation. According to his view, we place our hope of salvation in the cross, as the Roman Church sings, "Hail, O cross, our only hope, in this time of passion, increase righteousness for the pious and grant pardon to the guilty."

XLV. But according to the truth of the matter, not only is it not permissible to offer sacrifices to images, but not even the smallest part of religious worship should be given to them, as can be clearly inferred from the story in the eighteenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings, where it is said that King Hezekiah of Judah broke the bronze serpent that Moses had made, because the children of Israel were burning incense to it, and for this reason, the king's piety is commended.

XLVI. For if there ever existed an image deserving any veneration, it was undoubtedly that serpent. Moses, a man of great stature, had made it by God's express command; it had been an instrument of notable deliverance for the Israelites in the desert, its memory was preserved among the people, and it was a distinguished type of Christ who was to come and be lifted up on the cross. Yet Hezekiah, being moved by God, not only forbade the Jews to worship it but, out of indignation that the children of Israel were burning incense to it, he broke it into pieces. How, then, does it agree with God's will that the Second Council of Nicaea decreed that images should

be approached with reverence, offerings of incense, and candles? And what small part of the honor given to the images of Christ and the saints in the Roman Church consists of the burning of incense and the offering of candles?

XLVII. Finally, if the commandment prohibiting the making and worshiping of any likeness of things in heaven or on earth only forbids us to regard images as gods and worship them with absolute adoration as gods, it would follow that this commandment did not forbid the idol worship instituted by the wise men of the nations. As we indicated at the beginning of this discussion, they distinguished images from the deities themselves and did not worship them with absolute adoration but with worship that, in the minds of the worshipers, referred to the deities of whom the images were symbols.

XLVIII. Celsus often protests this in Origen, especially in Book 7, where he says it is ridiculous wisdom to despise statues because stone, wood, bronze, or gold polished by this or that person is not God. He adds, "For who else but a complete fool would believe these statues to be gods, not the statues dedicated to the gods?" Similarly, as Arnobius testifies in Book 6 against the Gentiles, the defenders of idols used to say, "The ancients were not ignorant that the signs have no divinity and no sense; but for the untamed and unlearned common people, they beneficially formed them with this design, that by such visible representations, they might drive away the harshness of their minds and, thinking they were in the presence of gods, might lay aside impious deeds and be transformed into human virtues."

XLIX. Therefore, they professed to worship the invisible God in their images, saying, "We worship visible images for the honor of the invisible God." This is found in the author of the "Recognitions," attributed to Clement of Rome, in Book 5. Similarly, Lactantius says, "We do not fear them themselves, but those whom the images represent and to whom they are consecrated" (Institutions, Book 2, Chapter 2).

L. Whatever may be said of the rude and foolish populace who perhaps among the pagans sometimes revered images as if they were the deities themselves, at least those who established and defended pagan superstition did not think, as Arnobius says, that the materials of gold and silver were gods and sacred deities in themselves, but worshipped the gods through these images and venerated the divine presence in them. Therefore, even if they sinned against God's commandment, "You shall have no other gods before me," when they joined other false gods to God, they cannot be said to have transgressed the commandment prohibiting the making and worshiping of any likeness if we are only forbidden by it to regard and worship images as gods. Nevertheless, despite their explanations and excuses, as reported by the ancient doctors of the Church, they are considered to have gravely violated this prohibition.

THEOLOGICAL THESES ON THE Worship and Veneration of Angels and Saints. In which the Doctrine of the Church and the Roman School is Explained.

Thesis I

First of all, the Doctors of the Roman Church, especially Bellarmine, observe that worship in general comprises three different acts. First, an act of intellect, by which we apprehend the excellence of the one we worship. Second, an act of will, by which we internally incline ourselves to them, and intend to perform some interior or exterior act to demonstrate their excellence and our subjection. Third, an exterior act, by which we bow our head, bend the knee, or show some other sign of subjection. (On the Beatitude of the Saints, Book 1, Chapter 12)

II. Secondly, they observe that there are as many kinds of worship or honor as there are kinds of excellence; because honor or worship is due to a person because of their excellence. But with regard to the present topic, there are three kinds of excellence. The first is divine and infinite excellence, which corresponds to the first kind of worship, called Latria by the theologians of the Roman Church. The second is human or natural excellence, which is found in human virtues, dignities, ranks, etc., and corresponds to the second kind of worship, which can be called civil worship and a kind of human observance. The third is a certain excellence between divine and human, such as the grace and glory of the Saints, which are supernatural gifts; and to this corresponds the third kind of worship, called Dulia in the Roman School.

III. Furthermore, since the Blessed Virgin, as the Mother of the Son of God, surpasses other Saints to the extent that, according to the opinion of the Doctors, she can be called our Lady and Queen, which applies to other Saints only very imperfectly, the Scholastics divide this third kind, which they call Dulia, into proper Dulia and Hyperdulia, assigning the latter to the Blessed Virgin and the former to other Saints. Although the common practice is to use the terms Dulia and Hyperdulia to distinguish this specific worship from other kinds, this usage has not yet been officially sanctioned and defined by the Councils of the Roman Church. Therefore, Martin Perez, a Spanish bishop, in his work on Traditions, as reported by Bellarmine, testifies that he does not much approve of the name Dulia taken for the worship of the Saints, since Dulia properly signifies servitude, and we are not servants of the Saints, but fellow servants.

IV. Indeed, even those who most approve of this use of the terms Latria and Dulia as employed in the Roman School acknowledge that those terms are confused in profane writers and in common usage; indeed, in the Sacred Scripture among Greek interpreters, Dulia sometimes refers to human servitude; often, however, both in the New and Old Testaments, it is used for the worship of the supreme God alone. However, they contend that the Theological School has not without reason devised this distinction between Latria and Dulia. For when there is a manifest distinction between the worship of God and the Saints, it was appropriate to designate each worship with a distinct term to avoid equivocation. They also believe it was appropriate to choose the terms Latria and Dulia for this purpose; because Latria in the New

Testament is used only to signify the worship of God, whereas Dulia is used for all kinds of servitude, both to God and to humans.

V. Whatever the case may be, just as it was permissible for the ancient Church to invent new terms against old heretics, such as the terms "Trinity," etc., so it was also permissible for the later Church to invent certain new terms or at least to use terms previously used in another sense against later heretics. Moreover, the fact that we are not properly the servants of the Saints, but fellow servants, does not prevent the term Dulia from being apt to signify the observance with which we venerate the Saints, because in the Scriptures Dulia is not only taken for the servitude of slaves but also for honorary subjection, as when the Apostle says, "By charity serve one another," (Gal. 5). Although we are not slaves of the Saints, we are in a certain imperfect sense their servants, in that they move and assist us to good works by their example and intercession with God. Furthermore, due to the majesty and glory they possess, we who are still pilgrims from the Lord are much inferior to them.

VI. Furthermore, the Doctors of the Roman School observe that these three kinds of worship are not univocal, that is, of the same nature, nor are they contained under the same univocal genus; but they are only analogous due to a certain proportional similarity, which exists between divine excellence and the worship due to it, and created excellence and the worship corresponding to it. Just as excellence is not said univocally and in the same manner of the excellence of God and creatures, so they teach that the worship due to excellence should not be said univocally of the worship of God and creatures.

VII. If someone asks whether the worship due to the Saints should be called religious or not, they respond that religion, strictly and properly speaking, signifies a special virtue that has for its object the worship of God and is distinct in species from the virtue with which we venerate the Saints: which is a kind of observance of another order. However, sometimes the term Religion is taken more broadly, namely for any virtue by which we worship God, or the friends of God, and other sacred things, and which is distinct from political and purely human worship. In the former sense, they deny that the worship of the Saints is an act of religion, but in the latter sense, they concede it. Or, what amounts to the same thing, they say the Saints should be venerated with the worship of religion, not primarily but secondarily.

VIII. Similarly, when it is asked whether the Saints are to be adored, and whether the worship due to the Saints should be called adoration or not, they respond in the same way: adoration is sometimes taken strictly for the worship of Latria, which is appropriate to God alone; and in this sense, the Saints are not to be adored. However, adoration is sometimes taken more broadly and extended to human worship and the worship due to creatures, and in this broader sense, the Saints should be adored, and their worship can be called adoration.

IX. However, it should be noted here that among the Scholastic Doctors, the term adoration has a stricter and broader meaning. In the broader sense, adoration includes all the

worship that is to be given to either God or the Saints, but sometimes it is taken more strictly for certain specific acts of worship due to either God or the Saints. Thus it is that Scholastics sometimes include sacrifice, the administration, and reception of Sacraments, petitions for grace and forgiveness, the beating of the breast, the construction of temples, the institution of feasts, vows, and oaths among the acts of adoration. Sometimes they want adoration to be a special act of religion distinct from sacrifice, prayer, vows, oaths, etc. As can be seen in Thomas Aquinas in the second part of the second question 84, where he assigns the first place among the external acts of Latria to adoration, and by adoration, he understands that by which one presents his body to God to be venerated. Therefore, adoration taken in this strict sense consists of external signs of submission exhibited from an internal affection to the one we wish to worship. Such signs are prostration of the body, kneeling, or something similar.

X. Moreover, they teach that Latria, which is the worship proper to God, is easily and best distinguished from Dulia, which is the worship due to creatures concerning internal acts. For internal Latria is a certain supreme prostration and inclination of the will, with the apprehension of God as the first principle and last end, and thus the highest good, which is the kind of adoration appropriate only to God. Internal Dulia, however, is a much lesser inclination of the will, with the apprehension of a certain excellence more than human indeed but much below the divine.

XI. But as for external acts, they say it is not easy to distinguish Dulia from Latria; because almost all the external acts with which either worship is exhibited are common to both Dulia and Latria. However, they exclude sacrifice and what pertains to it, such as temples, altars, and priests, which they believe belong solely to the worship of Latria. For it is not lawful for anyone to offer a sacrifice except to God, or to dedicate temples, altars, and priests.

XII. Although the Doctors of the Roman Church do not want sacrifices to be offered to the Saints, they consider it permissible to offer sacrifices in honor of the Saints, not to the Saints themselves, but to God. Therefore, it is common in the Roman Church to celebrate Masses in honor of the Saints. Although according to the doctrine of that Church, the Mass is properly called a sacrifice, in which the true body of Christ is daily immolated and offered to God the Father. Hence they call Masses by the names of the Saints, such as the Mass of Saint Roch, the Mass of Saint Anthony, etc. They call Masses in this way where there is a particular commemoration of a Saint, and through his merit and intercession, God's help is implored, and solemn thanks are given to God for the glory granted to this or that Saint.

XIII. Although the Doctors of the Roman Church do not want sacrifices to be offered to the Saints, they consider it permissible to offer sacrifices in honor of the Saints, not to the Saints themselves, but to God. Thus, it is common in the Roman Church to celebrate Masses in honor of the Saints. Even though, according to the doctrine of that Church, the Mass is a proper sacrifice in which the true body of Christ is daily immolated and offered to God the Father, they

call Masses by the names of the Saints, such as the Mass of Saint Roch, the Mass of Saint Anthony, etc. They refer to Masses where there is a particular commemoration of a Saint, and through his merit and intercession, God's help is implored, and solemn thanks are given to God for the glory granted to this or that Saint.

XIV. Furthermore, although sacrifices are not offered to the Saints in the Roman Church, various offerings are made to them, and it is customary to consecrate gifts to them in memory of the benefits believed to have been received from them, or obtained through their intercession. Many such offerings can be seen in the churches and chapels named after them.

XV. Even though the Doctors of the Roman Church deny that temples should be built for the Saints, it is nonetheless customary to name and refer to churches by the names of Saints, such as the Church of the Blessed Virgin, the Church of Saint Peter, Paul, Francis, etc. Regarding this matter, not all Doctors of that Church explain their views in the same way. First, some, as reported by Bellarmine, believe that sacred buildings cannot properly be erected except to God, just as sacrifices cannot be offered except to God. However, since many temples are consecrated to God, they distinguish among themselves by naming one after one Saint and another after another Saint; not because they are erected to them, but because the memories of those Saints are particularly honored there, and they are invoked as patrons in those places. Thus, when a temple or sacred building is called, for example, the Church of Saint Peter, the meaning is, according to them, that the temple is dedicated to God in memory and name of Saint Peter; or that it is dedicated to God so that God may be prayed to through the intercession of Saint Peter. Similarly, a certain Mass is called the Mass of Saint Peter, not because the sacrifice is offered to Peter, but because it is offered to God in thanksgiving for the glory given to Saint Peter, and at the same time, Peter is invoked as a patron and advocate before God. (On the Cult of the Saints, Book 3, Chapter 4)

XVI. But Bellarmine himself holds a different view; for in the chapter just cited, his fourth proposition is that sacred houses can be properly erected not only to God but also to the Saints, for two reasons: first, as a temple, second, as a basilica. A sacred house has the nature of a temple insofar as it is erected for offering sacrifices; it is called a basilica insofar as it is erected to adorn the tomb of a Saint and to provide convenience for those visiting the Saint's relics. He acknowledges that it would be idolatry to erect sacred houses to the Saints as temples, but denies that it is idolatry to erect basilicas to them. Just as, he says, it is not idolatry to donate gold or silver reliquaries to the Saints, in which their relics are enclosed; so, a basilica is nothing other than a large reliquary in which smaller reliquaries and tombs are enclosed. Hence, he concludes, it is one thing to say the Mass of Saint Peter, and another to say the Basilica of Saint Peter, since the Mass is not offered to Saint Peter in any way, neither primarily nor secondarily. But the basilica is truly built for Saint Peter, if not primarily, then secondarily. Therefore, he maintains that sacred houses are truly and properly built for the Saints, not under the aspect of a temple, but as a basilica or memorial.

XVII. However, the Roman Pontifical, dealing with the dedication or consecration of sacred buildings, does not designate them by the name of Temple or Basilica but simply calls them Churches and under this name says they are dedicated in honor and name of the Saints. For example, on page 173 of the Paris edition of 1615, it orders that in the Litany recited in such solemn dedication, the name of the Saint in whose honor and name the Church is dedicated should be mentioned in its place. Later, the Pontiff repeatedly prays to God to purify and bless the Church which he consecrates in memory of this or that Saint.

XVIII. In common usage and popular books, which are widely used among the Roman faithful, without any scruple, temples are said to be dedicated and consecrated to the Saints, especially the Blessed Virgin Mary. Thus, in a popular booklet titled "Merbodius on the Veneration and Honor of the Virgin Mary," authored by Alexis de Salo Capuchin, chapter eight begins with these words: "The Church, always led by the Holy Spirit, has at all times erected and consecrated temples and altars to the Mother of God." And later, on page 262 of the same book, it says, "Christians build temples, erect altars, and consecrate vows to her." Similarly, in the Manual of the Sodality printed in Liège in 1624, the following words are found on page 110: "We worship and venerate her with temples, oratories, and altars, which were indeed first erected to God, but in honor and memory of his most dear mother."

XIX. Moreover, what Bellarmine said earlier, that sacred houses are built for the Saints to adorn their tombs and for the convenience of those who visit their relics, and that basilicas named after Saints are large reliquaries in which smaller reliquaries and tombs are enclosed; this should not be taken as if, according to Bellarmine, it is not lawful to build a sacred house for a Saint unless their relics are present there, or as if a sacred house could only be called dedicated to a Saint because it is designated for preserving their relics. For Bellarmine himself, in the same place explaining his mind, teaches that basilicas can be built for the Saints for the purpose that those who come there, reminded by the very name of the basilica, may worship and pray to the Saint whose name it bears and in whose honor and memory it is said to be consecrated.

XX. Furthermore, he maintains that sacred houses can be built for the Saints, not only where their proper relics are found, such as bones and clothes, but also in places where they lived or performed some notable deed. For this reason, he says many churches have been erected in honor of the Blessed Mary and even of the Angels, whose relics cannot be had, namely in places where they appeared and performed some miracles. Indeed, he adds, as we commonly see, basilicas can be built for the Saints to preserve their memory, either by an image or by the name alone. For many churches are called by the name of the Blessed Virgin and are dedicated to her, although no relics of hers are seen there, nor is it reported that she performed any miracle in that place before.

XXI. Regarding the altars, which are also called by the names of the Saints and are said to be consecrated to them, Bellarmine similarly notes that the same stone is called an altar,

insofar as sacrifices are offered on it to God, and is called a tomb or sepulcher, insofar as it touched the bones of some Martyr. For all altars are considered the tombs of the Saints. Thus, altars are said to be dedicated to the Saints, not under the aspect of altars but under the aspect of tombs. For it would be idolatry to erect altars to the Saints, but not idolatry to erect stone tombs for them.

XXII. But the practice of the Roman Church does not align well with this doctrine and observation of Bellarmine. For how many altars are dedicated to the Blessed Virgin in that Church, called by her name, and yet are not her tomb or sepulcher, indeed where no relics of hers are said to be kept?

XXIII. But what is most noteworthy is that the Roman Pontifical, which describes the rites of blessings and consecrations customarily performed by Bishops, a book sanctioned by the public authority of the Roman Pontiffs, indicates that altars are dedicated to the Saints in a manner quite different from what Bellarmine established. For in that book, the consecration of the altar as a certain tomb is separate from its consecration as an altar. Indeed, as a tomb, it is consecrated with these words: "May this Sepulcher be consecrated and sanctified in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." But when the same stone is consecrated as an altar, the Pontiff uses these words: "May this altar be sanctified in honor of Almighty God, and of the glorious Virgin Mary, and of all the Saints, and in the name and memory of Saint N., in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." (Paris Edition, 1615, p. 229)

XXIV. It should be noted that any altar is indeed sanctified in the name and memory of a particular Saint, from whom it takes its name, and in respect to whom it can be considered a tomb, as Bellarmine says. However, all altars are sanctified not only in honor of Almighty God but also in honor of the Virgin Mary and all the Saints, to whom the notion of a tomb does not pertain. According to Bellarmine's recent teaching, it is only under this condition that it is permissible to dedicate altars to the Saints.

XXV. Although it is not permissible, according to the Doctors of the Roman Church, to institute priests for the Saints, it is nevertheless customary in that Church to establish confraternities and sodalities in honor of the Saints, especially the Virgin Mary. These confraternities dedicate themselves to their worship and veneration and, according to their particular institution, adore and invoke them.

XXVI. With regard to feasts, the Doctors of the Roman Church usually consider them among the things proper to the worship of God. However, it is customary in the Roman Church to institute feast days in honor of the Saints. To reconcile this, many of them say that feasts called the feasts of the Saints are not dedicated to the Saints properly but to God in memory and honor of the Saints. Just as temples are consecrated only to God but in honor and memory of the Saints. Similarly, the Mass sacrifice is offered only to God, but this does not prevent the Mass from being celebrated in honor of the Saints, as previously explained.

XXVII. However, others, particularly Bellarmine, maintain that the honor of feast days pertains immediately and terminatively to the Saints as well, although primarily to God and only secondarily to the Saints. They say this kind of worship is *Dulia*, not *Latria*, and is therefore an act of religion; but religion not as the name of a special virtue that disposes man to the worship of God but as a general name. This can be seen in Bellarmine's work, *On the Cult of the Saints*, Book 3, Chapter 16.

XXVIII. The Doctors of the Roman Church also consider the vows made to the Saints as part of their worship. It is very common in that Church to make vows to the Saints, especially the Blessed Virgin, which the Doctors argue is permissible. However, since theologians place vows among the acts of religion owed to God alone, there arises the difficulty of how vows can be made to the Saints without idolatry. According to Thomas's doctrine, the answer is that vows are not properly made to the Saints: vows made to the Saints include two promises; one to the Saints, which is not formally a vow but the matter of a vow; the other to God, which is formally a vow. For example, when someone says, "I vow to the Blessed Mary that I will make a pilgrimage to such a place," he promises this pilgrimage to the Virgin, but this promise is not a vow; and at the same time, implicitly and tacitly, he promises to God that he will fulfill the promise made to the Virgin, and this second promise is truly a vow.

XXIX. However, this solution does not satisfy Bellarmine, because this observation of Thomas can indeed be applied to vows that include a promise made to a mortal man. For example, when someone vows obedience to a prelate, the vow is really made to God alone, although obedience is promised to the prelate. For in that vow, he intends to worship and honor not the prelate but God. But when someone vows fasting or a pilgrimage to the Saints, he intends to honor the Saints religiously. Furthermore, some promises made to the Saints appear to be not only the matter of a vow but a formal vow. Thus, when someone vows to join a religious order, he formulates the vow in this way: "I vow to God, and the Blessed Mary, and all the Saints, to obey such and such a prelate." Here, only the promise made to the prelate is the matter of the vow, while the other promise made to God and the Saints is formally the vow itself.

XXX. Therefore, Bellarmine, following Cajetan, answers differently, namely that vows are made to the Saints not as creatures participating in reason but insofar as they are gods by participation, and as God dwells in them by glory, so that vows said to be made to the Saints are made to God in the Saints; just as curses directed at the Saints are called blasphemies because God is cursed in the Saints.

XXXI. Nevertheless, Bellarmine maintains that those vows made to God in the Saints do not terminate solely to God but also to the Saints, so that they are indeed made to them, just as alms given to Christ in the poor are truly given to the poor themselves. To show that there is no idolatry in this, he says that the vow is not made to the Saints and God in the same way; something is truly and properly promised to the Saints just as it is promised to God, but not with

the same end or intention. For when someone vows and promises something to God, he does so as a sign of gratitude to the first principle of all goods and in recognition of the benefit received from Him as the first author, and therefore that promise is an act of Latria; but something is promised to the Saints as a sign of gratitude only to mediators and intercessors through whom we have received benefits from God; and therefore that promise is not an act of Latria but of Dulia.

XXXII. Bellarmine considers both promises, the one made to the Saints and the one made to God, to be correctly called vows: namely according to the usage of Scripture, in which he admits a vow is said to be made only to God; but according to the usage of the Church. According to which, a vow is a general term, used analogically for promises made to God and the Saints. Among these vows, some distinguish that a vow made to God is absolute, while the one made to the Saints is relative: namely, because although it terminates in a way to the Saints, as has been said, it ultimately refers to the glory and honor of God.

XXXIII. Moreover, Bellarmine's doctrine, already explained, about vows made to the Saints and directed to them, is common and popular in the Roman Church, as it is taught in books commonly used by the Roman faithful. For example, a book called the Manual of the Sodality of the Blessed Mary states: "To this we give honor with the vows made to her, not only as we vow to God out of love and reverence for his mother Mary, calling her as a witness to the obligation by which we bind ourselves to God, and establishing and hoping for the fulfillment of the vow by her glorious and powerful intercession, but also by terminating the vow and promise in her." (Chapter 2, part 3, number 7)

XXXIV. Moreover, the theologians of the Roman Church also consider an oath as an act of Latria or Religion, that is, worship due to God alone. And yet in the Roman Church, it is customary to swear by the Saints and by their relics. To excuse this, they say with Thomas Aquinas that one should not swear except by God, primarily and principally; but it is permissible to swear by creatures, at least secondarily, insofar as divine truth shines in them. Thus, they swear by the Saints, not according to themselves, but as they believed and observed divine truth. This can be seen in Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, 2.2, question 89, article 6.

XXXV. But among the acts of worship due to the Saints, in the Roman Church, particular commendation is given to what is called adoration, which consists of external signs of submission and reverence arising from an internal and true affection of the soul, such as the prostration or bowing of the entire body, genuflection, uncovering of the head, and similar actions. This is the adoration which Gabriel Vasquez contends and tries to prove in several ways that the Saints are to be adored. (In the third part of Thomas, first volume, disputation 97, where the second chapter begins with these words: "The opposite Catholic opinion, confirmed by the perpetual use and tradition of the Church, is that the Saints are owed sacred adoration.")

XXXVI. Particularly, those popular books that the Doctors and Rectors of the Roman Church put into the hands of the faithful strongly commend both internal and external adoration

of the Blessed Virgin; and they require their devotees to testify to their reverence for the holy Virgin by frequent bowing and genuflection, both privately at home and publicly in churches. This can be seen especially in the *Method of Venerating and Honoring the Virgin*, published in Italian by Alexis de Salo, a Capuchin, which was later translated into French and frequently printed with many approvals from Doctors. In the Preface, the author testifies that his aim is to teach many devout and excellent ways of revering and adoring with the deepest (as he says) reverences, that is, by bowing of the body or genuflection, the Queen of Heaven, our lady and mistress. And later he promises first to show the excellence of such adorations. Second, how pleasing they are to the holy Virgin. Third, he will prove with four reasons that she is most worthy of being adored. Finally, he will deal with the way in which these adorations or genuflections are to be practiced and can be devoutly performed both internally and externally.

XXXVII. However, although the Doctors of the Roman Church teach that the adoration given to the Saints pertains to *Dulia* and not to *Latria*, some of them question whether the Virgin Mary can also be adored with *Latria*. And to that question, they answer affirmatively. This can be seen particularly in the works of the Jesuit Francisco Mendoza. When the question is posed, "Can the Blessed Virgin be adored with the adoration of *Latria*?" he notes that three kinds of dignity can be observed in the Virgin. The first dignity consists in her holiness, for which she should be venerated with the adoration of *Dulia*. The second dignity is that she is the Mother of God, for which she should be adored with the adoration of *Hyperdulia*. The third is that she touched our Lord Jesus Christ, for which reason he considers the Virgin to be adored with the adoration of *Latria*. Just as, according to Thomas, the cross and nails and other things that touched the body of Christ should be venerated with the adoration of *Latria*. After considering many objections, he concludes the question as follows: Nevertheless, it must be said that the Blessed Virgin can be adored with the adoration of *Latria* because of her physical contact. Thomas does not absolutely deny this, but only when there is a risk of scandal or idolatry, as his interpreter Cajetan explains. Therefore, if someone is capable of discerning the reasons for adoration and avoiding all scandal, he could adore the Blessed Virgin with the adoration of *Latria* because of her contact with Christ. Although this adoration of *Latria* is not primary and absolute, it is secondary and relative, stemming from the same disposition of religion. (In *Virid.*, Book 2, on Sacred Flowers, Problem 4, as referred by Charles Drelincourt in *On the Honor Due to the Blessed Virgin*, Volume 1, page 355.)

XXXVIII. The doctrine of the Jesuit Francisco Suarez, a highly renowned figure, aligns with this. Inquiring into the primary reason why the Blessed Virgin should be adored, he teaches that there can be three reasons for adoration in the Virgin. The first reason for which the Virgin can be adored, he says, is extrinsic, similar to the cross or the nails of Christ. Just as the cross touched Christ and was an instrument of our redemption, so the Blessed Virgin most perfectly touched Christ and cooperated in our redemption. Thus, the Blessed Virgin is adorably extrinsically, that is, insofar as she touched Christ, so that the entire reason for this adoration is Christ. He speaks of the adoration of *Latria*, at least relatively and secondarily, according to this

reasoning. Therefore, he immediately adds: And yet it should be observed that, although this reason considered speculatively is sufficient for the Virgin to be adored, practically or in use, she should not be adored in this way, especially in the common and public adoration of the Church, not because this is intrinsically evil, for it truly is not. For if someone is capable of discerning the reasons for adoration, avoiding all danger and scandal, there is no disorder or malice in such adoration. But he says the common use of this adoration should be avoided, both because of the risk that someone might attribute divine excellence to the Virgin, and because the greater honor is given to the person adored when she is worshiped absolutely for her intrinsic and proper excellence with an adoration inferior to Latria than if she were adored with relative Latria because of her contact with the divine person. Therefore, he wants the Virgin to be commonly adored for other reasons, namely both for her intrinsic holiness and for her dignity as the Mother of God; which corresponds to a worship inferior to Latria and distinct from Latria. (In the third part of Thomas, question 37, article 4, disputation 22, section 2.)

XXXIX. There is no need to be surprised that such eminent figures in the Roman School, like Vasquez, Suarez, Mendoza, and many others, openly assert as a Catholic truth that the Saints are to be adored; although many in the Roman Church deny this and many others affirm that God alone is to be adored and that they worship no one other than God. For there is no contradiction between them: those who deny that the Saints are to be adored understand this in the sense of the highest and absolute adoration, which belongs to God alone. But those who say the Saints are to be adored mean a form of adoration lower than the highest, which the former do not deny to the Saints.

XL. But the chief part of the worship that is given to holy men and angels in the Roman Church consists in their invocation and prayers directed to them, both vocally and with the mere affection of the heart and internal speech of the mind. To accurately understand the doctrine of the Roman School on this matter, it should be noted that their theologians generally assume that the Saints reigning with Christ do not know everything that happens here on earth, but at least all that pertains to and contributes to their own beatitude. They believe that it contributes to the beatitude of the Saints to know the worship given to them and the prayers and petitions by which the faithful on earth seek their help. Therefore, these theologians are certain that the deceased Saints perceive and understand the prayers of the living directed to them.

XLI. How the Saints hear and perceive the prayers of the living is not certain or defined among them, but various opinions exist. Costerus, in his *Enchiridion*, says there is no doubt that the Saints in heaven know what we do on earth through the intermediaries of angels and those who migrate from this life; especially that divine revelation makes known to them what is done by men to promote their glory. For God, who desires the perfect joy of His saints, hides nothing from them that could in any way affect or complete this joy. Such are the prayers poured out to them by the living and all that is undertaken for their glory.

XLII. However, according to his view, things are revealed to the absent differently than to the Saints enjoying eternal glory. To the former, secrets are made known by inspiration; to the latter, by the contemplation of the divine essence, in which all things are seen, like in a mirror, and are much more perfectly known than in themselves. He added that it is not unreasonable to admit that the Saints in heaven see our deeds on earth. Since they are not impeded by any corporeal bulk, neither the distance of places nor the bodies interposed prevent them from hearing our prayers, seeing our actions, and thus seeing in our hearts and thoughts what we wish to be manifest to them. Just as without an external voice or sensible sign, angels speak to each other and to souls and are heard and understood in turn; so men by their will alone can reveal internal desires and thoughts to spirits, both good and evil, and be understood by them, despite being clothed in a body or separated by any distance, however great. The thoughts and mind of the unwilling, however, are known to no one but God alone, who searches hearts and reins and to whom God chooses to reveal. (Cap. 12. on the Veneration of Saints in the explanation of the second proposition.)

XLIII. Indeed, Henri Holden, a Doctor of Paris, affirms that it can be demonstrated by natural reason that any pure spirit perfectly knows and understands the nature, motions, and actions of all corporeal things. Thus, he attributes gross ignorance to those who think that the Saints reigning in heaven do not hear the prayers of mortals. (In the Analysis of Divine Faith, Book 2, Chapter 7.)

XLIV. However, Bellarmine considers two opinions to be the most probable among the many on this subject. One is of those who say that the Saints see in God, from the beginning of their beatitude, all things that pertain to them in any way, and therefore also our prayers directed to them. The other is of those who think that the Saints do not see our prayers in the Word from the beginning of their beatitude, but that these are revealed to them by God only when we make them. Just as the Prophets knew the future by God's revelation, and many Saints on earth had the gift from God to know the thoughts of men and even the most hidden deeds. The former opinion seems to Bellarmine simply more probable, while the latter is more suitable for convincing heretics. (On the Beatitude of Saints, Book 1, Chapter 20.)

XLV. Secondly, the Doctors of the Roman Church assume that the Saints in heaven not only know the needs of the living but also pray to God with greater charity for their salvation than they did on earth. They not only pray in general for the Militant Church but also specifically for the needs of individuals who seek their help and patronage. Therefore, the Saints can rightly be called our intercessors, advocates with God, and mediators, not of redemption, which belongs to Christ alone, but of intercession.

XLVI. They note, however, that the Saints do not intercede for us directly with God, but their intercession relies on the merit of Christ, through whom they ask for benefits for us from God. These are the words of Bellarmine: "The Saints are not our immediate intercessors with

God, but whatever they obtain for us from God, they obtain through Christ." (Book 1, on the Beatitude of Saints, Chapter 17, Proposition 2.)

XLVII. Furthermore, although the theologians of the Roman School teach that there is no mediator of redemption except Christ, whose death and obedience rendered to God the Father is the only price by which we are redeemed from eternal death, they nevertheless maintain that the Saints can help us not only by their prayers but also by their merits. Not that by their good works they have merited for us grace and salvation, and other benefits we need, as Christ has merited for us; but because God is often moved and induced by their holy works and the piety and charity they have excelled in to grant us various benefits, though He is not bound by any right or special promise to do so. Hence, in the Liturgy of the Mass, they are accustomed to pray to God through the merits of the Saints whose relics they believe they possess, thereby presenting to God the outstanding deeds the Saints have done and suffered for His glory, so that He may be more easily and willingly moved to grant what they ask of Him.

XLVIII. Furthermore, the Doctors of the Roman Church also hold that the faithful living are governed and directed not only by angels but also by the spirits of blessed men. Bellarmine seeks to prove this in many ways in his work on the Beatitude of Saints (Book 1, Chapter 18). Similarly, Costerus believes it is clear from Scriptures that the Saints reigning in heaven with Christ care for and administer earthly affairs, having authority to compel, restrain, and punish the impious and to rescue the pious from their hands. He adds that the Saints, by the benefit of their glory, can accomplish whatever kings can with their power, the wealthy with their riches, and the wise with their wisdom. Therefore, he argues, if kings defeat enemies with their armies, the wealthy help the needy, and doctors heal with their art; the Saints can do these things no less than angels, one of whom destroyed 185,000 in one night, another restored Tobit's sight, took money from Gabael, and enriched the entire family at the marriage of his son, and another liberated Peter from prison, etc. (In the Enchiridion of Controversies, Chapter 12, in the explanation of the fourth proposition.)

XLIX. Furthermore, it is customary in the Roman Church for individual kingdoms, cities, and villages, as well as various guilds and professional groups, to have a particular patron Saint to whom they especially commend themselves. Thus, Luke is considered the patron of doctors, Ivo of advocates, Crispin of shoemakers. Spain has long taken the Apostle James, and the Dominions of Venice the Evangelist Mark as their patrons. Similarly, in various other cases. Moreover, it is also customary to turn to specific Saints for help in certain diseases, dangers, and needs. For example, those in danger at sea seek the help of the Apostle Paul and Nicholas of Myra, Margaret is called upon by women in labor, Roch by those suffering from the plague, Apollonia by those with toothaches; each is believed to provide particular help in these situations.

L. However, the Doctors of that Church warn that all Saints can intercede equally for any needs, and it is free for each faithful person to turn to any Saint to obtain any necessary blessings with their help. It should not be thought that God has assigned specific duties among the Saints in such a way that one is responsible for one matter and another for another, but rather that people of various nations and professions, and in various needs, turn to different Saints based on occasions such as the art or profession the Saint practiced, the type of suffering and death they gloriously endured, the particular gifts of divine grace in which they excelled, a notable miracle they performed either before or after their death, or simply based on some allusion or affinity of names. For example, doctors have chosen Luke as their patron because he practiced medicine. Sailors turn to Paul and Nicholas because, by Paul's favor, God saved the lives of 276 people from shipwreck, and similarly, it is said that God miraculously saved a ship from shipwreck at the prayers of Bishop Nicholas of Myra. This can be seen in Cardinal Perron's work, refuting the response of the King of Great Britain (Book 1, Chapter 3), and also in Jaubert, Archbishop of Arles (Volume 2, against Molineus' Shield, Chapter 1, Section 24).

LI. And these are the foundations on which the doctors of the Roman School build the invocation of saints. However, how the saints should be invoked, and what the difference is between the invocation that God claims for Himself and the one by which we implore the help of the saints, is explained in the Catechism issued by the decree of the Council of Trent. It states: "For we do not invoke God and His saints in the same way; we pray to God that He Himself may either give us good things or deliver us from evil; but we ask the saints, who are gracious to God, to take up our cause so that they may obtain for us from God the things we need." Hence, we use two different formulas; for God, we say, "Have mercy on us, hear us;" for the saint, we say, "Pray for us." Catech. Rom. part 4. cap. 6. sect. 1. num. 3.

LII. Similarly, Bellarmine asserts, "We are not permitted to ask the saints to grant us glory, grace, and other means to happiness as if they were the authors of divine benefits. Therefore, according to him, we should ask nothing from the saints except that they may obtain for us from God what is useful to us." *De Sanct. Beatitudine* lib. 1. cap. 17. Cardinal Perron calls the former invocation, by which someone is invoked as the author of good things, an absolute prayer. The latter, by which someone is asked to pray for us, is called a relative prayer, which terminates not in the saint but in God. And he teaches that the former should be reserved for God alone, while only the latter should be used for the saints. *Adversus Regis Magnæ Britanniae responsum* lib. 5. cap. 1.

LIII. Nevertheless, in the public worship of the Church, many prayers are directed to the saints, in which they are not simply asked to pray for us but to have mercy on us, to deliver us from the evils of body and soul, and to grant us the good things we need. Thus, in the hymn "*Lux mundi beatissima*," these words are addressed to the Blessed Virgin, "We beseech you to be

present, with our supplicant voices, Come now, sweet Lady, Remove our troubles, Confer heavenly gifts." And in the hymn "Ave Maris Stella," this prayer is made to her, "Unique Virgin, Among all gentle, Free us from sin, Make us gentle and chaste; Grant a pure life, Prepare a safe journey, That seeing Jesus, We may always rejoice." In the hymn "Memento salutis author," these words are found, "Mary, Mother of grace, Mother of mercy, Protect us from the enemy, And receive us at the hour of death." Finally, in the antiphon "Alma Redemptoris Mater," Mary is addressed as follows: "Virgin before and after, From Gabriel's mouth taking That 'Hail,' have mercy on sinners." In the Litanies, not indeed received by the public use of the Roman Church but added to Bonaventure's Psalter and published for the use of the Roman faithful, after the Blessed Virgin is often invoked under various titles and praises with "Pray for us," she is finally also addressed, "Be propitious, Spare us, Lady. From all evil, deliver us, Lady. From the wrath of God and His indignation, From dangerous despair, From precipitating pride, From disturbing lust, etc., Deliver us, Lady. Sinners, we beseech you to hear us; That you may preserve the Holy Church, most gracious Lady, We beseech you to hear us." Finally, she is addressed, "Mother with your most holy Son, have mercy on us; Most beloved Mother, Lady, have mercy on us." In the Psalter of Our Lady published in French in Paris, by Claudius Chappelet in the year 1601.

LIV. Similarly, a hymn about John the Baptist begins with these words: "Glorious Baptist of Christ, Who reveal Christ to us, Look upon us with mercy, Cleanse our sins." And in another hymn addressed to him, it is said, "Remove the guilt of our polluted lips, Holy John." To the Apostle John, this prayer is made: "We beseech you, we pray to you, Holy Apostle of God, remove the plague, take away the ulcer, and comfort the afflicted: Drive away disease, slay the enemy, and remove scandal." And in another hymn addressed to John, it is said, "We beseech you with humble hearts, Heavenly Senator: Grant us to see the face of the Word, Who teaches us to believe the Word."

LV. To Saint Martin, this hymn is usually sung, "Martin, equal to the Apostles, Favor us who celebrate your feast, Who wish your disciples to live or die, look upon us. Do what you did before, Now make the prelates glorious, Increase the honor of the Church, Crush the deceptions of Satan. You who thrice conquered Chaos, Raise those sunk in guilt: You who divided your cloak, Clothe us in justice." Finally, to Saint Benedict, it is said in the hymn about his translation, "Grant us to climb the narrow path, Bestow the eternal kingdom." And in the hymn about Saint Nicholas, which begins "The heavenly hall exults," this prayer is directed to him: "O venerable Pontiff, Pious and not tardy Workman, To all who with faithful hearts Seek you in danger, Remove the threats of death, Grant the help of life: That after the exile of the flesh, We may be with you in glory."

LVI. To reconcile these prayers and many other similar ones used in the Roman Church with the above doctrine, Bellarmine notes that when he said, "We should only ask the saints to pray for us," he was not speaking of the words but the sense of the words. For as to the words, he says, it is permitted to say, "Saint Peter, have mercy on me, save me, open the gates of heaven for

me. Also, give me bodily health, give me patience, give me strength, etc., provided we understand, save me, and have mercy on me, by praying for me, give me this or that through your prayers and merits." *De Sanctor. Beatitudine* lib. 1. cap 17.

LVII. Similarly, the Roman Catechism, after saying that to God we say "Have mercy on us" and to the saint "Pray for us," adds by way of explanation, "However, it is also permissible to ask the saints themselves in another manner, that they may have mercy on us; for they are very merciful: so we can pray to them, moved by the misery of our condition, to help us by their grace and intercession with God."

LVIII. However, Bellarmine's exposition just mentioned, which states that prayers to the saints, whatever words they use, have this meaning according to the mind of the Roman Church, that the saints provide what is asked by praying and obtaining it, and not otherwise. This exposition, I say, does not adequately fit those prayers addressed to the saints in which they are not simply asked to absolve sins, sanctify hearts, and open heaven, but to do so by command, power, and authority, such as many prayers found in the public worship of the Roman Church.

LIX. Thus, in the hymn which begins "*Exultet cælum laudibus*," it is said to the apostles: "You who close heaven with a word, and release its bonds, release us from all our sins by your command, we ask. The salvation and sickness of all are subject to your command. Heal the fields from diseases, restoring us to virtues." This is consistent with what is often said to the apostles in the Breviary: "You who close temples to worship, and release their bonds with a word, release us guilty from sin by your command, we ask. The sickness and health of all are subject to your command. Heal languid minds, increase us in virtues." A specific prayer for Peter is composed as follows: "Now good shepherd Peter, kindly receive the prayers of the suppliants, and by your power, release the bonds of sin, which you close and open heaven with a word." This also pertains to John the Baptist: "Now powerful through the merits of our Lord, repel the hard stones of our hearts, smooth the rough path, and direct the winding ways." Here, the saint is asked to provide these things as one powerful through his merits.

LX. Certainly, reason does not allow us to say that what we obtain from God through prayer is done by command, power, or authority. Therefore, the authors of these prayers intended not simply to ask the saints to obtain the goods they requested through their prayers to God, but also to regard the saints not only as intercessors with God but also as dispensers and administrators of these goods under God. Costerus also attests to this view, asserting that the saints are administrators of God's goods. He concludes that the saints should be asked both to intercede with God for us and to help us directly. In the *Enchiridion*, chapter 12, in the explanation of the fifth proposition, Costerus, commenting on the hymn *Ave Maria Stella*, on the words "*Solve vincula reis*," uses the gloss: "Solve by prayers, solve by merits, solve by authority, solve by command. You can remove all external bonds by a mere nod and will." And explaining

other words of the same hymn, "Mala nostra pelle," he says: "Therefore, remove our evils by prayer, merits, and power."

LXI. Moreover, a large part of the worship given to the saints in the Roman Church consists of praises, titles, and eulogies with which they are adorned, which are diligently accumulated in their prayers, hymns, and other devotional books. This kind of honor is especially given to the Blessed Virgin. Thus, she is called absolutely Queen and Lady in their hymns and litanies, Queen of Heaven, Queen and Lady of the World, Queen of Angels, and even Glorious Monarch. She is called Mother of Mercy, Mother of Grace, and the Fountain of all grace; also, the Gate of Heaven, the Happy Gate of Heaven, the Window of Paradise, the Ark of the Covenant, the Star of the Sea, the Morning Star, the Health of the Sick, the Refuge of Sinners, the Help of Christians, the Light of the World driving away all schisms. She is also saluted as the Hope of the World, Our Hope and Life, and the Light driving away all schisms and clouds. She is also said to have saved the world through her, lifted it up, defeated death, and granted life. Examples of these can be found both in the ordinary litanies of the Holy Virgin and in ecclesiastical hymns, along with the Book of Psalms printed in Paris by William Chaudiere in 1582; where the aforementioned hymns are also found.

LXII. Furthermore, in the Paris Breviary, on the Feast of the Assumption, it is said to the same Virgin: "Rejoice, Virgin Mary, you alone have destroyed all heresies in the whole world." And on the second day within the octave of the Assumption, these words are read about her: "She who is closely united to God of hosts, deserves to be called powerful in her own way over hosts and virtues. She is our Warrior, of whom it was said to the ancient serpent, 'She shall crush your head.'" Later, it is recounted that King Philip the Valiant, who obtained a notable victory over the Flemish rebels, dedicated the horse and armor in which he had conquered to the most glorious Virgin. Finally, there is a hymn at the end of the works of Almainus, which Antoninus testifies is publicly sung in the Roman Church, in which these words are said to the Virgin Mary: "Mediatrice of men, Cleanser of sins, Comforter of all, Pardon of sinners, Cleanser of crimes." And in the litanies added to Bonaventure's Psalter, mentioned above, Mary is called the Health and Beatitude, and the Illuminator of Hearts.

LXIII. Private doctors strive to add something to these praises, devising new praises and titles to exalt the Blessed Virgin. Thus, Viegas in the Apocalypse says that she is the Princess and Mistress of all creatures. Jacobus de Voragine says that she rules in Heaven, in the World, and in Hell. Costerus says she is the Queen of Queens, and is absolutely called the Queen of all places and all creatures. The writer under the name of Anselm, in his work on the Excellencies of the Blessed Virgin, says that Mary is the supreme Lady and the only Mistress of heaven and earth. Salazar, a Jesuit, says that the Virgin Mother of God is truly and properly, and not metaphorically, Queen and Supreme Empress because she is the Mother of the supreme King and Emperor of all things; not by any election or privilege, but by natural right. Similarly, Mendoza says that this dominion of the Virgin is not metaphorical but proper and genuine, derived from

maternal dignity. Not only is she the Queen of the world, but she also makes the kings of the world. Finally, the aforementioned Salazar says she is the Queen by political and civil empire; the Lady by direct dominion of all things, and the mistress by power over servants and slaves. And by divine right, she has acquired spiritual dominion over souls.

LXIV. Not only do they subject all creatures to the Virgin as their proper Lady, but they also attribute dominion and authority to her over Christ Himself, now gloriously reigning in heaven. This is related to the old rhythmic prose, often cited by us: "Rejoice, heavenly Matron, You wanted to call yourself the handmaid of Jesus Christ: But as divine law teaches, You are His Lady: For the law and reason teach, that the Mother rules over the Son. Therefore, pray humbly, And command sublimely, That in the evening of the world, He may lead us to the supreme kingdom." These are in harmony with those inserted in the old Paris Missal: "O happy Mother, Expiating our sins, By the right of a Mother, command the Redeemer."

LXV. And although these have been erased from some missals, they have been replaced in others not long ago, and many doctors of the Roman Church approve and defend them. Thus, Cardinal Damian, speaking of the Virgin Mary, says: "She approaches the golden tribunal of the Divine Majesty, not asking but commanding, as a Lady, not a servant." Likewise, Albertus Magnus, in what is called the Bible of Mary, says: "Mary prays as a Daughter, commands as a Sister, and rules as a Mother." Pelbartus of Temeswar says: "Therefore, the supreme dominion of the Blessed Virgin is real, for she rules not only over creatures but even over God as a Mother over her Son. Furthermore, for the salvation of those who pray to her, she can not only pray to her Son, as other saints do, but also command Him with maternal authority. Therefore, the Church prays, 'Show yourself to be a Mother'; as if to say to the Virgin, 'Command imperiously and with maternal authority, pray for us.'" Finally, Bernardinus de Bustis, in whose writings these words are found: "This is a true proposition, that everything is subject to the dominion of the Lord, including the Virgin. And again, this is true, that everything is subject to the dominion of the Virgin, including God."

LXVI. Nor are their more recent followers ashamed; Francis Costerus, a Jesuit, serves as a witness, who addresses the Virgin in this way: "All others pray as servants, but you, as a Mother with authority, are heard out of reverence for you." Also, "What does it mean to be the Mother of God? The Mother is the cause of the Son, the Mother is superior to the Son, honor is due to the Mother from the Son, and the Son is bound to obey the Mother." Another witness is the Jesuit Salazar, who believes that the most holy Virgin has parental authority over her Son so that nothing escapes her universal dominion. And Mary rejoiced in a certain royal power over Christ by maternal right; and that Christ, being both God and Man, was subject to her maternal power and quasi-domination, just like other sons. It is not likely, given the divinity to which His human nature was united, that Christ was emancipated from parental power, which other parents

naturally hold over their children. Indeed, he believes this right still remains with the holy Virgin, and that she often uses it. He says, "The most holy Virgin often used this right and power, but especially when she intercedes with her Son for us." Another witness is John of Argent, also a Jesuit, whose words are cited about the Blessed Virgin, "As if forgetting her condition, assuming dominion over her Son, she placed her throne above the very throne of God." And he further professes that he believes Jesus still serves Mary; "Lord Jesus, most lovable Savior, allow me to do something for your Mother; and if you do not want to believe this, at least allow me to serve you while serving your Mother." Hence, he gives the Blessed Virgin this title, "that she is the Lady of God; this is," he says, "the supreme dignity of the Blessed Virgin, the highest and most adorable power, that God is subject to her, and she has dominion over Him."

LXVII. Not only is the Holy Virgin called the Lady and Queen of all in the Roman Church, but she is also given the name of Goddess by many. This is frequent in their sacred poems, as in this one by Lipsius, "Then to you, Goddess, will every age and sex offer praises." Also, "Is not Judas a Goddess in this generation?" And in this one by Coster, "Lead us, Goddess, to the blessed superiors." And many others. Moreover, those who write prose not rarely give the title of Goddess to the Blessed Virgin: thus Mendoza, a Jesuit, says that through prayer, the Virgin becomes as a Goddess to the whole creation; thus Philippus Beroaldus says, "What greater praise can be said of our Goddess than that she nurtures us with maternal affection and indulgence?" Similarly, Ambrosius Catharinus, one of the fathers of the Council of Trent, citing Augustine, says, "Augustine used the word 'Goddess' for our Lady, which I will not hesitate to repeat." Also, "It is not fitting to call her a mere human who is the Mother of God, who is clothed with the sun, crowned with twelve stars, and has the moon under her feet. Certainly, Goddess, you who were so much a part of the Divinity, that you alone were preserved as the paradise of God, to be cultivated by God's hands." Even Cardinal Bembo, writing on behalf of Leo X to a certain Italian city, advises them to donate better wood for the use of the house of Loreto, "lest you seem to have mocked not only us but also the very Goddess with a useless gift of poor wood." Antoninus and Bernardinus de Bustis also assert that the Blessed Virgin can rightly be called the Goddess of Goddesses, but in consolation of sinners, they prefer to call her the Queen of Mercy.

LXVIII. This can also be referred to what Alexis de Salo and John of Argent say, that God is in the Virgin not only by essence, power, and presence, as in other creatures; nor only by grace, as in the soul of the just; but in a much more excellent way, that is, by identity.

LXIX. Moreover, the dominion attributed to the Virgin according to their doctrine is not an empty name or merely an honorary title, but a true and real power, which she is considered to exercise in many ways over the human race. For they say she is the one who dispenses God's grace and various gifts to all others: thus Jesuit Salazar affirms that all the flow of grace and help is conveyed to us through the Virgin as through the moon; and all spiritual goods are in the power and discretion of the Virgin; indeed, if we are to believe him, "the faithful, while they live

in the world, are carried in the womb of the Virgin, who breathes nothing good of the spirit or inspiration that is not inspired by Mary." It may be said, "All live by the spirit of Mary." Cornelius a Lapide similarly says, "She is the treasurer of divine graces; and Christ placed in her the fullness of all good, so that the Lord willed that we should have nothing except through her hands." Similarly, Pelbartus teaches that Mary is the dispenser of all grace, having jurisdiction and authority in all temporal processes of the Holy Spirit, so that no creature has obtained any grace or virtue of the Holy Spirit except according to her dispensation; and if we believe him, "All gifts, all virtues, and graces, and all good things, which she wills, when she wills, how she wills, and as much as she wills, are administered by her hands."

LXX. Therefore, Bernardinus de Bustis, often mentioned, says that God made the Virgin his Cellar; because God loved her so much that He willed that we should have nothing except through her hands. Hence Alexis de Salo says that the Virgin Mary is the neck through which our Savior, who is the head, flows into the Church, providing all spiritual motion and sensation, being the trunk through which the root supplies life to the branches, producing flowers, fruits, and leaves. She is the basin that receives the abundance of living grace waters and distributes them through her channels to others according to each one's merit and capacity. Jesuit Osorius confirms this, saying that all our good depends on the Virgin; and that the Son, to honor the Mother, committed all the dispensation of grace to her. Salazar even decrees that all other saints can do nothing, and no good flows from them, except through the Virgin as the moon intercedes and moderates their influx.

LXXI. They do not only want this to be understood of spiritual goods but also of temporal ones. Thus Salazar philosophizes about this matter, "Generous men and lovers of their wives, and greatly trusting them, usually commit to them the keys and custody of their money and all domestic expenses; they themselves, meanwhile, attend to more serious duties. Similarly, God, the Greatest and Best, has given to His most holy spouse Mary the same, granting her the custody of temporal goods and the keys, so that whatever of these goods is spent in this great house of the world, it passes through the hands of Mary and is distributed at her discretion."

LXXII. Some even go so far in the Roman Church as to say that Mary is the cause of things and that she made the world and preserves and governs it. For example, Gabriel Biel says: "To her, that is Mary, all things look as to their medium, as to the ark of God, as to the cause of things, as to the business of the ages, and those who dwell in heaven and those in hell, and those who preceded us, and we ourselves, and those who will follow, and the children of our children, and those who will be born from them." And Alanus, who is venerated as a saint, says in similar words: "This Mary is the Lady of all, who made the whole world, and who preserves and governs all things in it." Therefore, Salazar, following Bonaventure, does not hesitate to say to the Virgin, "By your arrangement, most holy Virgin, the world perseveres, which you and God founded from the beginning."

LXXIII. Nor do these seem sufficient to them; they add that the Virgin has done more for God than it seems God Himself has done for mankind. For after Bernardinus the elder, who was canonized, had made a long comparison between God and the Blessed Virgin, he concludes with these words: "Therefore, rendering each one their due, that is, what God did for man and what the Blessed Virgin did for God, you see that it can rightly be said that Mary has done more for God than God did for man; hence God is greatly obligated to us because of the Virgin." This is elaborated and cited in its place by Andrew Rivet in his *Apology for the Most Holy Virgin Mary* and by Charles Drelincourt in his books written accurately and extensively on the honor due to the Blessed Virgin Mary; from which these few things have been excerpted out of many, and to which the curious reader is referred if they wish to read more of this kind and inquire with the authors.

LXXIV. However, these things are said only by private doctors and are not defined by public authority, but the fact that they are not disapproved by the Roman Church is made clear by many and significant signs. Firstly, it is gathered from this, that those who have spoken more harshly on this matter are counted among the saints, such as Bernardine of Siena, Antoninus, Alanus, and Bonaventure. Another significant indication is that the books in which such things are found are approved by many doctors and bishops, and even by some popes. Especially notable is that these statements are diligently inserted and emphasized in books intended for the people and aimed at fostering popular devotion, and this is done not only without prohibition or objection but rather with the open favor of bishops and other pastors.

LXXV. Furthermore, it is evident when Protestants raise these objections, men of great weight and renown in the Roman Church are unwilling to openly condemn them but instead strive to excuse them by all means. This can be seen in the writings of Cardinals Bellarmine and Richelieu, and in those of Peter le Camus, the bishop celebrated for his numerous writings, in his discussion with Charles Drelincourt regarding the honor due to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

LXXVI. Finally, the same is demonstrated by the Expurgatory Indices, which carefully note and order the deletion of what seems suspicious or even ambiguous in the writings of the Roman Church's authors. However, they leave untouched those passages that cause scandal to the Reformed and are often observed and objected to by them as greatly exceeding all bounds of reason and measure. For example, the propositions we have cited from Bernardino, Bembo, Costerus, and Catharinus are not marked by any censure in the Expurgatory Indices. These indices, however, order the deletion of the following propositions from Augustine's writings: "We have not set up temples to the saints nor sacrificed to them. Temples should not be built for angels. It is not lawful to build temples for the saints. To build temples for creatures is sacrilege." Therefore, we rightly conclude that those to whom the censorship of books in the Roman Church is entrusted consider these propositions to be either disapproved or suspicious, but not those about which we are now speaking and in which the aforementioned praises are attributed to the Blessed Virgin.

LXXVII. Moreover, it seems that the honor given to the saints in the Roman Church is greatly increased by the cult of their relics and the images set up in sacred places and worshiped in various ways. However, this should be reserved for special discussion. Here it only remains to note that it is indeed a matter of faith in the Roman Church to believe that the saints can be lawfully and piously invoked. However, they admit it is not necessary for each individual believer to pray and invoke the saints, for someone can attain salvation by invoking God through Christ without such invocation. As can be seen in Henry Holden's "Resolution of Faith," Book 2, Chapter 7: "Indeed, we profess that the saints can be invoked without any harm, but we do not assert that all Catholics are bound to the actual exercise of such invocation as a Christian truth. For some Catholics may indeed be saved who have never invoked the saints crowned in heaven.

THEOLOGICAL THESES On the Cult and Veneration of Angels and Holy Men.

PART TWO.

In which the Doctrine of the Protestants is Explained, Compared with the Doctrine of the Roman School, and confirmed by various Arguments.

Thesis I

In the previous theses, we briefly and clearly explained the Doctrine of the Church and the Roman School regarding the cult and veneration of Angels and Holy Men. To summarize what was stated earlier: The Roman Church bestows a certain kind of veneration on Angels and Holy Men, which is intermediate between the worship due to the Majesty of God and the honor given to those who stand out among men either by civil dignity and authority, or by gifts, virtue, and excellence that nevertheless do not exceed the order of nature.

II. This cult is not of the same univocal kind as the worship that properly belongs to God, but it bears some analogy to it. However, it can be called religious, not in the proper and strict sense, but in a broader and less proper sense. Similarly, the term adoration can also be applied to it, although adoration is often restricted to the worship proper to God.

III. To make this cult more easily distinguishable from the divine, the Schools have designated each with a specific term: they assigned the term Latria to the divine worship, and the term Dulia to the veneration due to Holy Angels and men. This Dulia is further distinguished into hyperdulia, which is attributed to the Blessed Virgin, and dulia properly so-called, which is appropriate for the rest of the Saints; although they acknowledge that in the usage of Scripture this distinction between Latria and Dulia is not always strictly observed.

IV. Furthermore, they argue that the honor which is due to the Saints is greatly different from the divine worship in terms of internal acts and can be easily distinguished; however, this is

not the case with external acts and the external signs of worship and honor, which are commonly used in both the worship of God and the veneration of Saints, except for sacrifice and what specifically refers to sacrifice, such as altars, temples, and priests.

V. Indeed, they do not consider it lawful to offer a sacrifice properly so-called to any creature, although it is very common among them to honor and venerate Saints with sacrifices offered to God in their honor. And this not only in such a way that thanks are given to God for the grace and glory bestowed upon them, but also so that they may be invoked in solemn liturgy, and divine assistance may be implored through their prayers and merits. What is more, the very sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, as they believe, is offered to God through their merits and prayers. For example, in the Mass of Saint Andrew they say, "May our sacrifice be acceptable to you, O Lord, through the intercession of Blessed Andrew the Apostle, in whose honor it is solemnly offered, that by his merits it may become acceptable."

VI. Similarly, although altars, according to the doctrine of the Roman School, should not be consecrated to Saints under the notion of altars, we have shown that their doctors believe they can be consecrated to them under the notion of tombs. Indeed, according to the practice of the Roman Church, each altar is sanctified not only in honor of God but also in honor of the Blessed Virgin and all the Saints. In the same way, temples, according to the opinion and usage of that Church, are not constructed for the Saints as such, but they can and should be built and dedicated to them under the notion of sacred houses and basilicas, in which they are solemnly worshiped and invoked with various rites.

VII. Thus, it is customary throughout the Roman Church to worship Saints in those buildings dedicated to them and named after them, with various rites performed before their relics, statues, and images, by bowing the body and bending the knee, lighting candles, and burning incense, and offering all kinds of gifts. To these they add feast days specifically dedicated to the veneration of the Saints, societies named after them and instituted in their honor, and also frequent vows made and religiously fulfilled in their names.

VIII. However, the principal part of the cult rendered to Saints is their invocation, through which the help and assistance of the Saints departed in Christ are privately and publicly implored. It is assumed that they intercede not only in general for the Church Militant but also for individual members; indeed, they are considered to be the guardians, patrons, and protectors of the human race, who can see the needs of individuals and hear prayers conceived in the heart alone.

IX. Nevertheless, the Doctors of the Roman Church profess that Saints are to be invoked not as if they themselves grant the goods we need, as if they were their authors and dispensers, but that they may obtain them from God by their prayers and merits. This does not prevent them

from frequently asking for any blessings of body and soul simply from the Saints, and using the same forms of prayer to the Saints as they do to God, although they say they direct them to the Saints with a different sense than to God.

X. As for the theologians of the Reformed Church, the doctors of the Roman School are accustomed to charge them with denying all cult and honor to the Saints and simply teaching that Saints should not be venerated. But they are far from that, and all unanimously profess the contrary. They concede that not only divine but also created excellence deserves its own cult and honor; and that the greater the excellence of grace and glory that God communicates to the Saints, which surpasses all civil dignity and natural gifts and privileges, the greater honor and observance are owed to them.

XI. However, no matter how great that observance with which we ought to honor those whom God has adorned with saving grace in this life and crowned with glory in the next, they contend that it differs only in degree from the honor we are bound to give to those who stand out among others by civil authority and dignity, or by some natural virtue and excellence; but it is entirely different in kind from the honor that the divine Majesty demands and requires.

XII. As to what name this honor should be designated by, they consider it of little importance, provided it is clear in what matters it should be constituted, and by what acts and signs it should be testified and exhibited. They do not want it to be simply called religious, because religion properly and directly pertains only to divine worship; but rather civil, or as Augustine puts it, social and affectionate. Not that they confuse it with that worship which civil dignity and certain natural excellence require: for this, as mentioned, it surpasses at least in degree. But since there is a double citizenship, one earthly and the other heavenly, they think it can be called civil by denomination taken not from the earthly city, but from the heavenly; to which grace and glory pertain, and to which that cult and honor should be rendered.

XIII. Abraham Ramburtius explains his view on this matter as follows: "It should be known," he says, "that there is a double honor. There is religious honor due only to God; and there is civil honor given to creatures. Civil honor is further given either in respect of the worldly city, which encompasses all the duties of reverence, love, and fear that are owed to men, even if they are alien to the faith. Thus, we honor princes, parents, elders, wise men, and fellow citizens. Or civil honor is said in respect of the heavenly city, with which we honor the domestic household of faith: and this includes the mutual love with which we embrace each other, as in Romans 12:10; the respectful opinion we hold of our brothers, as in Philippians 2:3; and the solicitude with which the members are mutually affected. Moreover, the observance and reverence, according to the various conditions, excellent gifts, and even the glory of those who constitute that heavenly city. And in this sense, we honor the holy Angels with love, as Augustine says, not with servitude, but with the cult of affection and society, just as in this life we honor the Saints of God; as mentioned above. We praise them in a due manner; we love,

imitate as much as we can, and proclaim their virtues, so that our zeal may increase and be inflamed.” (The Treasury of Sedanen Theses, vol. 2, Theses on Religious and Idolatrous Cult, thesis 16.)

XIV. Vossius teaches similar things in his Theological Theses. After stating that the honor owed to Saints, Angels, and men should not be called religious or servile cult, since it is merely human and civil cult, he immediately adds: “This appellation indeed seems ridiculous to Bellarmine, but unjustly; because those Saints were men; and together with the Angels, they are ‘fellow servants’ with us, as the Apostle teaches, who shows that they share a common servitude with us. But Bellarmine confuses the secular and ecclesiastical cities, of which one is by nature, the other by grace. For we are called citizens of one city, one Republic, and one people, both by reason of the heavenly as well as the earthly city. A part indeed is in the homeland; a part is on pilgrimage from the homeland, as the Apostle says, but although they are absent from us, and we from them, yet both they are present with each other, and we with each other, and God is present with both in the Son through the Holy Spirit. Therefore, since nothing prevents us from being called citizens of one city, there will be no reason why the civil honor given to heavenly citizens should not be called civil just as much as that given to earthly citizens; for although these honors differ in degree, both are civil.” (Disputation 7, thesis 47 and following.)

XV. Daniel Chamierus, however, philosophizes somewhat differently on this matter. He observes that civil cult can be understood in two ways: formally and causally. Civil cult formally is that which is in itself truly civil and distinct, even separate from religious cult. Civil cult causally, whatever it may be in itself, is nevertheless from merely civil causes. Otherwise, a cult that is formally civil can be from non-civil, but supernatural causes. And such, in his view, is the honor owed to Saints reigning with Christ. Although their dignity is supernatural, and therefore the cult owed to them is not causally civil, it is nevertheless entirely distinct from religious cult; and therefore formally civil, unless one prefers to call it officious. (Panstratia, vol. 2, book 19, chapter 5, numbers 2 and 3.)

XVI. Although he does not wish to call the honor by which Saints should be venerated religious, but rather civil or officious, he nonetheless acknowledges that it flows from religion and is an act of religion, not elicited but impetrated. This is seen in the first chapter, number 11, of the book already cited, where he teaches that the cult of God is essentially distinguished from the cult of men by religion. This means there are two kinds of cult: one religious, the other civil. The former is an elicited act of religion; the latter, an impetrated act of the same. For to worship God, he says, is religion itself: just as to love is love itself: and religion is to worship God, just as love is to love. But civil cult flows from religion, that is, from the cult of God: just as in the Samaritan, washing and binding wounds flowed from love. Indeed, it is an effect of religion, not religion itself: just as an effect is not the cause

XVII. Charles Drelincourt observes that something religious can be said in two ways: first rigidly and exactly, as religion properly signifies that which binds souls to God and prescribes the manner of worshiping Him. In this sense, he teaches that only God should be religiously worshiped: nor should the honor by which Saints are venerated be called religious in this sense; for it is entirely of the same species as that by which we honor the faithful living on earth and differs only in degree. But sometimes religious is said in a broader sense to mean all that which not only constitutes the essence of religion but also depends on it and flows from it. And in this sense, he concedes that the honor by which we venerate the Blessed Spirits and the Holy Virgin, the mother of Christ, can be called religious. (Response to the question of Peter le Camus, already mentioned, page 27.)

XVIII. However, the commonly made distinction of religious cult into Latria and Dulia is generally rejected by the doctors of the Reformed School. This is for two reasons. Firstly, because there is only one cult that deserves to be properly and simply called religious: namely, the cult proper to God. The cult rendered to creatures, even the most excellent and holy, cannot be called religious except improperly and equivocally. Secondly, because in the use of Scripture, the terms Latria and Dulia are often confused. For in the Greek interpreters of the Old Testament, the term Latria is sometimes used for human service; but more often, both in the Old and New Testaments, it is restricted to divine cult alone.

XIX. Some Reformed theologians, however, testify that it does not seem inconvenient to them if the term Latria is reserved for divine worship, as proper to it; and the term Dulia is particularly applied to the honor and observance given to creatures, to distinguish it from divine and religious worship. This can be seen in Chamierus. For after establishing for certain that religious cult is entirely due to God, and civil cult pertains to creatures, he adds that for signifying this matter, we can use the terms Latria and Dulia: provided we understand that these names do not indicate different degrees, as if one were more and the other less, but different kinds: so that religious cult and civil cult are entirely different in kind; nor can both Latria and Dulia be compared to each other. (Panstratia, vol. 2, book 19, chapter 1, number 11.)

XX. Gerardus Johannes Vossius in his Theological Theses presents similar views. He states that the distinction between the terms "latria" and "dulia," where the former is said to belong to God alone and the latter also to creatures, is not observed either in the Holy Scriptures or in classical writers, as even Valla, Vives, and others acknowledge. Indeed, the term "dulia," unless taken metaphorically, is less fitting for Saints than for God because in terms of religious worship, it pertains not to the creature but to God, as recognized by Pontifical Perezius, although Bellarmine disputes this in vain. Nevertheless, we do not disapprove of those who support this distinction, partly because a prudent person should avoid all ambiguity, partly because it does not seem useless to apply different names to cults that differ entirely in kind, such as those of God

and creatures, to avoid homonymy, and partly because Augustine did not reject this. Thus, we do not deviate, nor do we support the cause of the Romanists in any way because, as Calvin acknowledges in discussing this distinction, the issue is about the matter, not the term. Namely, what we condemn in the Romanists is that they do not keep their worship pure for God but transfer a large part of divine honor to the Saints.

XXI. Moreover, to see in what this honor consists, which they confess is owed to the blessed spirits in heaven, whether of men or angels, the doctors of the Reformed School state in general that no cult can be lawfully offered to them other than that which is suitable for a creature that is absent or is as if absent, with whom we have no mutual commerce.

XXII. Therefore, they remove from that cult all that, according to the doctrine of Scripture, pertains to divine worship. For a cult to be considered divine, it is not necessary, in their view, for the one offering it to consider the object worshipped as the supreme Deity, upon whom everything depends, who depends on nothing, and who is the first principle and ultimate end of all things: and thus, to terminate their worship absolutely in Him and intend to refer it to no other superior. But it suffices that the cult be such that it truly cannot befit a creature because it presupposes something divine in it; even if the one offering such a cult mistakenly judges otherwise.

XXIII. Therefore, they consider a cult to be divine if it presupposes that the one worshipped, although invisible and not exposed to any senses, can still be viewed by all who worship him, at any time and place, as present; and although requested and invoked simultaneously by countless people scattered everywhere on earth, with various petitions, can perceive and understand all their requests, even those conceived only in the mind, and can help each one at the same moment with the aid they ask from him. Even if the one using such a cult professes that the one he worships is not considered by him as God, but only as a friend and minister of God, in whom he thinks he honors the supreme God Himself: because whatever humans can imagine and presume, in reality, such majesty and power belong to none but God.

XXIV. Moreover, the Reformed theologians believe that many acts and signs pertain to divine worship, no less than sacrifices. These include, in their view, feast days, sacred buildings, and offerings dedicated and hung in sacred buildings, oaths, vows, and prayers by which we ask for the goods of the body and soul, especially the gifts of grace and glory, from anyone. Thus, just as, in the judgment of the Roman School, it would be considered latria to offer sacrifices to a creature under any pretext and would not be excused by saying that one offers the sacrifice to some creature, not absolutely, but relatively, not as to God Himself, but as to a certain friend and minister of God, to whom ultimately that honor of sacrifice, from his intention, is finally referred: so also, according to the Reformed, one is not purged from the crime of offering divine worship to creatures if one dedicates sacred buildings to them, offers them gifts, makes vows to them, swears by them, and asks them for grace and glory, no matter how much one professes to

render and exhibit these things to creatures otherwise than to God Himself, and thus intends to refer these things to God's worship and glory.

XXV. Therefore, they consider it absolutely unlawful to dedicate sacred buildings to angels and saints received into heaven, not only to offer sacrifices to them but also to worship and invoke them with any rites, although they do not condemn the custom of the ancient Church, in which it was customary among other things to build sacred buildings to preserve the memory of the martyrs and give thanks to God for the victories obtained through His grace by them, and for this reason, Eucharistic sacrifices were offered to God, which greatly honored the holy men. This can be seen in Andreas Rivetus' "Consideration on the Third Article of the Judgment of a Learned Man" regarding his "Apology for the Blessed Virgin," found at the end of that Apology.

XXVI. Likewise, they deny that it is lawful to consecrate feast days to angels and blessed men, since feasts pertain to the solemn worship of God, although they see no objection to making special and solemn commemorations of certain saints on certain days, giving thanks to God for the benefits bestowed upon them and through them, and presenting their virtues and notable deeds to the Christian people for imitation. For such feasts are dedicated to God alone, although they greatly honor the holy men, as is customary in the Anglican Church; in whose liturgy the feasts of the Apostles and certain other holy men are commemorated.

XXVII. Similarly, they completely disapprove of the custom of swearing by the Saints and consider it as prohibited as swearing by any creatures, just as offering sacrifices to them is prohibited because Scripture condemns not only those who swear by those who are not gods but also those who offer sacrifices to anyone other than God alone. They see no more reason to swear secondarily by the Saints because divine truth shines in them than to offer sacrifices to them secondarily because they exhibit signs of divine omnipotence and goodness.

XXVIII. They hold the same opinion about vows, which Scripture commands to be made and fulfilled to the Lord alone, and they believe it is no less contrary to true piety to vow to the Saints, considering them as gods by participation or as impetrators of the goods we need than to offer sacrifices and victims to them under the same title.

XXIX. Finally, they do not believe that those escape the crime of divine majesty's violation who in their prayers address the Saints with the same formulas as God, asking them for grace and glory, and any goods of the body and soul, even though they do not consider the Saints as the primary authors of those goods, but only as their dispensers and administrators under God: just as the crime would not be avoided by someone who, under a similar pretext, wanted to offer sacrifices to the Saints.

XXX. Furthermore, the doctors of the Reformed School believe that it is not only unlawful to transfer what pertains to divine worship to angels or saints received into heaven, but

there are also many forms of worship and honor, which we can rightly use towards living humans on earth, that reason and piety forbid to use towards the spirits of the dead.

XXXI. Thus, we courteously greet holy men with whom we converse, uncover our heads to them, and bow our bodies: but we use such signs of honor only towards those present. It would be absurd if someone, in honor of a holy man traveling among the Americans or Chinese, were to bow his body or bend his knees here in France, at home, or in a sacred place. Therefore, since the Saints reigning with Christ in heaven are as far from us as heaven is from earth, they think it is entirely unreasonable to use such signs of honor towards them.

XXXII. Daniel Chamierus, among others, observes this. After establishing that the honor due to Saints is of the same kind as that which ought to be rendered to the living and differs from it only in intention and degree, which create various levels but do not change the species, he notes that this honor should be distinguished in its acts. Some acts are owed to the Saints, which can be rendered to any absent persons. But whatever is rendered only to those present, such as genuflections, salutations, bowings, and many similar things, should not be rendered to the Saints, and much less those things that are for the needy, such as clothes, lights, bread, and wine. (Panstratia, vol. 2, book 19, chapter 2, number 20.)

XXXIII. Moreover, part of the honor we render to those with whom we converse here, or with whom we have mutual commerce, includes asking those of whose piety we are convinced to help us with their prayers to God, and to pray with us for the goods and help we need. No one would ask a pious man living far away, with whom no epistolary commerce is possible, by voice or heart, to pray to God for him: as if someone had addressed Paul in Rome, bound, from Jerusalem long ago, and implored his prayers to God, either verbally or with silent and inward speech. Therefore, Protestants and the Reformed do not ask Saints in Christ who have died to pray for them with the same freedom as they ask the living because those in heaven enjoy beatitude and glory far from us, and there is no reason left by which we can communicate our inner feelings to them.

XXXIV. If anyone supposes that the Saints reigning with Christ in heaven can simultaneously behold all people in any part of the world, hear their prayers, know their thoughts, and even provide the help they are asked for, and perceive and acknowledge whatever is done in their honor; this, they believe, attributes something divine to the Saints, and the signs of honor we are discussing no longer pertain to human but to divine worship.

XXXV. You may ask, then, what remains, according to the doctors of the Reformed Church, by which we can honor and venerate the Saints? I respond, according to them, this honor consists in the pious and frequent commemoration of them; in holding them in high regard; in celebrating their praises when the occasion arises; in diligently recalling and remembering their

virtues and notable deeds; and especially in following their example, embracing their teachings, and striving with all our strength to emulate their faith, love, zeal, courage, patience, and humility by which they have shown us the way.

XXXVI. Thus, according to Frederic Spanheim, the honor due to the Blessed Virgin Mary (from which one can judge the honor appropriate for other Saints) consists firstly in the respectful and notable remembrance of the honor with which God distinguished her above all creatures in His gracious goodness, so that she might be and be called the mother of Him who is the Father and Lord of all. Secondly, it consists in proclaiming her virtues as described to us in the Holy Scriptures: her piety, love, humility, steadfastness, and other such virtues that shone uniquely in this excellent instrument of God and should be set as an example for all. Thirdly, it involves the commendation of the glory and blessedness she enjoys in heaven. (*Dubia Evangelica*, part 2, dub. 48, num. 4.)

XXXVII. Similar views on the honor we render to the Blessed Virgin are taught by Charles Drelincourt. He says, “The honor we render her consists of several things: First, we venerate her memory, speak of her with all reverence, and greatly delight in her praises. Next, with all our heart and all the strength of our souls, we praise God for the grace and benefits He has given us through her. Thirdly, we embrace the faith and religion that issued from her mouth and strive to follow the teachings that the Holy Spirit has left us through this instrument of grace. Moreover, we set her as an example for living rightly, just as for believing rightly. We strive to imitate her piety, love, zeal, purity, humility, patience, constancy, and all the Christian virtues in which she was enriched to an excellent degree. Finally, we extol her blessedness and happiness.” (*Book on the Honor Due to the Blessed Virgin Mary*, chapter 2.)

XXXVIII. Andreas Rivetus elaborates further on the honor owed to rational creatures, whether angels or humans: “If angels are present, we do not know when and where unless they appear to us in a visible form, as happened in the past. Otherwise, we know that some are often present with us and help us; but because we have no verbal communication with them and they are not omnipresent, nor do they scrutinize the recesses of our hearts, we do not usually exchange words with them or greet them with external signs. This we do with present humans and the patriarchs did with angels, whom they hosted at home, thinking they were men. Outside this occasion, we speak of angels (meaning the angels of light) with honor and reverence, valuing their nature, duties, and prompt obedience to God, and propose this for our imitation.”

XXXIX. Speaking of humans, he says, “If there were those who shone with great virtues, especially piety towards God and merits for the Church, their memory is sacred and venerable to us; we speak reverently of them, recall their virtues, propose them for our and others' imitation, pursue them with due praises, and if there is anything else we can render to those we do not see and who do not hear us, we offer it. This kind of honor and worship is more esteemed because it

is free from all flattery and can only come from a mind persuaded of their excellence and valuing their dignity without any regard for personal gain.”

XL. He then advises that we should increase the degrees of respect and veneration according to the measure of God's gifts in such persons and their greater or lesser excellence, giving each their due measure of honor. But we do not serve as slaves those whose works we do not need and who cannot benefit from our services. For we are not servants of the deceased Saints, but co-heirs of the same inheritance and followers of their footsteps as much as we can, which they greatly desired while living, by setting an example in imitating Christ for us to follow.

XLI. He finally adds that we should particularly praise and honor the Blessed Virgin for the great gifts she received from God. He says, “If she were living with us on earth, we would consider it a great honor to receive her in our homes, render all services due to parents, converse with her reverently, greet her with respect, and receive her most holy advice. But since she does not dwell among us on earth, nor do we see or hear her, nor should we believe she is infinite or omnipresent, now that she lives in heaven after fulfilling her role in God's plan, we honor and revere the Blessed Virgin in all ways and means by which the absent can be rightly honored and glorified, except for the worship of religion, which is due only to Him who is omnipresent, omnipotent, and scrutinizes hearts and minds. We obey His will by proclaiming the Blessed and Blessed among women: and we do so for many reasons; because she believed, because it happened to her according to the Word of the Angel; because she gave birth to the Son of God, cared for and nursed Him as an infant, rendered Him the best maternal services, acknowledged Him as her Savior even as a child in the manger; because she believed His words when many contradicted, and because after an exquisitely pious and holy life in this world, she peacefully slept in the Lord and returned her most holy soul to God, enjoying in heaven the beatitude promised by God to those who honor Him, and being exalted in glory according to the measure of grace received here, as God knows. We pursue such with praises, celebrate their memory with grateful hearts, speak of them reverently, propose their virtues as an example for all Christians, especially pious women, and exhort everyone to imitate them in what is worthy of imitation.” (Apology for the Blessed Virgin Mary, book 2, chapter 1.)

XLII. Likewise, John Dallyaeus in his book "On the Object of Religious Worship" teaches: “For we refuse to worship the angels and other blessed spirits with adoration and religious prayers, not out of any contempt for them but from a sense of our duty to God, to whom alone we believe prayers and other religious worship should be offered. While preserving this worship for God, we nevertheless acknowledge the great excellence of the divine work in all the heavenly spirits, the exceptional wisdom, faith, love, sanctity, and blessedness of the Blessed Mary, the saints, martyrs of Christ, and faithful ministers, and often and gladly celebrate their remarkable deeds, words, and struggles in the cause of piety whenever the occasion arises, and we propose them for our imitation to ourselves and others according to our abilities, and we only use their

names and memory with praise, which all show that the saints of God, both angels and humans, are honored and esteemed by us as is fitting.”

XLIII. Furthermore, the honor due to both angels and saints received in heaven, according to the opinions of both divine and ecclesiastical authors, is considered to consist entirely of two things: praise and imitation. The former involves thinking and speaking well of them as the distinguished ministers of God, and the latter consists in faithfully and diligently imitating their conduct and the service they rendered to our common Lord and God.

XLIV. In this praise and imitation of the holy angels and men, the doctors of the Reformed School believe that care must be taken not to attribute to them titles and commendations that are due only to God and Christ. They should also avoid speaking of things they have not seen, nor attribute anything to them that is not established by the word of God. Since sacred Scripture does not teach or indicate that the saints who have died in Christ preside over human affairs or are appointed by God as patrons and guardians of the living, they do not wish to celebrate them as such, nor do they attribute to them the ability to pray for individual believers, to hear and answer individual prayers simultaneously, as this is not revealed by any divine revelation.

XLV. Whether the saints at least pray in general for the Church Militant, some among the Reformed are unwilling to affirm for certain and suspend their judgment on the matter, as Charles Drelincourt frequently mentioned, who considers it uncertain whether the saints pray for the Church and places this among the hidden things of God, not revealed to us because Scripture nowhere clearly and expressly teaches it. (On the Honor Due to the Blessed Virgin, vol. 2, p. 106, num. 179, and following.)

XLVI. Similarly, Chamier, when posed with the question of whether the souls of the Saints pray for us in general, that is, universally for the Christian Church and the entire body of the faithful, declares that it is not established by any certain argument. Although he admits it has some degree of plausibility, he leaves the matter undecided so that each may follow their own judgment. (Panstratia, vol. 2, book 8, chapter 3.)

XLVII. Others, however, readily concede and consider it probable that the Saints reigning with Christ in heaven at least pray in general for the Church fighting here on earth. This seems quite consistent with the love they possess and the communion that exists between the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant. Andreas Rivetus expresses his opinion on this matter, saying, "We do not deny that the Church of the Saints reigning with Christ is concerned for the members fighting here. But that care is general, not from knowledge of individual conditions but from their general awareness that, since the whole Church is not yet received where they reign, there are always some fighting on earth, for whose preservation and completion they pray to God, always seeking the increase of His kingdom." (Summary of Controversies, second tract, question 48.)

XLVIII. Peter Moulin holds a similar view. He says, "The blessed spirits, although they do not see what is happening here, nor do they know individuals, are aware that the Church is constantly engaged in perpetual struggles against its adversaries. And since their love has been increased rather than diminished by glorification, it is consistent that they are concerned for the Church Militant." (The Treasure of Theses from Sedan, vol. 1, Theses on the Parts of the Saints, thesis 3.)

XLVI. Similarly, Chamier, when posed with the question of whether the souls of the Saints pray for us in general, that is, universally for the Christian Church and the entire body of the faithful, declares that it is not established by any certain argument. Although he admits it has some degree of plausibility, he leaves the matter undecided so that each may follow their own judgment. (Panstratia, vol. 2, book 8, chapter 3.)

XLVII. Others, however, readily concede and consider it probable that the Saints reigning with Christ in heaven at least pray in general for the Church fighting here on earth. This seems quite consistent with the love they possess and the communion that exists between the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant. Andreas Rivetus expresses his opinion on this matter, saying, "We do not deny that the Church of the Saints reigning with Christ is concerned for the members fighting here. But that care is general, not from knowledge of individual conditions but from their general awareness that, since the whole Church is not yet received where they reign, there are always some fighting on earth, for whose preservation and completion they pray to God, always seeking the increase of His kingdom." (Summary of Controversies, second tract, question 48.)

XLVIII. Peter Moulin holds a similar view. He says, "The blessed spirits, although they do not see what is happening here, nor do they know individuals, are aware that the Church is constantly engaged in perpetual struggles against its adversaries. And since their love has been increased rather than diminished by glorification, it is consistent that they are concerned for the Church Militant." (The Treasure of Theses from Sedan, vol. 1, Theses on the Parts of the Saints, thesis 3.)

XLIX. However, whatever the case may be, the Reformed Theologians unanimously deny that the Saints are and can rightly be called our Intercessors and Advocates. They argue that only one who can hear and perceive all prayers of everyone at all times and who has the office of presenting and commending them to God deserves the title of our intercessor with God. They believe this role belongs solely to our Lord Jesus Christ. No one would say that the faithful here on earth are our intercessors and advocates merely because we ought to pray for one another out of mutual charity.

L. They also reject the notion that the blessings we receive should be attributed to the merits of the Saints, or that anything should be asked of God through their merits. They assert that the Saints, who owed everything they were to divine grace, could not merit anything for

themselves or others, strictly speaking. Nevertheless, they acknowledge that through the communion of Saints, the good and pious works performed by individual members of the Church through God's grace can somehow draw God's blessing and favor upon the entire body. Indeed, they believe that God, considering the pious and righteous, sometimes spares the wicked among whom they live and grants them time and means to repent, as the Lord professed to Abraham that He would have spared Sodom and Gomorrah if ten righteous people had been found there.

LI. Furthermore, from what has been presented in these and the preceding theses, it is clear that there is no controversy here about whether blessed humans and Angels are worthy of some honor and veneration and should be regarded with affection by us. This is freely admitted and taught by the Reformed Theologians, and the contrary cannot be imputed to them without slander.

LII. Moreover, it is evident that the Roman School Doctors and the Reformed agree that the veneration owed to human Saints and Angels does not belong to the same univocal genus as the divine worship and therefore is not of the same species. They agree that such veneration is not religious in the proper and strict sense but only in a broader and less proper sense, according to which the honor given to Saints can be called religious, as distinguished Reformed Theologians expressly admit.

LIII. We have also shown that the Roman School Doctors acknowledge that the distinction of religious worship into Latria and Dulia is an invention of the School, and that this distinction, as used in the Roman School, is not exactly maintained in Scripture. They admit that Dulia is often restricted to the worship proper to God, while Latria is sometimes extended to human service. Conversely, the Reformed School Doctors do not strongly oppose the use of Latria for divine worship and Dulia for the veneration owed to creatures, for the sake of distinction.

LIV. Therefore, the entire difficulty and question reduce to this: In what does the honor consist that can be legitimately rendered to the holy and blessed creatures, especially the Blessed Virgin Mary? Specifically, whether sacred buildings can not only be named after Saints and Angels for the sake of designation but also constructed so that in them the Angels and Saints who have been received into heaven are publicly invoked and venerated with various rites, including bowing the knee and bending the body before them, burning incense, lighting candles, and offering various gifts? Whether it is permissible to swear by them and make vows to them, relatively to God, that is, insofar as God's truth shines in them and God dwells in them by His glory? And finally, whether we can ask them to pray for us, not simply, but to direct prayers to them, though in a different sense, yet conceived in the same words and forms as those we direct to God? This is affirmed by the Roman School Doctors and confirmed by the practice of the Roman Church, but denied by Protestants by common consent.

LV. Furthermore, it is in controversy whether it is permissible to celebrate the Saints who have died in Christ as the guardians and patrons of the human race, to whom the management of our affairs has been entrusted by God; and to regard them as such mediators and intercessors before God who can at all times hear and perceive the prayers of all men, whether conceived in the heart or spoken aloud, and present and commend them to God, and assist us by their suffrages and merits. Especially whether the Blessed Virgin should be acknowledged and proclaimed as the Queen of heaven and the entire world and the Lady of all creatures; as the one through whom the world was saved, and who alone has destroyed all heresies, and as the Mother of mercy, the Mother and fountain of grace, our life and hope of salvation. All these are approved by the practice of the Roman Church but disapproved and condemned by Protestants.

LVI. Moreover, Protestants are scandalized by many other praises heaped upon the Blessed Virgin and the Saints by certain private Doctors, but not disapproved or prohibited by the Roman Church: such as the title of goddess attributed to the Virgin Mary, the Saints being called tutelary deities, as in an inscription I remember reading a few years ago in a church dedicated to Saint Peter at Troyes, "Peter, Helena, and Mascidia, Tutelary Deities of the People of Troyes." And that the Virgin Mary is attributed dominion and authority over her own Son, and the power to dispense all the gifts of grace and nature under God and to communicate them to whom she will. She is called the illuminator of hearts and the cause of things; indeed, she is said to have founded and created the world and to preserve and govern all that is in it. Many such things, for the sake of brevity, are omitted here.

LVII. Therefore, Protestants prove that blessed spirits, whether human or angelic, should not be venerated with the type of worship given to them in the Roman Church when sacred buildings and altars are constructed and dedicated in their honor, candles are lit, incense is burned, and knees are bent before them as if they were present, vows are made to them, various offerings are given, and oaths are taken in their name; and finally, when solemn prayers are directed to them for help and aid, and hymns are publicly sung to them in thanksgiving for benefits received from God, and so forth. Nor should Angels and Saints in Christ be venerated in this way, Protestants argue first because such worship should not have been devised by humans without God's word. Otherwise, it would be offered without faith since no one could be sure it is pleasing and acceptable to God without His word. Therefore, if it is clear that such worship is not based on any command or revelation from God, it can be justly rejected among those practices condemned by the Apostle. It is clear that this entire worship has no foundation in God's word because there is no precept or example of it in the entire Scripture, whether Old or New Testament.

LVIII. As for the Old Testament, the Roman Church doctors themselves admit that the worship given to deceased Saints, as it is practiced among them, was not used in the Old Testament Church. They explain this by saying that the souls of the Saints at that time did not yet enjoy the heavenly glory and beatitude to which they were elevated after Christ's advent, but

were detained in a sort of prison, which they call the Limbo of the Fathers. However, there is no reason why the worship given to Angels, if legitimate, should not have been given under the Old Testament. Indeed, if Angels were ever to be worshiped, they should have been worshiped most then, when God frequently used the ministry of Angels in governing the ancient people, and their appearances were frequent in the Jewish Church. For God often used them as messengers among the faithful. However, in the Church of the New Testament, God has spoken to us through the Son, to whom, not to Angels, He subjected the world to come, as the Apostle teaches in Hebrews 2:5. Yet, it cannot be shown from sacred Scripture or from any historical and Jewish sources that any part of public worship was given to Angels: for example, no chapel or oratory was consecrated in their honor, no festivals were celebrated, not even a single candle or grain of incense was offered or lit for them; nor were any prayers addressed to them in public assemblies of the faithful, nor hymns sung to them, nor any form of adoration exhibited. On the contrary, it is universally agreed that nothing prevented, and it would have been most fitting, to honor Angels with such worship among the Jews, if it were permissible among us.

LIX. Under the New Testament, Christ and the Apostles made no changes in this matter; nor did they establish any new worship by which Angels and the spirits of the righteous admitted to the vision of God would be venerated. Indeed, there is no command, example, or even the slightest indication of this in the entire New Testament Scripture: nowhere are we admonished to invoke Angels or deceased Saints, seek their help, sing hymns to them publicly, or honor them with incense, sacrifices, sacred buildings, or any other external acts of adoration.

LX. Not only is there a complete silence on these matters in the New Testament writings, but nothing similar can be found in the ecclesiastical tradition of the first three centuries. There were many illustrious writers among Christians during that time whose works survive and are widely known: such as Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, and Arnobius among the Latins; and Justin, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and many others among the Greeks. Nowhere in their writings is there any mention of worship similar to that in the Roman Church today being given to Angels and deceased Saints, or even proposed to be given. On the contrary, there are many and very clear indications against it.

LXI. Firstly, the ecclesiastical writers of the second and third centuries after Christ were mostly of the opinion that the souls of all the faithful, even the most holy, were kept in certain places outside of heaven until the day of final judgment, and were not admitted to the celestial homeland until after the resurrection of the body. Some of them, indeed, by a special prerogative, assign a special place to the martyrs, which they call Paradise. But by that name, they do not mean the highest heaven, where the martyrs see the Lord face to face; rather, they refer to a certain sub-celestial region, the bosom of Abraham, where the souls of the rest of the righteous rest, a more pleasant and delightful place, but not capable of heavenly glory, as shown in detail by the renowned Johannes Dallaeus against Cardinals Bellarmine and Perron. Therefore, it is evident that the dogma of the veneration and invocation of Saints, as now held in the Roman

Church, had not yet been received as Apostolic tradition in those early centuries of Christianity. For that worship is based on the hypothesis of the highest glory and beatitude of the Saints, which, according to the Roman School, the souls of the Saints were not admitted to before Christ's advent; hence, they admit that the Saints had not yet been solemnly venerated and invoked. (*On Penances and Satisfactions, book 5, chapters 3, 4, 5, 66, and On the Object of Religious Worship, book 3, chapter 22.)

LXII. Furthermore, it is evident from the most ancient liturgies that have survived that the early Christians offered prayers and supplications to God for all the deceased, even the most holy, the martyrs, the apostles, and indeed the Virgin Mother of God. In these liturgies, they ask God to grant them rest in the land of the living, bestow upon them the goods of His promises, and provide them with good rest and remembrance; not simply, as Bellarmine futilely contends, offering thanksgiving for them. Indeed, since the time when the religious veneration and invocation of Saints was publicly accepted, it has been considered an oracle of Augustine's saying, "It is an insult to the martyr to pray for the martyr." And no one would ever consider using the solemn invocation that the Roman Church teaches should be given to the Saints reigning with Christ for those who need our prayers commended to God.

LXIII. Furthermore, when the wise men of the Gentiles professed to acknowledge only one supreme God, they still regarded other beings they called gods as ministers of that supreme deity, worshipped in a secondary place. When Christians were accused of neglecting these lower powers, which were nonetheless worthy of some veneration, the early Christians honestly admitted that they worshipped only one supreme God, defending this as legitimate and right. They did not concede that any part of religious worship was owed to the good and holy ministers of God, nor did they distinguish religious worship into supreme and subordinate, or absolute and relative worship. This would have been demanded by candor, charity, and prudence if they had shared the same views on the veneration of Saints and Angels as the present Roman Church.

LXIV. In response to this accusation from the pagans, they replied with Arnobius: "For the worship of Divinity, it is sufficient for us that we have God the first, the Father of things and Lord, the Creator and Governor of all. In Him, we worship all that is to be worshipped, and venerate what should be venerated. Since we hold to the head of Divinity itself, from which all Divinity of all the divine beings, whatever they are, is derived, we consider it superfluous to go through each one individually, since we do not even know who they are, what their names are, or their numbers, which we cannot comprehend, or explore." He then illustrates this with the same analogy of royal courts that the pagans used in this matter: "Just as in earthly kingdoms, we are not compelled to individually adore those established in the households of kings by necessity, but in the worship of kings themselves, whatever is connected to them is understood to be comprehended in silent honor; so too, whoever these gods are, whom you propose to us, if they are royal offspring and originate from the principal head, even if they receive no individual

worship from us, they understand themselves to be honored collectively with their King and included in His veneration." (Against the Gentiles, book 3, beginning.)

LXV. This aligns with what Origen teaches on a similar topic. For Celsus argued that while one should never deviate from the worship of God and should keep the soul directed to Him in all work and thought, this does not preclude the placation and propitiation of various powers established under God, and that this redounds to the honor of the supreme deity. Origen, a distinguished doctor of the early Church, responds: "To ensure that the Angels of God are favorable to us and do everything for us, our first affection for God is sufficient, as is our disposition, as far as human nature can, imitating the judgment of the Angels who imitate God. Secondly, our grasp of the Word of God and the Son of God to the best of our ability. Also, the living God, the Lord of all, must be placated by us, and to have Him favorable, we must pray, who is propitiated by piety and all virtue. But if anyone wishes to have others under this supreme God favorable as well, let him consider that just as with a moving body, its shadow also moves; so, when one has the supreme God favorable, it follows that all His friends, Angels, souls, and spirits, who are worthy of God's favor, are also favorable, not only being well-disposed themselves but also assisting those who want to worship God, placating Him, and praying and petitioning together with us; so that we may dare to say to men who choose and follow better things with a firm purpose of mind, that whenever they pray to God, innumerable sacred powers, uninvoked, pray together with them, presenting themselves as companions to our fragile and mortal race, and, so to speak, competing and collaborating with us in this struggle." (Against Celsus, book 5.)

LXVI. It is very noteworthy what Origen says, that innumerable sacred powers, by which he designates Angels and Blessed Spirits, wish to worship God together with us, praying indeed, but uninvoked. For he not only teaches in general that only one God is to be worshiped and religiously adored indivisibly and inseparably, but also that our prayers should be directed to Him alone, and not any form of prayer or invocation should be used towards Blessed Angels or any other creatures. "Away with this council of Celsus," he says, "which commands us to pray to demons (that is, spirits who minister to the highest God, according to the Platonic manner and usage of speech) who ought not to be heard at all. For prayers ought to be offered only to the Supreme God; and indeed, they should be offered to the only-begotten Word of God, the firstborn of all creation, who should be invoked as the High Priest, so that He may bring our prayer, which reaches Him, to His own God and our God, His Father and our Father." (Against Celsus, book 8.) In the fifth book of the same work, he says, "Every prayer and supplication, every intercession, and thanksgiving should be sent up to the Supreme God, the Lord of all, through the living Word, God, and the High Priest who is above all the angels. But we will also pray to the Word Himself, and intercede with Him, and give thanks to Him, and offer our prayers to Him, if we can understand the proper and catachrestic use of prayer. For it is unreasonable to invoke angels from us, who have not received the knowledge of their nature, which is placed above men. And even if we comprehend their nature, which is wonderful and mysterious, this

very knowledge of their nature and their appointments and orders will prohibit us from daring to pray to anyone other than the Lord who is above all, and who is abundantly sufficient for all things, through our Savior, the Son of God." (Against Celsus, book 5.)

LXVII. Here it is also to be noted that Origen, like many other doctors of the Christian school of his age, believed that the sun, moon, and stars are certain rational living beings, endowed with virtue and illuminated with the light of knowledge from that wisdom which is the splendor of eternal light. Nor did he in any way disagree with Celsus, who proclaimed them as the most illustrious heralds of higher things, and truly celestial angels, being thoroughly convinced that the sun, moon, and stars offered prayers to God, the Lord of all things, through His only-begotten. Therefore, if, according to Origen's opinion, the angels of God are worthy of some religious worship, the sun, moon, and stars should be considered worthy of the same. However, when Celsus questioned why the Jews did not worship the sun, moon, and planets, Origen not only denied in general that it was lawful to worship and adore these creatures but also affirmed that it was unlawful to supplicate them and sing hymns to them. "We judge," he said, "that it is not proper to pray to those who themselves pray. Rather, the sun and the stars themselves would want us to be directed to God, whom they themselves pray to, rather than being directed to themselves, or dividing the power of prayer we have from God and attributing a part of it to themselves. And he adds, since the Lord is with us everywhere and is near us, it is absurd to seek to pray to Him who does not reach everything, to the sun and the moon, or any other star. Finally, when Celsus writes that it would seem that we honor the great God more if we also sing hymns to the sun, moon, and stars, Origen responds that he knows the contrary: 'For we sing hymns only to God, the Lord of all, and to His only-begotten Word.'" (Against Celsus, book 5.)

LXVIII. Nor should anyone say, along with Cardinal Perron, that when Origen denies that angels are to be prayed to and invoked, he is speaking about the absolute prayer, not about what is called relative prayer, which the Roman School teaches is the only kind to be used with angels. For Celsus himself, against whom Origen argues, did not consider angels, or as he speaks with Plato, demons, to be worshipped with the highest and absolute worship, but with that which refers to the supreme God, of whom they are ministers. Therefore, since Origen denies that they are to be invoked in the manner that Celsus and other wise pagans desired, it is clear that, according to Origen, it is not lawful to use either absolute or relative invocation with them. Moreover, Origen, when he says that they pray for us uninvoked, clearly indicates that they should not even be asked to pray to God for us: which is to deny them relative prayer, not just absolute.

LXIX. Therefore, when Origen, in the eighth book against Celsus, insinuates a certain form of honor and respect due to the true ministers of God, Gabriel, Michael, and the other

angels and archangels, this honor, according to Origen's teaching, can in no way consist in any form of their adoration and invocation, which he contends belongs solely and indivisibly to the one supreme God; but in the acknowledgment and celebration of their blessedness, glory, and holiness, and also in the pious imitation of their obedience and love towards God, which he admits is how we should honor the holy angels.

LXX. But to return to Holy Scripture, not only does it not contain any command or example of worshipping angels or deceased saints, but it also repeatedly teaches that only one God is to be worshipped, and that religious worship should be given to Him alone; therefore, no religious worship is to be offered to angels or saints who have died in Christ. The doctors of the Roman School respond that Scripture only prohibits giving creatures that highest and absolute worship, which belongs to someone as the first principle and ultimate end, to which they have appropriated the name *Latria*, but that it is not forbidden to give a lower form of religious worship, which they call *Dulia*, to God's ministers and friends, such as angels and the spirits of the just received into heavenly glory.

LXXI. But the sacred Scripture, when it prohibits worshipping and serving creatures, does not simply forbid recognizing them as the first principle and ultimate end and worshipping them under this aspect; but it forbids exercising any acts of religious adoration towards them under any pretext, such as publicly invoking them, singing hymns to them, offering incense to them, dedicating sacred buildings and feast days to them, swearing by their name, making vows to them, and similar acts.

LXXII. This is clearly proved by the fact that the wise men of the Gentiles are accused by the Apostle of worshipping and serving the creature rather than the Creator because they religiously worshipped the sun, moon, and stars, heroes, and spirits. And yet it is certain that these wise Gentiles did not regard the sun, heroes, and spirits as the highest gods, but as ministers of the highest God, whom they called the Father of gods and men, and whom they believed to be honored in those lower gods. (Romans 1:25)

LXXIII. Thus Orosius reports that the pagans used to admit that they did not follow many gods, but revered many ministers under one great God. Similarly, the ancient writer of the *Recognitions* introduces the same pagans as saying, "We also say that there is one God who is the Lord of all. But these are gods. Just as there is one Caesar, who has many judges under him, such as prefects, consuls, tribunes, and other powers, so we believe that there is one God of all, who has arranged these [gods] in this world under Him, subject to the greater God, but also dispensing affairs in this world." (Orosius, *History*, book 6, beginning; Clement, *Recognitions*, book 5)

LXXIV. Therefore, when Celsus, in Origen's work, affirms that those who worship many gods, by worshipping one who is subordinate to the supreme God, are pleasing to the supreme God: "For no one is to be honored unless he whom the supreme God wants to be honored: therefore, whoever worships his subjects does not offend him whose subjects they all are." He wants the lower powers under the supreme God to be worshiped in such a way that God is never left out, neither by night, nor by day, neither in private nor in public, neither in any thoughts nor in works, but always with the soul intent on God, whether with or without these [powers]. (Against Celsus, book 5)

LXXV. This is consistent with what Hierocles teaches: the gods should be recognized and worshipped as distinct from their author and parent, but their dignity should not be excessively elevated; ultimately, all worship should be referred to their single creator, whom you may properly call the supreme and best. (Hierocles, On the Golden Verses of Pythagoras)

LXXVI. Therefore, since the wise men of the pagans worshipped the sun, moon, and spirits with a certain inferior worship, not as supreme gods, but only as ministers of the supreme God, and referred all this worship to the honor of the supreme God, as is evident from the cited testimonies; and yet are said by the apostle to have exhibited Latria, that is, divine worship, to the creature, it is clear that those who worship angels and deceased saints with prayers and hymns, vows and oaths conceived in their name, various offerings, sacred buildings, and feast days dedicated to their honor, cannot be purged from the crime of Latria, even if they protest that they do all these things not as to supreme gods, but as to God's ministers and friends, and therefore gods only by participation; and that these acts are ultimately referred to the honor of the supreme God.

LXXVII. Nor should anyone say that the pagans are accused by the apostle of offering Latria to creatures because they offered sacrifices to them, which by all admission pertain to the worship of Latria. For the sacred Scripture condemns the Gentiles not only for sacrificing to creatures but also for worshipping them with a holy kiss. From this crime, the holy man Job declares himself to be free, saying, "If I have seen the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand." (Job 31:26-27)

LXXVIII. Moreover, according to the hypothesis of the doctors of the Roman School, if it is permitted to worship creatures even with Latria, provided it is not absolute but relative, no solid reason can be given why it should not be permissible to sacrifice to them relatively. And if it is good and pious to make vows to angels and saints reigning with Christ, and to swear by them, insofar as God dwells in them by glory and divine truth shines in them, and they are gods by participation, why should it be impious and forbidden to offer sacrifices to them on this account and in this respect? Nor did the ancient doctors of the Church reserve sacrifices alone for

the divine worship which it is unlawful to give to creatures; but as we have seen above, they also reserved prayers and hymns, which they teach should be directed only to God, the Lord of all.

LXXIX. But sacred Scripture not only says in general that one God is to be worshipped and that Latria is not to be given to creatures, but also specifically forbids giving any religious worship to angels. If it is not permitted to worship angels religiously, much less will it be permitted to apply such worship to deceased saints; since angels surpass humans in the excellence of their nature, and are not inferior to saints in grace and glory. The Apostle Paul expressly condemns the religious worship of angels. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind." (Colossians 2:18) Here the Apostle simply prohibits the worship of angels. It cannot be reasonably denied that those who build sacred buildings in honor of angels, dedicate feast days to them, solemnly invoke them in religious places, seek their patronage and protection with prayers, and bow their knees and prostrate themselves before them as if they were present and looking on, do indeed worship angels religiously. Therefore, according to Paul's mind, such people are either deceived by them or vainly puffed up by their fleshly mind.

LXXX. If, according to the Apostle's judgment, any such worship was due to angels, if it was permissible to dedicate feasts and oratories to angels, to sing hymns to them in the public assemblies of the faithful, to invoke them and prostrate themselves before them, he would not have simply condemned the worship of angels; but if there was anything excessive in the religious worship of angels introduced by impostors among the Colossians, he would have distinctly noted it and separated the legitimate worship of angels from the illegitimate in some way: as the doctors of the Roman School would undoubtedly do if any sect were to arise now which, in their judgment, attributed too much to angels in this regard.

LXXXI. To this, the doctors of the Roman Church respond with various arguments and inventions; but their vanity immediately becomes apparent to anyone who weighs and considers the matter without affection and prejudice. Cardinal Perron wants to understand by the term "worship of angels" not the worship given to angels but rather that which was taught by angels; and by this term, he conjectures is meant the Jewish religion, or Mosaic rites, since in other places the law is said by Paul to have been ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Hence, according to his interpretation, the Apostle's goal is to recall the Colossians from Jewish worship and the ceremonies of the Mosaic law. (Against the King of Great Britain, book 5, chapter 6)

LXXXII. But this interpretation of Perron is entirely new and unheard of among Christians until his time. For not only do the ancient writers, such as Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary under the name of Ambrose, Pelagius under the name of Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Oecumenius, understand by the worship of angels that which has angels as its object; but no interpreter of the Roman Church, before Perron, ever took Paul's words in that sense. Nor could

the authority of such a great Cardinal persuade the most learned men in that Church after him to approve of this interpretation. But it was explicitly rejected by them as empty, as among others by the Jesuit Petavius, a notable antiquarian. (Theological Dogmas, volume 3, book 2, chapter 9, paragraph 16)

LXXXIII. Certainly, in sacred Scripture, the Mosaic law is nowhere called the worship of angels, nor can any example of this nomenclature be found among any authors, whether profane or ecclesiastical. Nor, even if this term were used, could it be applied to this passage of Paul. For Paul, in the preceding verses, abundantly fortified the Colossians against the fraud of the Judaizing impostors, saying, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." What need would there be to repeat the same matter in those obscure and ambiguous words? Moreover, Paul asserts that those who introduce the worship of angels walk in things they have not seen, that is, they intrude into things they do not know and babble about unknown matters: which indeed fits well with the worshippers of angels, who utter many incomprehensible things about the nature, orders, and offices of angels; but it does not fit those who are addicted to the Mosaic law; since the Mosaic discipline is accurately explained in the sacred volumes and open to all who wish to know it.

LXXXIV. Therefore, the theologians of the Roman School resort to another solution to defend their Church's faith and practice against such clear apostolic law. The solution of many of the more learned among them is that the Apostle does not condemn the religious worship and invocation of angels or saints, but only false, superstitious, and idolatrous worship. They say that Simon Magus, Cerinthus, and their disciples taught such worship. But this is merely their invention, which has no foundation in the Apostle's words or doctrine. For the Apostle does not teach or imply that there is a kind of pious and legitimate worship of angels, but simply and in general condemns the worship of angels. Therefore, whatever errors the ancient heretics may have had concerning the nature, offices, and worship of angels, it does not prevent Paul's prohibition from also being violated by those who today worship angels with religious worship and exhibit any kind of religious worship to angels and saints. The Apostle absolutely prohibits the worship of angels, not just the kind said to have been taught by Simon or Cerinthus. It is clear that those who worship angels and saints with prayers, hymns, basilicas, oratories, feasts, donations, and all kinds of offerings, as is customary in the Roman Church, are indeed worshipping angels and saints; and consequently, what the Roman Church does in this regard is condemned by the Apostle, no less than what Simon or Cerinthus or similar heretics are said to have done.

LXXXV. The doctors of the Roman School respond that the rites and acts by which they honor angels and saints do not constitute divine worship, because they venerate angels and saints not as gods, but as ministers of God and our intercessors with God. They argue that the term "religion" or "worship" is properly applied to the worship given to God alone. However, from the

Apostle's text, it can be sufficiently inferred that those he rebukes, and from whom he warns us to be cautious, did not regard angels as gods, but as messengers and ministers of the supreme God and our mediators and intercessors with God, as indicated by the very name "angel," which means messenger. Furthermore, these deceivers professed to be Christians and venerated angels under the pretext of humility, as if they were unworthy to approach God directly and therefore needed the mediation and intercession of angels. Hence, it is clear that they venerated angels with a certain subordinate worship, considering it inferior to that due to the supreme God. Therefore, according to the Apostle's mind, those who venerate angels with a certain inferior worship also fall under the prohibition of angel worship.

LXXXVI. We can gather the nature of the religion of those pseudo-Christians, who were called Angelici by the ancients, from the Council of Laodicea, which included this canon in the code of universal Church canons: "It is not right for Christians to abandon the Church of God and go to invoke angels and hold assemblies, which is forbidden." What it means to invoke angels is explained by Theodoret, who, commenting on the epistle to the Colossians, says, "Those who defended the law also led people to the worship of angels, saying that the law was given through them; and this vice continued in Phrygia and Pisidia. Therefore, the Synod convened in Laodicea in Phrygia prohibited praying to angels. Even to this day, the oratories of Saint Michael can be seen among them and their neighbors." These people, led by a sense of humility, persuaded others that since the God of the universe could not be seen, touched, or comprehended, they should seek to gain divine favor through the mediation of angels.

LXXXVII. Therefore, according to the Fathers of the Synod of Laodicea and Theodoret's explanation of its canon, invoking angels and praying to them to gain divine favor is an illicit worship of angels and a sin against the Apostle's precept condemning the worship and religion of angels. Building oratories for angels, including Saint Michael, as part of the practice of the Roman Church, aligns with this condemned practice. Dionysius Petavius, a Jesuit, acknowledges that the Roman Church seeks the protection and patronage of angels through prayers and vows, and venerates them as mediators to God. They also build oratories and basilicas in their honor and dedicate feast days to their worship.

LXXXVIII. It is absurd, as Estius observes, to interpret Theodoret's reference to oratories dedicated to Saint Michael as places consecrated by heretics for their illicit worship of angels. He argues that these places, once polluted by the idolatry of heretics, were converted by the prudent bishops of the time into oratories dedicated to Saint Michael. It is irrational to imagine that Theodoret meant to say that the ancient heretics used to pray to angels and that the Synod of Laodicea prohibited this, and that therefore, the places where they prayed to angels were prudently converted into oratories of Saint Michael by the Orthodox. Theodoret does not hint at such conversion or the supposed prudence of the bishops. Theodoret's point is to prove that the vice of invoking angels persisted for a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia, as evidenced by the

oratories dedicated to Saint Michael seen there even in his time. Such oratories were not found in other parts of the Christian world.

LXXXIX. Furthermore, the fact that sacred Scripture regards prayer and invocation as an integral part of divine worship, and as a distinguished and principal duty of our religion towards God, confirms that neither angels nor the blessed spirits of the just are to be prayed to or invoked. Therefore, the temple of God is called a "house of prayer" in Scripture, and the prayers and invocations of the faithful are proposed as a spiritual sacrifice. We are taught to invoke only Him in whom our faith rests. As the Apostle says, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?" (Isaiah 56:7, Matthew 21:13, Psalms 14:1-2, Hebrews 13:15, Romans 10:14).

XC. The doctors of the Roman Church respond that the prayer proposed by Scripture as part of the worship proper to God is absolute prayer, which asks someone to be the author and giver of blessings; not relative prayer, which asks someone to pray to God for us and to obtain from Him the things we need. They claim that they invoke angels and saints not as the authors of blessings, but only as their intercessors and our advocates before God. Therefore, they argue that they do not ask angels and saints for anything other than to pray to God for us, just as we ask the faithful living on earth to assist us with their prayers to God.

XCI. However, the Roman Church, when invoking angels and saints, does not simply say to them, "Pray for us"; nor does it merely ask them to intercede with God for us. Instead, they use many prayers directed to them in the same form as those addressed to God, not only in private devotions but also in public and solemn worship. In these, the Blessed Virgin is asked, "Protect us from the enemy, and receive us at the hour of death"; "Grant us a pure life, and a safe path"; "Free us from our sins, make us meek and chaste." John the Baptist is asked, "Look upon us with pity, and wash away our sins." John the Apostle is asked, "Remove the plague, take away the ulcer, and heal the sick"; "Drive away disease, defeat the enemy, and remove scandal." Similar things are said to many other saints, as we have extensively shown in the first part of these theses.

XCII. They respond that when they pray to the saints in this manner, their intention is not that the saints themselves grant and bestow these blessings by their own power, but only that they obtain them from God by their merits and prayers. Therefore, although the words may suggest otherwise, they mean only that the saints, by their intercession, obtain what they ask from God. But certainly, nothing compels them to think and speak differently. If they ask the saints for nothing more than to pray to God for them, why do they use the words of absolute prayer to them and not simply reiterate the solemn "Pray for us"?

XCIII. Certainly, it is acknowledged by all that it is permissible to ask the saints living among us to pray to God for us. However, it would not be tolerated for someone to address a holy man living on earth as they address the Virgin Mary, saying, "Remove our troubles, grant

heavenly gifts"; "Free us from sins, make us meek and chaste." Or to say to Saint Benedict, "Grant us to ascend the narrow way, giving us eternal rewards." Or as in the hymn to Saint Nicholas, "Take away the dangers of death, grant the help of life; so that after the exile of the flesh, we may be with you in glory." If any Apostle had been addressed with such a prayer, they would have rebuked it as impious and commanded that such things be asked from the Lord, not from them. Therefore, should we think that now, in heaven, they would be pleased with what they once regarded as impious and sacrilegious while living on earth?

XCIV. Moreover, in the usage of the Roman Church, there are not a few prayers directed to saints in which blessings of grace and glory are asked of them, and they are requested to bestow them on us by the power entrusted to them and by divine command and mandate. This is clearly different from obtaining such blessings for us from God through their prayers. For example, it is said to the Apostles in general, "You who close the heavens with a word, and open them, free us from all sins by your command, we beseech you." This is followed by, "Health and sickness of all, heal the sick by your power, restoring us to virtues." Likewise, "Free us from guilt, we beseech you." And specifically to the Apostle Peter, "Release the bonds of sin by the power entrusted to you, which closes and opens heaven to all."

XCV. Even if the Roman Church asks nothing else from the Saints than that they pray to God for us, this cannot be legitimately defended by the example of prayers that believers request from each other; when, for instance, they ask their brothers, when pressed by some necessity, to assist them with their prayers to God. For from the fact that Scripture admonishes us to assist each other with prayers and to seek mutual help in this way, it does not follow that someone living in Europe could, without foolishness or even impiety, verbally or mentally address a holy man living in China or America, and ask him, as if seeing and hearing, to intercede with God for him and obtain what he feels he needs. How then can we conclude that we can piously and reasonably request from Saints who have died in Christ, whether by voice or by the mere affection of the heart, to pray to God for us; when they are now received into heavenly Paradise and are as distant from us as the highest heaven is from the earth; nor do we have any means of communication with them until we enjoy a similar blessedness; and no method of mutual conception? Therefore, from the prayers that believers on earth request from each other while they are still fighting together, it no more follows that Saints who have already been received into heaven can be invoked by us, than it formerly followed, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church, that the souls of the fathers detained in Limbo could be invoked by the believers living at that time.

XCVI. The Roman School Theologians indeed suppose that the spirits of the just admitted into heaven, despite such a great distance, know and perceive what is happening on earth; and that the Saints can simultaneously hear the prayers of all who invoke them, see their needs, and observe their intimate thoughts and hidden affections, and certainly know them.

However, this should not be assumed without God's word and clear reason: to pronounce this based on our conjectures and suspicions is plainly to step into things unseen.

XCVII. Nor is it our duty to prove the contrary; although many arguments could be brought from Scripture in this matter. For, to abstain from imploring the prayers and help of the deceased Saints, it is enough that we do not know whether they hear us, nor do we see this revealed in God's Word. It is incumbent on those who affirm this to prove what they say; and the knowledge of our affairs that they attribute to the souls of the Saints must be demonstrated with an invincible argument or a clear oracle of Scripture. Otherwise, this devotion to the pious souls of the Saints will be entirely shaky and will be done without faith.

XCVIII. How weak and trivial are the arguments from Scripture to support such a significant matter will become easily apparent to anyone who examines them. Firstly, they argue that the saints reigning with Christ in heaven know what happens on earth, and thus perceive the prayers of all who invoke them, and see their thoughts and hearts, by citing examples of certain individuals while alive knowing distant and future events, and even the secrets of the heart. For example, Elisha, who said to his servant Gehazi, "Was not my heart with you when the man turned from his chariot to meet you?" And Samuel, who said to Saul, "I will tell you all that is in your heart" and about the donkeys of your father which you lost. Similarly, Peter knew that Ananias and Sapphira had deceived regarding the price of the field, even though he was absent. And Paul, seeing the heart of the lame man, knew that he had faith to be healed. But what kind of conclusion is this: the prophets and apostles knew certain hidden things, relevant to their office, revealed by God; therefore, the souls of the blessed, received into heavenly glory, know what happens on earth, see the needs of all who invoke them, and perceive prayers conceived either by voice or by heart and affection? From this, it indeed follows that God can reveal the needs, actions, and thoughts of those living here to the blessed spirits of the just, as He pleases; but whether He does this or not cannot be concluded from this in any way. 2 Kings 5, 1 Samuel 9, Acts 5, Acts 14.

XCIX. If anyone argues that the duty assigned by God to the deceased saints requires them to have knowledge of our affairs because they are appointed by God as our patrons and intercessors, they are proving an unknown by another unknown. For the word of God nowhere teaches that the saints enjoying heavenly glory are given to us by God as patrons and mediators who intercede with God for us; indeed, the contrary is sufficiently evident from sacred Scripture. Nor can it be said that it pertains to the beatitude of the saints to hear the prayers of those invoking them, as this would add to their greater glory. For if the invocation of saints in Christ who have died is a superstitious and illicit practice, devised only by men, it in no way pertains to the glory of the saints to know who is invoking them. And it should first be proven that it is pleasing and acceptable to God that the saints reigning with Him be invoked before it can be supposed with any probability that such invocation contributes to their glory.

C. Moreover, Roman School theologians argue that the saints triumphing in heaven are not ignorant of what humans do and what happens in this lower world; indeed, they assert that even the secret thoughts of humans are not hidden from them, on the grounds that such knowledge does not escape the angels. For Christ Himself testifies that the righteous in heaven will be like the angels of God (Matthew 22:30). Therefore, since they ought to be equal to angels, it is not thought that they are surpassed by angels in knowledge of our affairs. Now, it is believed that heavenly angels know what happens on earth and the inner movements and affections of human hearts because they are said to rejoice over one sinner who repents more than over ninety-nine righteous persons who do not need repentance. For if the repentance of sinners is known to them, surely they know what happens in the world, not only externally but also internally in the heart of the sinner, where true repentance and sorrow for sins occur. Luke 15:10.

CI. But it is not surprising that angels, who are "ministering spirits sent to serve those who will inherit salvation," as they are present with us and engage with us in their ministry, know what pertains to us, especially the repentance and conversion of sinners, to which they are appointed by God's command. However, as we have already said, it cannot be shown from the word of God that a similar duty has been assigned to the blessed souls of the righteous. Nor does it help to affirm that Christ said the righteous in heaven will be like the angels; for this equality or similarity with angels should not be extended beyond Christ's purpose, which is to teach that the righteous, after the resurrection, will lead an angelic life, free from the necessities and infirmities of this life, neither marrying nor being given in marriage, as is clear from Christ's words in Matthew. Moreover, it does not follow that each angel knows the thoughts and prayers of each individual human, simply because Christ says that the angels rejoice over one sinner who repents. Just as we can truly say that there is great joy in the Church of God when one sinner turns to God; it does not follow that each member of the Church knows the thoughts, words, and deeds of all others.