

DISPUTATION ON ORIGINAL SIN – Abraham Calov

On Original Sin

It pleases us to adhere to the Augsburg Confession and its unchanged tracks. Which, discussing this Article in thesis and antithesis, concludes what our Church teaches in three parts: firstly, it concerns the existence of Original Sin, which after the fall of Adam, all humans born naturally are born with sin: These words at the same time imply its Universality, that no human being, who is propagated according to nature, is free from it. Thus, only Christ is excepted, who is indeed a true man like us in greatness, but was begotten beyond and above nature. The second establishes the Nature of Original Sin, that we are all born with sin, that is, without fear of God, without trust towards God, and with concupiscence, which indeed this disease or original flaw is truly sin. The third presents its penalty, that this sin condemns, and brings, Now, (which was later added for Zwingli's sake, as we will advise) eternal death to those, who are not reborn through baptism and the Holy Spirit. And so, the thesis stands. Antithesis condemns for heretical errors, both the Pelagians denying original sin, and others also, such as Zwingli, Anabaptists, and Papists, whose error here is reprobated with sufficiently clear words, denying original flaw to be sin, & disputing that man by his own rational powers can be justified before God, to diminish the glory of the merits and benefits of Christ. Hence, the significance of these errors

can be seen, not to be considered by our Churches as trivial or of little relevance to faith, but as such, for which Papists rightly accuse and condemn heresy.

Concerning the existence of Original Sin, the first dispute was raised in the Church by Pelagius the Briton, to differentiate from another Pelagius of Tarentum so named, about whom Augustine wrote in Epistle 106. Which in the previous century the Anabaptists with Zwingli, but especially the Socinians, renewed. Hence, regarding the state of the Controversy, some of their opinions here must be mentioned. They might seem to recognize Original Sin with us, since Faustus Socinus in his prelectures of Theology, chap. IV, p.13, and Johann Volkel in his book V of true Religion, chap. XVIII, p.551, admit that a proneness to sinning naturally exists in humans, which can be said to be born with them. This proneness is also confessed by Socinus in his persuasive book, p. 58, to be transmitted to descendants through propagation, and Ostrodox agrees in his Institutes, chap. XXXII, p.281, that it is inherited from the force of the seed in children. Nor do they hesitate to call that proneness to sinning evil desire, with Sacino chap. IV, prelectures, p.13, and some depravity, chap. V, p.14. Corruption with Osterodo in the cited place, or if you inquire its origin, to confess with us, that this proneness to sinning, which Ostrodox calls very great, did not originate from the first creation but was contracted after the first sin; as it is clear from Socinus's book Suasoriae, p.57,59. What then remains, but that they with us name this proneness to sinning original sin! From which denomination Socinus himself does not shy away, who professes to recognize original sin with Scripture, as far as the guilt of perpetual and necessary death, which awaits all descendants of Adam, in his cited book, p.58,59. Hence Volkel, p. 548, says that almost all agree on this, that Original Sin is some evil desire or proneness to sinning

transmitted to all his posterity by natural propagation from that fall of Adam.

What then is the cause, that Socinus in his Dialogue on Justification, p. 21, proclaims original sin to be a concoction and fable; this notion of original sin or parental guilt is a Jewish fable; & Valentine Smalcus against Dr. Franz, dispute 2, That sin is a mere fable, which the Lutherans bemoan as some alien fate; and that in the Racovian Catechism, X, Original Sin is considered utterly non-existent? Clearly, they understand something far different by proneness to sinning, than what our Churches call original sin: Not only if the subject, to which it adheres, and the origin, from whence it arose, are considered, but also, if its own and formal reason is regarded. For they do not say that this proneness exists naturally in all, but in most and almost all, nor do they place it in the higher faculties, but in the sensitive appetite, nor do they derive it from the first sin, but from a habit of sinning, which parents have contracted by frequent acts of sin, which since it happens often, they therefore conclude that humans are often born with a proneness to sin; on this see Socinus's prelectures, p.13, Suasoriae, p.57, & Ostrodox, Institutes, chap. XXXIV, p.281. Although even in the very creation, Socinus in his brief discourse on the reason of salvation & Smalc. Against Franz, p.59, and in the book on the Natural Son of God, p.61, contend that not slight dispositions to evil were implanted: And finally, that this proneness to sinning is far different than original sin, they expressly profess with Smalcio against Franz, p.60. Indeed, it can happen, that one, who is prone to sin, may not sin, whereas, one, who is infected with original sin, cannot not sin: even more so, they deny that this proneness is sin, and has the character of guilt, with Socinus again leading the way in prelectures, chap. IV. It helps to present the sum of the matter, as to the points of disagreement between Socinus and

our Churches, in Socinus's own words, so that what is truly controversial may be clearer. Therefore, he says, on page 11, there are those who wish, (this opinion is widely accepted) that original sin is some innate evil desire or concupiscence in man, and a proneness to sin: This opinion mainly cannot be true for three reasons: first, because it is not established that this concupiscence or proneness to sinning naturally exists in all humans at all. Then, even if it were established, it would not be because Adam, from whom we all are descended, transgressed that divine command. Finally, because this desire and proneness to sinning, when it does not have joined with it the guilt of the man himself, in whom it is, cannot properly be called his sin. Therefore, they deny that the proneness to sinning is naturally in all, they deny it to be from Adam's first sin, they deny it to be properly sin: Indeed, Socinus concludes, p.13, that there is no original sin, even speaking improperly, that is, from

That sin of the first parent there is no stain or depravity necessarily innate or in some manner inflicted on the whole human race. This is what Socinus contends in the dispute with Francisco Pucci about the state of the first man, p.13, when someone is generated in this world, it pertains only to life and to his good, and he contracts no evil, as some kind of poison from the very generation, which drags him to such perdition. And in response to the objections of Cuttenius, p.85, infants when they are born, are of no sin and are born without sin, as far as they undoubtedly have not yet sinned at all. Hence, according to Smalcio, in the cited place, infants can be called and are innocent

IV. This unfortunate Socinus: but who can doubt that these ideas originated from the schools of Pelagius, Celestius, and Julian? Pelagius certainly, in the book 'On Nature' as mentioned by Augustine in 'On the Nature of Grace', chapter XXX, denied Original Sin for the same reason, asserting that it is not of one's own will.

How can one be subject to God for the guilt of that sin, which he knows not to be his own, for it is not his own if it is not voluntary. If it is his own, then it is voluntary. And if it is voluntary, it can be avoided. And in the book 'I. On Free Will', with Augustine, II. Against Pelagius, which is on Original Sin, chapter XIII: Before the action of one's own will, the only thing in man is that which God has created. About Celestius, Augustine states in 'On the Acts of the Pelagians', chapter XI, it is reported in the doctrine of Celestius, his disciple (of Pelagius), that Adam's sin harmed only himself, and not the human race, and infants are in the state Adam was before the transgression. Julian, in book II of his last work against Augustine, chapter XVI, which is in Augustine's 'Unfinished Work', chapter Julian 1.1, states: It is clear that the nature of those generating communicates germs, not guilt: children, as children, that is, before they act through their own will, cannot be guilty: & in his later book in response to Augustine, with S. Augustine, book I against Julian's later responses. There is no sin by nature, but free will persists in human nature. Hence, from Pelagius' book 'On Nature' with Augustine, 'On the Nature of Grace', chapter IX, it is said that all sinned in Adam, not because of the sin attracted by the origin of birth but because of imitation; and Julian in his last work against Augustine, chapter LXI, emphasized (man) to teach that sin is transmitted by imitation, not generation. Thus, the Pelagians fought with the same weapons that the Socinians today wield against the Catholic faith: namely, that voluntary action is required for sin, which has already been said; that Adam's sin could not corrupt the entire nature: that one sin, says Socinus, in his prelecture, chapter IV, could not of itself corrupt not only all descendants, but not even Adam himself. Pelagius placed this argument in the forefront in his book 'On Nature' with Augustine, 'On the Nature and Grace', chapter XIX. First, it must be debated that which is said to be weakened and

changed by sin. Hence, first of all, I think it should be asked, is sin some substance, or a name lacking substance, which does not signify a thing, an existence, a body, but wrongly expresses an action? I believe it is so, and if it is so, how could it weaken or change human nature, which lacks substance?

V. The Arminians, holding some positions similar to those of the Socinians, defend the same opinion with them: indeed, they do not recognize that anything worthy of God's hatred could come from Adam's sin in his descendants, nor do they admit any original sin that is properly called sin, that would make Adam's descendants worthy of God's hatred, or be evil, weakness, or defect, or whatever else it may be called, that is transmitted from Adam deprived of original righteousness to his descendants, as can be read in the Apology of the Remonstrants, chapter VII, folio 84. Hence, Simon Episcopus in book IV of the Institutions, Sect.V, chapter 1, says, "Scripture nowhere mentions any original sin, nor allows us to believe it was asserted." The Remonstrants, directly denying Original Sin today, to whom the Anabaptists do not object, attributing purity of innocence to infants and contending that none of Adam's descendants are born sinners, but become sinners only through their own consent and actual engagement in sin, as argued in the Confession opposed by Fauckel, p. 96. Compare with the Belgian Anabaptist Confession published in Harlem in 1648, article IV. Hence, P. O. Calls Augustine's invention similar to the Mathematicians' Eccentrics and Epicycles, see Frankenthal Colloquy, Acts 11, p.195,245,248.

VII. Calixtus does not depart much from Socinus with his doctrine, which he proposed in Exercises on original sin, theses V, VI, namely, that Original Sin leaves nothing more than the guilt of death, which Socinus and his followers would most gladly admit. While he never denied that we are propagated under the necessity of dying, by

natural generation. That is only, unless I am mistaken, what Calixtus asserts and sells as Original Sin. “Therefore, all believe,” he says, “those who recognize and understand the necessity of redemption by Christ, that every individual human being, who descends in the common and natural way from Adam, is born in such a condition that they are excluded from eternal blessedness and liable to eternal damnation; and cannot be rescued from this or admitted to that except by the grace of GOD and because of the merit and death of Christ. – This Condition, this stain, or this evil, clinging to natural generation like a natural and naturally inseparable property or affection, is called by the ecclesiastical phrase ORIGINAL SIN: about which, as much as we have now said, knowing suffices for salvation. It is, that simpler folks, peasants, craftsmen, many women are taught or follow. Thus far Calixtus. If Calixtus’ Disciples can construct a sense from these words different from the Socinian heresy, let them take the risk. We cannot derive any other from it. Although, says Socinus, p.111, in ‘On the Savior’, chapter IX, all descended from Adam are subject to eternal death, it is not because Adam’s transgression is imputed to them. And in the theological prelectures, chapter V, as well as in the persuasive booklet, chapter P, p.57. Speaking strictly, there is no original sin, indeed, no stain, or depravity inflicted or innate to the human race, nor any other evil from that first offense necessarily flowed to all descendants, other than the necessity of dying, not indeed from the force of that offense, but because once man was naturally mortal, he was subjected to natural death for his transgression, and what was natural became utterly necessary as a punishment for the sinner. Therefore, those who are born from him are born in the same condition, nothing removed, which he naturally had or would have had. Calixtus insists on this part following the footsteps of the old heretics, the Arminians, who established only the

guilt contracted from the first disobedience of Adam, admitting no original sin properly called, which made Adam's descendants hateful to God, see Magdeburg Centuries, VII, p.127. He also follows the Scholastics, whose spit Calixtus loves to lick. For some

Of them, noting with the Master of the Sentences, book II, distinction XXX, letter E., thought original sin to be the guilt as a penalty for the first man's sin, that is, a debt or liability, by which we are liable to temporal and eternal punishment for the actual sin of the first man. In this respect, they asserted original sin to be in infants, because infants are guilty of punishment for that first sin, just as children of an unjust parent are sometimes exiled: Such was also the opinion of Scotus and Biel, distinction IV, question 1, article 1, after any sin nothing remains but the guilt of punishment, therefore, nothing more remained after Adam's sin, and among the more recent ones, Albert Pighius, Cardinal, in his Controversies, 1, on Original Sin, argued that this sin is only a penalty transmitted and propagated to descendants without any fault, and the guilt, which becomes ours by imputation, just as from slaves who lost their freedom due to their own fault, are born slaves not by their own, but by their parents' fault; and also Ambrosius Catharinus, Bishop, in his work on the fall, VI, in Romans, chapter V, because of Adam the transgressor, children are constituted sinners and worthy of hatred not differently, sometimes children of criminal parents, who however do not commit the same sins as their parents, are deprived of paternal goods and are forced to exile eternally according to the justice of the law. But this doctrine was acknowledged to be condemned by the Council of Trent by Andreas Vega, Gregory de Valencia, Gabriel Vazquez in the chastisement of Egidius Augustinian, Ferdinand Quirinus Salazar as a Pelagian error, in the defense for the

immaculate conception of Mary, chapter 1, refuted also by Cardinal Bellarmine, book V, chapter XVI.

VIII. Hence it is clear, as the Catholic faith asserts about the existence and truth of Original Sin, which Augustine indeed briefly but exquisitely proposed, that after the fall of Adam, all humans born naturally are born with sin, and it must be proven that through carnal generation, not only guilt but sin and fault making us liable to this guilt are transmitted to us. Although Stapleton, following Occam, who at the end of the Sentences confessed that, if not prevented, he would have said by the authority of the Fathers that original sin is only the guilt of someone else's sin without any fault inhering in us, thus attributing this dogma to the authority of the Fathers or ecclesiastical tradition rather than Scripture. However, for us, who recognize no doctrines without evidence, the authority of Scripture alone must be attended to, from which alone articles of faith are to be proven and demonstrated, as the sole principle of faith.

IX. Therefore, we prove original sin briefly (1) from Moses in Genesis 6:5, 'every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.' Note that the discussion is about the imagination of the heart, which cannot be referred to sensuality with the Papists, but since the heart continually in Scriptures denotes the superior faculty of the soul, it pertains to it. Nor does it signify merely a fleeting thought or sudden impulse, but as the word is, to form something with singular effort and mental strain, Habakkuk 2:18, thus deliberate thought is encompassed, as Chrysostom in Homily XXII on Genesis and B. Chemnitz observe, Romans 9:7. Not only the formed thought but also the very formation of thoughts, or the act of imagination, even the subject itself, the natural faculty and propensity seems to be encompassed: just as man himself is called a workmanship in Psalm 103:14, and from the heart proceed evil thoughts, Matthew

12:35, 15:19, therefore because it is inclined to evil: for a tree that can bear only bad fruit is undoubtedly bad itself, Matthew 7:17-18. This includes what Elias Levita observes in his *Thisbi* about the word denoting the desire of the heart, and R.D. Kimchi in the book of *Roots* calls the desire of the heart and its malice an 'imagination', because it forms and shapes many things in the heart which the Heart desires. Nor is it only about certain individuals here: But about the common lot of humans after the fall, as they are propagated, not according to the image of God, but the Adamic, Genesis 5:2. Distinctly here mentioned with the malice of men on earth, and that every imagination of the human heart is only evil continually: where the former refers to the specific condition of men of that time, the latter touches on the source and spring of vices common to all. Hence, a fourfold universality is employed: (1) The subject of the heart's inclination. It deals with the human heart: indefinitely, and the whole human race is regarded, when this source of common corruption and malice, which flooded the whole world and brought the flood to all, is opened. (2) The attribution of the subject: every imagination of thoughts: Therefore, no imagination, no thoughts are excepted, but after the fall they are liable to vice due to inherent corruption. (3) The depth: It is so evil that we cannot naturally think or imagine anything good, so evil are the imaginations and thoughts of the human heart in the state of sin. (4) The time: all days. If the imagination of thoughts of the heart is evil all days, then also in the days of earliest infancy, and thus from the beginning of life, so that even the infant's imagination of thoughts is included. And certainly, even newborn infants perished in the flood, even those still enclosed in their mother's womb; who, since they were not infected with actual sin, are implied here to be wrapped in that malice adhering to them from the first days. Nor can 'ALL flesh had corrupted his way' in

verse 12 be understood in any other sense than corruption partly actual, partly original; since not all were guilty of it. Finally, it is not said, only the intention towards evil, as the Vulgate has it, but ONLY evil: to indicate truly contaminated by sin: from which we argue from that place: Those whose every imagination of thoughts of the heart every day is not only inclined towards evil, but truly evil, from the very beginning of life, and indeed so evil, must necessarily be liable to original evil, or sin. But the imagination of every heart of all humans after the fall is every evil and so on.

X. To this is added (2) another parallel passage, Genesis 8:21, 'the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth': in which again the word is noted, about which we have already spoken, and the indefinite assertion, the imagination of man's heart, which inserts universality: and also the scope, which here is to deal with the entire human race and its natural constitution; and the connection, that God would not further destroy the earth because the imagination of man's heart is evil; therefore, this pertains to the entire human race, which the Lord promises never again to submerge in a universal flood: hence, also here it is not about actual voluntary malice, but original and innate: Since this cause is added, why God would want to have mercy on the human race, that the human heart after the fall labors with inescapable malice, not voluntarily contracted, but attracted through carnal generation. Therefore, an explicit designation is added, by which the very infancy is implied not only from the Etymology some derive, meaning from the shaking off, as signifying the age from the casting out of the fetus in the mother's womb; but also the use of Scripture applying it to the newly born Moses, Exodus 2:6, confirms: Nor should the word be restricted, but expanded here, as the context teaches, when the misery of such infants especially provokes God to mercy: hence we conclude:

Whatever malice is common to the entire human race, so that the human heart and its imagination from the very infancy is evil, and moves God to compassion, must be innate, not attracted by its own accord. But such is this malice, about which we speak here.

XI. Thirdly, we add from Job 14:4, 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.' The Holy Spirit speaks universally, no one can be found clean, since a clean cannot be given from an unclean, as the text deals with the misery common to all humans. Nor indeed is the discussion about the impurity of the body, but of the soul, by which we could be brought into God's judgment; nor about acquired filthiness, but native, because it discusses not so much an adventitious misery of man as a congenital and natural condition of the same, of man as he was born of a woman: Of hidden uncleanness, from which no human in this life can be thoroughly cleansed and freed, hence it is always true, who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Which is common to all, so that no one can be found clean, not even one; which is inevitable; since here it is brought up as an excuse, that God should not contend with us in judgment, because no mortal can avoid filth; which finally is attracted from parents: therefore it says, who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean: in Hebrew, there is a participial or adjectival name, and some substantive noun is understood, from the unclean, perhaps the parent from whom we are procreated, or as the Vulgate adds from the seed from which we are born, to also include the reason why no one can be found clean, because we are all procreated from an unclean parent, or seed, from which this uncleanness does not exempt even infants. If infants were exempted, some could be given clean from the unclean: therefore notably the LXX interpreters render it, 'for who shall be clean from filth? But none, even if his life on earth be but one day': which Augustine explains, no one is clean

from filth, not even the infant, whose life on earth is but one day. Cf. Job 25:4. Hence Augustine, in Volume VII of 'On Predestination and Grace', chapter III, states the stain of the root has spread the blemish of the progeny through the branches of generations, so that not even an infant of one day is alien from the guilt of the first transgression, unless by the undue grace of the Savior he has been freed. What here is not even without sin, who could not have his own, concludes, but has inherited that foreign sin, about which the Apostle says, through one man sin entered into the world, and so on.

XII. A fourth illustrious passage is Psalm 51:5, where David laments, 'Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.' He speaks in Hebrew of some particular sin, and with two very emphatic verbs, he expresses the inherited stain: The first is לָמַד, which signifies the pain of carrying in the womb and childbirth, Isaiah 23:4, 26:18, and looks back to the divine curse, Genesis 3:16, as when a mother feels pain in gestation, she knows she is being reminded of the original sin of the embryo. The second is טָהַר, which is peculiar to females when they conceive from the warmth of the seed and become pregnant, Genesis 30:3, 39:39, so the sense is, 'in sins my mother heated me up,' that is, when the mass of my nature first began to be nurtured, I was already in sins through the labor of the womb. Hence, the LXX translates it as ἐν ἀνομίαις (in iniquities); the Syriac has, 'in sins my mother carried me,' indicating that I was infected with sin in my mother's womb. Therefore, rightly did Ambrose in his Apology for David, chapter 11, mournfully deplore the contaminations of nature in himself, that the stain in man begins before life itself.

I conclude. Whatever is inherent to a man from conception is natural and original to him. But sin and iniquity are inherent to man from conception, as testified by David in Psalm 51:5.

XIII. Fifthly, we bring forward from the Old Testament, Jeremiah 17:9, 'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it!' He does not say 'your heart,' but speaks absolutely and universally about the human heart, as he had previously commanded that trust should be placed in no human, but in God alone; hence, it must be a general reason, because every human heart is wicked; or if you take it this way: Indeed, trust should be placed in God alone; but in truth, the human heart is so wicked and deceitful that it is completely turned away from God. Thus, it shows the natural constitution of the heart, and by the word רָצוֹן (form), it alludes to the name that man received after the fall, called אָדָם (Adam), because of incurable miseries and a diseased and desperate constitution, i.e., The heart is such as the name men now have from miseries, i.e., diseases. For it is no doubt that the Prophets in such significant sentences sought very meaningful words, as if in Latin it were said, 'they are flesh;' therefore, their hearts are carnal. That man is truly miserable and his body is very sick and incurably has labored from a desperate and lethal disease: see Isaiah 17:1, 30:15, Jeremiah 15:18, Micah 1:9, so that only with death can a miserable man be freed from this disease; hence, it cannot be understood from acquired actual malice. It is also said עָקַב (aqob) which means 'he supplanted by the heel, and deceived,' thus noting the heart's deceitfulness, as the Targum translates: see 2 Kings 10:19, Jeremiah 9:7, and עֲקֵלְקָלוֹת (devious paths), a metaphor derived from a twisted and convoluted path, Isaiah 40, which, deprived of straightness and perverted by trampling, becomes hard, rough, and calloused, hence petrified as in Luke 8:12, and the hardness of their hearts, Romans 11:27, Ephesians 4:18. Thus, the human heart is shown to have been deprived of its original righteousness, Ecclesiastes 7:30, and to have contracted wickedness and hardness, becoming wicked ABOVE ALL THINGS,

expressing its utmost and extreme perversion, which is hidden and inscrutable. Therefore, it is added, 'who can understand it?' as if to say: The misery is so great, the perversion of the human heart so immense, that no mortal can fully explore it; only God can know it thoroughly. Compare Psalm 19:13, 90:8.

XIV. In the New Testament, this evil is also illustrated by the rays of the Sun: John 3:6, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh,' says Christ; thus, by the very nature of birth, all who are born of the flesh, and are naturally and carnally propagated, are flesh, that is, liable to sin and in need of regeneration. This general assertion by Christ, the context of the passage, its purpose, and intention, clearly confirm this, which is to teach the manner by which all must enter the kingdom of heaven, and to explain the common condition of all before regeneration, i.e., what they are like by temporal birth. Whatever pertains to man as he is born, and not yet reborn, pertains to his natural condition and state. Moreover, all humans, who are born of the flesh and are propagated from Adam, are subject to eternal death, and thus through propagation are excluded from the kingdom of heaven, as even the Socinians concede. But the cause from which all are excluded is, according to Christ's testimony, none other than that they are born of the flesh. Since the exclusion is natural to them, and the guilt of eternal death by generation also pertains to them, the cause of the same is also natural to them, and pertains to them by generation, which is that they are born of the flesh. What then is understood by 'flesh' both in opposition to the Spirit, and in itself, that this cause is an exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, is taught. For the flesh, which opposes the Spirit within us, is that which wars against the Spirit and bears fornication, idolatry, contentions, envy, etc., Galatians 5:17, 19. According to this, we are said to be carnal, sold under sin, etc., Romans 7:14, where the

discussion is about the highest propensity of man to sin, which Socinus himself admits, in his prelectures, p.13. The flesh, from which we are excluded from the kingdom of heaven, what is it but sin, iniquity, and the habit of sinning? For it is said by Socinians that this habit excludes; therefore, undoubtedly, 'flesh' here is metaphorically used for the whole carnal man prone to sin, subject to the universal habit of sinning, as all are when they are born of the flesh.

XV. A classical passage on Original Sin is also found in Romans 5:12 and following, which Catholic Fathers frequently and rightly press against Pelagius: for not only are all said to have sinned in that one man, which cannot be understood as imitation but must necessarily be taken as imputation, since even those who did not sin in the likeness of Adam's transgression are here argued to have sin passed to them, verse 14, but also through one man's disobedience many are said to have been made sinners, verse 19, both because we all sinned in Adam and because we contracted the habit of sinning from him, which is propagated to us, on which we have treated more in the Apostolic Theology on Romans, oracle XLIV, p.211 and following.

XVI. Nor should we overlook, which the Ancients also frequently emphasize, the passage in Romans 7:14 and following. It is agreed, among Socinians, that this passage deals with the highest propensity of man to sin. That this is common to all is clear: (1) because the Apostle presents himself as an example of all, (2) he speaks in relation to the law, which is universal, (3) he depicts the condition of the reborn, in whom both the oldness of the flesh and the newness of the Spirit, the remnants of sin and the firstfruits of wickedness, exist. Therefore, it differs not in what is found in some converts, but in what is in all. (4) It discusses a matter, the mortification and abolition of which is necessary not for many, but for all. Romans 6:2, 6. (5) Those descriptions apply to all. Who has not at some time been

in the flesh? Romans 7:5. Who is enslaved to righteousness, if not freed from the captivity of sin, etc.? (6) The opposite liberation, sanctification, regeneration, resurrection, grace of the Spirit are necessary for all, not just for many. To all is given that desire and wickedness by which they are constrained and held captive. (7) Finally, the Apostle here contends to vindicate justification by faith alone: because no one is justified by works. Romans 9:3. Whoever denies this universality, undermines the entire argument of Paul. That the discussion here is not about actual sin, but Original Sin: the description itself testifies, which is expressed through weakness in the flesh, verse 5, oldness mortified, verse 6, sin reviving, verse 9, sin dwelling, verses 17, 18, 20, evil present, verse 21, the law of the members warring against the law of the mind, verse 23, body of death, verse 24, law of sin, verse 25, all of which denote some singular sin, not actual, but original, not voluntary, but necessary, not personal, but natural. This is further confirmed by its operation. That it corrupts nature, opposes the law of GOD, hinders the reborn from fulfilling the law, captivates them, etc., are effects not of voluntary evil, but of original. Also, from its hidden nature: The Apostle says he would not have known it except through the law, verse 17. But he certainly knew voluntary evil desire to be sin, since he was most zealous for a virtuous life, Acts 23:1, Philippians 3:6, 2 Timothy 1:3. The involuntary desire the Pharisees did not consider sin, which the Apostle was before. Moreover, from the inhabitation of this evil, since it dwells in the Saints, although they do not delight in it but resist it, therefore it is not some voluntary evil, but congenital, necessary, and inevitable, that evil in Hebrews 12:1. Finally, from liberation. Because no one can be fully freed from it in this mortal life. Such is no other sin but original. What more, that Socinians admit here the discussion is about congenital propensity to sin, not

acquired: Which other commonality to the human race is none other than original sin itself.

XVII. Lastly, not to mention others, the passage in Ephesians 2:3 is notable, 'We were by nature children of wrath, just as the others.' Whoever is by nature a child of wrath, is by nature a sinner, or liable to sin. But all humans are by nature children of wrath; the major premise is evident, because where there is wrath, there is sin, Psalm 90:8, 9, Isaiah 59:2. If you argue with Pelagius that by nature is the same as actually, I will press (1) the proper meaning of the word. For those things that are by nature are so by nature, and are opposed to those which are by custom or law, Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, book V, chapter VI. (2) The usage of Scripture: The Gentiles who do by nature (not actually) the things contained in the law, Romans 2:14. Jews who are Jews by nature and not by conversion to Judaism, Galatians 2:15, who are not sinners of the Gentiles by nature, Ephesians 2:3. (3) The apostolic opposition. Since nature is opposed to grace: as the natural state is contrasted with the supernatural and spiritual state. (4) The Socinians' Confession: that indeed all by nature are subject to eternal death, from which it follows we must by nature be children of wrath.

XVIII. And these are the testimonies from Scripture for now. We add arguments derived from the analogy of faith: (1) From Circumcision. Since the sacrament of circumcision was divinely ordained for infants, so that, being freed from the guilt of sin, they might be received into the covenant of grace, what could be more certain than that infants are subject to sin, as they are propagated carnally, hence circumcision was administered on the same member. (2) From the purification of women under the Old Testament, which was required for the same reason after childbirth, not because marriages were impure or childbirth itself as such, which is to be attributed to the

divine blessing before the fall, but because of the sin adhering, with which infants are conceived. Hence St. Augustine, in his work *Against Julian*, posits, “If original sin is not shown in the law, why then is it said in the law that the soul of the infant not circumcised on the eighth day shall be cut off from his people? Why was a sacrifice for sin offered upon the birth of an infant? Now, please be silent. Pay attention to the infant and do not sin. (3) From Baptism and regeneration. Whoever needs regeneration through baptism and the washing away of sins, must be liable to sin. But infants, as they are generated carnally, need regeneration through baptism, etc., John 3:3, Titus 3:5, Acts 2:36. Infants are baptized for the remission of sins according to the universal rule of the Church, and according to the judgment of the Gospel. Celestine himself professed this, as witnessed by Augustine in his work against Pelagius and Celestius on original sin. Hence, the Council of Mileve, Canon II, “Since it cannot be otherwise understood what the Apostle says, ‘through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned,’ except as the Catholic Church has always understood it everywhere: For this reason also infants, who could not have yet committed any sins themselves, are truly baptized for the remission of sins, so that by regeneration what they have drawn by generation may be cleansed. (4) From Exorcism in baptism. Augustine, in his letter 105 to Sixtus, presses this argument: They find nothing to answer to this, that infants are exorcised and breathed upon; for this is undoubtedly done deceitfully if the Devil does not dominate them. If, however, he dominates, and therefore they are not deceitfully exorcised and breathed upon by some nature, if not by sin, the prince of sins. (5) From the commonality of death to all. Since all humans are subject to death, all must also be liable to sin; because death is the penalty for sin: Romans 6, last

verse. But not all are liable to actual sin. Therefore, it is necessary to concede original sin, for which infants are cast away, who lack actual sin. Fulgentius in his work on the Incarnation and Grace of Christ, chapter XIV, "By what justice is an infant subjected to the wages of sin, if there is no pollution of sin in him, or how do we see death struck, if it has not felt the sting? The same rationale applies to diseases and other afflictions. Therefore, Augustine in his work Against Julian, chapter LXXXI, "For what reason then do infants suffer, if they have absolutely no sin? Could the Almighty and just GOD not prevent unjust punishments from being inflicted by so many believers? And against the Collator, chapter XX, "Unless perhaps it is said that punishment, not guilt, passed onto Adam's descendants; which is utterly falsely said, and perhaps for this reason, it is not said. For it is exceedingly impious to think this of GOD's justice, that He wished those free from transgression to be condemned with the guilty. Therefore, it is evident that where punishment is not hidden, guilt is convicted of the community of suffering, so that what is human misery is not from the creator's institution but from the judge's retribution. (6) From Christ's unique sinlessness. For if infants were not subject to original sin, lacking actual sin, Christ would not be the only sinless one; if the flesh of infants were free from sin, it would not differ from the flesh of Christ, who, however, is said to have been made like us in every way except for sin. Hebrews 4:15. Finally, (7) from the universal redemption by Christ. For if infants are not infected with original sin, Christ will not be their redeemer, nor will He pertain to them while they are in their mother's womb; thus, they will not need Christ the Savior. Hence Augustine, in his work against Pelagius, states, "The Pelagians say that GOD is not the cleanser, savior, liberator of all ages among men.

XIX. To these, we now add the consensus of the Church. The testimonies of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, Cyprian the Martyr, Reticus, Olympius, Hilary, and Ambrose, Bishops of the West, as well as those of the East, Gregory, Basil the Great, and also the fourteen others who presided as judges against Pelagius, Eulogius, John, Ammonianus, Porphyrius, Eutychius, Fidus, Zosimus, etc., are brought forward by Augustine and considered by us following his considerations. Ignatius, earlier than all of them, calls original sin in his Letter to the Trallians a 'wound from the old serpent.' Irenaeus calls it the 'ancient wound of the serpent,' Origenes the 'filth of sin,' from which no one is clean, in his work against Celsus and on Romans. Athanasius, in his oration against the Arians, calls it the sin that spread from Adam to all men. Nazianzen, in his oration on Easter, says we fell from the beginning through sin. Basil the Great, in his oration on fasting, says because we did not fast, we fell from paradise. Chrysostom, citing Augustine, says Christ came once, found OUR paternal handwriting, which Adam wrote. He initiated the debt, we increased the interest with subsequent sins. And in his homily on Romans, our body before the advent of Christ was easily conquered by sin. For along with death, a great swarm of passions also entered. Tertullian, in his work on the soul, otherwise remembers the Lord's definition: 'Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of GOD,' that is, he will not be holy. Thus, every soul is reckoned in Adam until it is recounted in Christ; unclean as long as it is not recounted. A sinner, however, because unclean, receiving its shame from the association with the flesh. Cyprian, in his third letter to Fidus, says an infant who is newly born, who has sinned nothing except that, born carnally according to Adam, he contracted the contagion of the ancient death by his first birth, should not be Prohibited. Arnobius, against the Gentiles, says we are

prone to faults and to various desires of lust by the vice of innate weakness. Ambrose, in his Apology for the prophet David, says before we are born, we are stained by contagion and before the use of light, we receive the injury of our origin; and in iniquity, we are conceived. Hilary, on Psalm 119, says by nature, indeed, the origin of his flesh detained him, but his will and religion divert his heart from that in which it remains, from the vice of origin to the works of justification. Jerome says the world is set in wickedness, and from childhood, the heart of man is prone to evil: so that not even one day from the beginning of human condition is without sin. Hence, David confesses in the Psalm: 'Behold, I was shaped in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me:' not in the iniquities of my mother, or certainly mine but in the iniquities of the human condition.

Therefore, St. Augustine rightly called Pelagius' doctrine a novelty in his time, and original sin a matter about which there was never any controversy in the Church of Christ. The truth against Pelagius and his supporters was asserted by various Doctors and Bishops in their own names, and also by entire councils, especially by the African Council of 214 Bishops, which approved the decrees made at the Council of Mileve in the year of Christ 418, and by the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in the year of our Lord 431, during which, according to Prosper against the Collator, the Eastern Church was cleansed of the twin plague of Nestorian impiety and Pelagian heresy, which, while they were allied with related errors, were at that occasion simultaneously defeated. But this is about the existence of original sin.

XX. Now, as for the universality of it, when the Augsburg Confession asserts that ALL humans after the fall of Adam are born with sin by natural propagation, it does not exempt any human being propagated naturally, thus not even Mary. Only Christ, who is not

merely a man but truly God by nature, and not naturally from a man and a woman but above nature through the operation of the Holy Spirit from the virgin pure, is free from all sin. As St. Ambrose comments on Isaiah, praised by St. Augustine in his fourth book to Boniface, it has thus been preserved that from a man and a woman, that is, through that physical union, no one seems to be free from fault; and whoever is free from fault, is also free from such conception. Also: 'For it was fitting that he who was not to have sin in his body should feel no natural contagion of generation.'

XXI. Although this could be clearly established by the most evident testimonies of Scripture, universally concluding all humans under sin, and by the consensus of all the ancient Doctors, including the early Scholastics, Marian devotion superstition, with what the Church defined from the Scriptures against Nestorius, that Mary is the Mother of God, gradually began to be shared with the mother, and eventually referred solely to her, so that veneration for the mother descended to her alone, without the Son, in images, with Him merely added as a sort of appendage to the painting: and eagerly, without mentioning Christ, they embarked on inventing new praises and types of religious worship for the Blessed Virgin, so much so that around the year 1050, the office divided into 7 canonical hours, which had once been used to celebrate the divine majesty, was established in honor of Mary, and in the following century even the Scriptures' declarations about the hypostatic wisdom were applied to her, so that among the newly conceived privileges, the one about immunity from original sin was also considered by some, until around the year of Christ 1136, it was introduced into ecclesiastical services by the Canons of Lyon, despite St. Bernard's vain opposition to this novelty. However, it was refuted in the following century by Scholastics of both orders, both Franciscans and Dominicans, until

John Duns Scotus, a Franciscan, in the thirteenth century, argued that God could have made it so that Mary was never in sin, either only momentarily or even for a while, and that the former could probably be attributed to Mary unless it conflicts with Scripture and the authority of the Church, while others of his order argued absolutely and straightforwardly that Mary was never in sin, with the Dominicans, under the auspices of Thomas Aquinas, advocating the contrary. Since the Franciscan opinion appeared more acceptable to most because of its semblance of religion and piety, it was also approved by the University of Paris, and then by the Council of Basel (prohibiting the contrary doctrine) and by Pope Sixtus IV, a Franciscan, with two diplomas. In one, he confirmed the new office of Leonardo Nogarolo, a Cleric of Verona and Protonotary, with indulgences granted to those who celebrate it; in the other, he condemned as falsehood and error those who might claim that defending or celebrating the Immaculate Conception was heretical or sinful, since it had not yet been determined by the Roman Church and Apostolic See. However, the contention between these orders did not cease, therefore Pope Leo X decided the controversy should be determined. But when a dispute arose among the Tridentine Fathers themselves, with John of Cadone, a Dominican, pressing the testimonies of the Fathers and Paul, and Jerome Lombardelli, a Franciscan, contending on the opposite side that the authority of the Church at that time was no less than that of the primitive, the Pope changed his plan and notified Rome that this controversy, which could cause schism among Catholics, should not be touched; but that the Tridentine Fathers should reconcile with each other, and to satisfy BOTH, especially the diploma of Sixtus IV should be diligently observed. Thus, it was decided, as noted by Peter Suavis, a Polish historian, in his History of the Council of Trent, book II, p.199, so that

in the decree it was expressly said not to include the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in this decree concerning original sin, to somewhat satisfy the Franciscans, nor to segregate her from the common law, so as not to offend the Dominicans, and to comply in all respects with the Pope, observing the constitutions of Sixtus IV, as declared by this Holy Synod, thus the words of session V, canon V, do not intend to include in this decree, where original sin is discussed, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, but the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV are to be observed under the penalties contained in those constitutions, which are renewed: Which indeed are as follows in the second constitution; those assertions of preachers and any others who presume to affirm that those who believed or held that the same Mother of God was preserved from the stain of original sin in her conception, are therefore tainted with the stain of any heresy, or commit mortal sin: such office of the conception celebrating or those listening to such sermons incur any sin, as false, erroneous, and utterly alien from the truth, we, by Apostolic authority through the tenor of the present, reproach and condemn: --- Also, by the same motion, knowledge, and authority, subjecting to similar punishment and censure those who dared to assert the contrary opinion, namely, that the glorious Virgin Mary was conceived with original sin to incur the crime of heresy or mortal sin, as it has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and Apostolic See. Pius V thus decreed, ordained, and commanded, in the bull 'incipiente super,' that no one of any order or dignity should presume to dispute in public sermons, lectures, conclusions, or any other public acts, asserting their own opinion with arguments or the authority of doctors, refuting or attacking the contrary, or to write or dictate in the vernacular on this question under any pretext of piety or necessity. However, as long as the

Apostolic See had not defined one side of the argument and condemned the opposite,

It was permissible for learned men in public academic disputes, whether at general or provincial chapter meetings, or where else those capable of understanding the matter were present without any occasion for scandal, to discuss that question and argue for either side with arguments, as long as neither was proclaimed as erroneous. Although these were thus decreed by Sixtus IV, the Council of Trent, and Pius V, again complaints arose about the seeds of dissent, hence controversies and quarrels, lamented by Paul V, who with a new diploma sanctioned the predecessors' constitutions, imposing new penalties on those who contravened them, depriving them of the faculty and active and passive voice of preaching, publicly reading, teaching, and interpreting, with perpetual disqualification for preaching, public reading, teaching, and interpreting, etc., established on July 6, 1616, and on August 31, 1617, in the general congregation of the Roman and universal inquisition at Quirinal Hill, it was decided that henceforth, until such an article had been defined by the Apostolic See, or otherwise ordered by Apostolic faith, no one dare assert in public sermons, lectures, conclusions, and any other public acts that the Blessed Virgin was conceived with original sin. Finally, Gregory XV, on May 24, 1622, in the general congregation of the Roman and universal inquisition extended and amplified this also to private conversations and writings, mandating and ordering that no one, even in private talks and writings, dare to assert that the Blessed Virgin was conceived with original sin, nor to act or treat in any way on this affirmative opinion, with this protestation, however, that by this decree it does not intend to disapprove that opinion, nor to inflict any prejudice upon it.

XXII. We have an excellent example of significant consensus within the Papacy, as well as a clear and infallible decision of controversies expected from the perpetual assistance of the Holy Spirit by the Roman Pontiff, and also of supreme and irrefutable authority in the Church! Although not only was it stirred by various and highly scandalous contentions, but it was vehemently urged by the prayers, desires, requests, and supplications of many, including the legation of King Philip III of Spain, carried out through Antonio de Trejo, Bishop of Carthage. As described by Luca Waddingo, Lavan, Ann. 1624 published; nevertheless, no decision could be obtained that would consult the peace of many Kingdoms, Academies, Cities, Monasteries, and the tranquility of consciences. Although also from the equally severe decrees of many Roman Pontiffs and the Ecumenical Council called Tridentine, under the severest penalties, it was decreed that no one should publicly or even privately assert that the Blessed Virgin was conceived with original sin, yet such authority could not prevail among its own to cease treating this matter: on the contrary, the truth prevailed against Bulls, Briefs, and Papal decrees. For not only from one side was the immaculate conception of the virgin (about which nothing had been defined by the Papal see) fiercely defended, which, after the Franciscans, as well as Ambrosius Catharinus and Johan. Clichtoveus, Jesuit Didacus Lainoz, Alph. Salmer, Petr. Canisius, Franc. Suarez, Azorius, Gabr. Vazquez, Ben, Perer: Martin Del Rio, Joh.de Salas, Bellarminus, Fr.Costrus, Henr. Henriquez, Jofeph.de Acosta, P.Sanchiez, Didat. Granado, Alvar. Pizanno in discussions on the conception, Ferdinandus Salazar in the defense for the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mother of God, especially asserted: to which are also added Basilius Pontius de Leon, Melchior Canus, Martin. Azpilcueta, Navarrus, Joh. Baptist de Lozana, Iband. from Bardaxi, Anton de Butrio, Didac. Matut and many others,

as Balt. Porrenon in his work on the immaculate conception of the Virgin and also Augustine. Barbosa in remissions to the Council of Trent, session V, notes even the Academy of Cologne, Mainz, Paris, Salamanca, Toledo, Alcalá, Zaragoza, Lerida, Tarragona, Braga, Seville, Valencia, and all other notable academies have accepted that opinion, and with a cheerful face took on its definition by public and solemn oath, even some cities affirmed its defense by solemn oath: Nor is anyone admitted to the degree of Doctor without a prior oath of asserting or not attacking the immaculate conception in the Academy of Mainz, Paris, and Spain, noted by Surius, Salmero, Canisius, Suarez. Even that opinion as defined by Gregory XV, Andreas Capitel, a Jesuit from Freiberg in 1626, defended, which whoever denies, incurs anathema, asserts Ambrosius Catharinus: See Gerhard's Catholic Confession, Appendix, article XXI, book II, part 3, p.466, into which opinion seems also to fall the Hosanna Marianum of the boys of Seville with the Bull granting indulgences by Paul V, at Dn. D. Dorfcheum in the Catholic ode, p.47. But from the other side, the Dominican opinion was defended no less fiercely, notwithstanding Papal decrees; As from the ancient Dominicans, Vincentius de Bandellis in his books on the conception of the Blessed Mary, published around the year of the Lord 1475, asserted the opinion that denies the Virgin was conceived in sin to be insane, full of falsehood, contrary to divine letters, contrary to the faith of all Catholics, to wickedly pervert the Scriptures, and to impiously defend the error of Pelagius, Celestine, and Julian, even to be heretical; so recent Dominicans affirm the same opinion, as the spokesperson sent by the King of Spain to the Pontiff in his Legation, page 395, reports, and Gabriel Vazquez in part 3, dispute 117, complains that Dominicans always persevere in their opinion: especially Ferdinandus Quirinus de Salazar in the Preface of his defense, not only

vehemently rebukes the Dominicans' stubbornness, that they present their opinion too freely in private conversations, even often among the uninformed, and seriously assert that Pope Paul V by his edict favored their doctrine; indeed, by the very fact that, after careful deliberation, the decision, which is so eagerly expected by all, regarding the immaculate conception is delayed and postponed, it tacitly demonstrates the strong arguments of the opposite doctrine, even when he commands that no action be taken on the opposite opinion, nor do the defenders of the immaculate conception attack it, the discussion of it seems to be completely banished and relegated from the Schools, complains Salazar, that edict imposes a not insignificant religion on the pious and learned, lovers of the virgin. Such is the esteem of the Pontiff in the Papacy, even among Jesuits themselves, to judge Papal decrees, to complain, to tragically lament. Nor do the Dominicans hesitate to extend the decree even to the Council of Trent, that the Blessed Virgin was also subject to the stain and guilt of original sin, although she was sanctified and completely cleansed. Are the decisions of Papal Councils so illustrious, so certain, and clear?

XXIII. But leaving those aside, we briefly note the foundations opposing the immaculate conception: Firstly, that there is nothing about it in the Scriptures. Indeed, Jodocus Clichtoveus dared to draw some passages here in his book on the purity of the conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, but, as they say, by twisting the collar. Nowhere in the sacred books, according to the true meaning of the text, does it appear, as Melchior Canus, book VII, Loc. Theol., chapter 3, and Jacobus Tirinus, a Jesuit, in the index of controversies, XI, n.9, admit that Mary was never subject to original sin because at the very first instant of her conception she was granted sanctifying grace, attempting to prove this from Luke 1:28, Song of Songs 2:2, 4:7, 12,

Psalm 45:6, Ezekiel 44:2, Proverbs 8:27, Genesis 3:15. But the last two passages speak of Christ, not Mary; those drawn from the Song of Songs and Psalms speak of the Church purified by Christ; the others do nothing for the immaculate conception of Mary. She is called full of grace, which means having the grace of GOD objectively, not that she is subjectively full of grace, as admitted by Erasmus, Stella, Eman. Sa, Salmer, Jansenius, with Theophyl

act, and others. The closed gate in Ezekiel 44, if applied to Mary, is said not to be closed to the demon, but to man, indicating her chaste and pure virginity, not the immaculate conception of Mary, which the Fathers noted allegorically. Why elaborate? Even Bellarmine himself, the wall and bastion of Catholic truth, as judged by Cornelius a Lapide, admits we should not expect an express word of GOD for the immaculate conception in his book IV on the loss of grace, chapter 15.

XXIV. Nor (2) can anything about it be brought from the doctors of the early Church or tradition. Bellarmine acknowledges, and it is agreed upon by almost everyone, that there is no certain Church definition on this; the ancient Fathers spoke little about this privilege of the Blessed Virgin, admits Suarez in Thomas, part 3, question 27, article 2. All the saints, who happened to mention it, unanimously asserted that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin, as shown by Melchior Canus, using Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Eusebius Emesenus, Remigius, Maximus, Bede, Anselm, Bernard, Edward the Martyr, Anthony of Padua, Bernardino, Bonaventure, Thomas, Vincentius, Antoninus, Damascene, Hugh of St. Victor; Cajetan brings forth fifteen, and those indeed irrefutable, and others two hundred, and others, like Blandellum, nearly three hundred

Fathers stating the same, notes Salmero, in Romans, chapter 5. How then will they teach the immaculate conception from tradition, which rather supports the contrary opinion?

XXV. (3) The testimonies of Scripture are too clear, accusing all those propagated by carnal generation of sin, with no exceptions, no exclusions. John 3:6, Romans 3:27, 5:12. Jesuits do not escape the force of these verses, while they distinguish between the obligation to contract original sin and the actual contraction of it. For carnal conception not only introduces the obligation but the sin itself *de facto*: nor do those verses deal with sin in potential, but in actual, to which all, whether Jews or Gentiles, are declared subject, just as all are actually subject to the penalty of sin, not only potentially or merely by the obligation of penalty, not even with the exception of the Blessed Virgin. And if all have sinned in Adam, including Mary, as admitted by Jesuits Bellarmine, Tirinus, others, (although Valent. Gerhardus in the triumph of the Blessed Virgin and a few others deny it), how can she be said to be redeemed, asks Bellarmine in book IV on the loss of grace, chapter 16. What is clearer than that not only the necessity and obligation of contracting sin but the very sin itself has been transfused into all, including Mary herself? For to whom Adam's sin is imputed by just God's imputation, to them also original sin is propagated through carnal generation, as that habitual sin and specific nature of corruption, with which he infected the source of the whole human race with his defection. And how can the Blessed Virgin be said to have sinned in Adam if she never at any moment sustained the stain and guilt of that sin, and if in no way did sin pass from Adam to her?

XXVI. The Scripture makes the Blessed Virgin Mary susceptible to certain sins and actual lapses in Matthew 12:46, Luke 2:45,49, John 2:4, and Salmero in Volume III, treatise 43, Chrysostom, Origen,

Theophylact, and other Fathers recognize the faults and lapses of the Blessed Virgin but says they spoke more freely at a time when her sanctity was not fully known and explored. Where, then, have the Papists now discovered it, if it was not known to the Fathers?

XXVII. (5) Sacred Scripture claims the privilege of sinlessness for no one except Christ alone, as a unique and proper attribute, and exempts only Him from all sin, as seen in Isaiah 53:6, Daniel 9:24, 2 Corinthians 5:21, Hebrews 4:15, 7:26. Even to be free from sin, He alone was conceived by the Holy Spirit. This argument is pressed by St. Bernard, even though he otherwise indulges in hyperbolic praises of Mary: 'Whence, then,' he asks in Epistle 174 to the Canons of Lyons regarding the sanctity of conception, 'unless perhaps someone says that she was conceived by the Holy Spirit and not by a man? But this is unheard of until now—only the Lord Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit because He alone was holy before His conception.' Gregory the Great, in *Morals*, Book XVII, Chapter XV, asks, 'Who would be without sin if he descended from a mixture of sin? Therefore, for our sake, the Son of God was made man in the womb of the Virgin for us, etc.' Bellarmine does not deny that there are among Catholics those who find the path excluding Christ from the common law of original sin to be more inclined to truth.

XXVIII. (6) There is no doubt that the Blessed Virgin needed a redeemer and was redeemed by Christ, whom she declares her Savior in Luke 1:47. 'Among Catholics,' says Bellarmine, 'it is agreed that the Blessed Virgin was truly redeemed by the blood of Christ, and what the Apostle says, 'Christ died for all,' in 2 Corinthians 5, is to be taken without any exception. But that redemption is not needed unless one is actually a sinner, since Christ redeems and saves from sin; nor do the healthy need a physician, but the sick, or a plaster where there is no actual wound. Matthew 1:21, 9:12, Isaiah

53:5, 1 Peter 2:24. Nor, unless absurdly, do Jesuits concoct that Mary was redeemed by Christ in a manner different from other humans, as if she were redeemed before the fall, merely by being preserved from falling, and that redemption for her was only a prophylactic remedy, while for others it is cathartic: for Scripture recognizes only one redemption for all, made through the intervention and satisfaction of the Redeemer, who took the place of all and bore the guilt of all, satisfying for it. If, therefore, Mary was redeemed through Christ, she must not have been immune from sin; otherwise, Christ would not have borne or expiated her sin, nor would He have suffered death or satisfied for it. No one can be said to be freed and redeemed unless truly previously captive through sin, as stated by Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, in Augustine's Epistle 157. No one pays the penalty for a potential sin, but for one that exists; no one is held to satisfy for themselves or through another for a debt that could have been contracted but was actually contracted. 'The Lord Jesus,' says Ambrose in Book IX, Epistle 71, 'forgave sin for all, which no one could avoid, and erased our handwriting with the shedding of His blood. Since the whole world had become subject, He took away the sin of the whole world.' And in Book III on virginity, near the end, 'We were pledged to an evil creditor by our sins; we contracted a handwriting of guilt, we owed the penalty of blood; the Lord Jesus came and offered His blood for us.' 'Everyone who is redeemed,' says Gregory the Great, Pope, in Book XVIII of Morals, Chapter XXV, 'is surely liberated from some captivity. Where, then, is anyone redeemed from if he was not previously captive under guilt?' Hence, Leo the Great, also a Bishop of Rome, in Sermon 1 on the Nativity, 'The reason for joy is common to all because our Lord, the destroyer of sin and death, found NO ONE free from guilt but came to free ALL.'

XXIX. (7) Nor did the Blessed Virgin obtain blessedness and salvation in any other way than which, after the fall, surpasses all through the grace of the merciful God, by the forgiveness of sins, Romans 4:6, Psalm 32:1. For there is no other method of obtaining salvation, Acts 4:12, 13:3. We have often said that justification is the forgiveness of sins, and the forgiveness of sins is justification, says Bellarmine in Book II on justification, chapter 13, section 3. If, therefore, the Blessed Virgin was justified, she must have received forgiveness of sins. Certainly, grace and liberation, which are in Christ, the second Adam, reach no one to whom Adam's sin and from it the guilt of death had not previously reached, as testified by the Apostle in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15:22. 'Is there anyone truly blessed to whom the Lord has not imputed sin? For who has not had sin? Everyone has sinned and falls short of the glory of God,' says Bernard in Sermon XXIII on the Song of Songs and Sermon XXII. 'Christ became for us wisdom in preaching, righteousness in the absolution of sins.' And in Epistle CXC to Innocent, 'For if one died for all, then all have died; so that the satisfaction of one may be imputed to all just as he bore the sins of all.' Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome, in Sermon VI on the Nativity of Christ, 'Whatever part of the world of believers is regenerated in Christ, by breaking the chain of oldness, passes into a new man by rebirth, and is no longer counted in the lineage of the carnal father but in the seed of the Savior, who became the son of man so that we might become children of God.'

XXX. (8) Since all Saints are obliged to pray for the forgiveness of sins, Psalm 32:1, undoubtedly Mary also had to obtain the same; to whom, no less than to others, the form of prayer prescribed by the Lord applies, Matthew 6:12. This is also supported by the teaching that Mary was baptized, as taught by Bellarmine in Book III on Baptism, chapter 9, Sebast. Barradius in Book

I of the Concordance of the Gospels, Book X, chapter 6, Canisius the Jesuit, etc., as observed in the Roman Church by Gabriel Biel in Book IV of Sentences, Distinction VI, Question II, Doubt 6. For baptism is for the forgiveness of sins, Acts 2:38, 22:16.

XXXI. (9) Finally, since Mary was subject to the penalties of sins, various calamities, miseries, and death itself, which is the wage of sin, what is clearer than that she was also subject to sin? Where there is no guilt, there can be no punishment. Hence, the Apostle himself links the universal penalty of death with the guilt common to all humanity in Romans 5, and thus teaches that death passed to all men because sin passed from one man to all humanity, as testified by papal interpreters.

XXXII. To all these points, let's add the testimonies of the opponents themselves. We mentioned earlier how both the Scholastics and the Dominicans recognized that Mary was conceived in original sin and refuted the contrary opinion about the Immaculate Conception. As an initial challenge, St. Bernard opposed it, although in other respects he exceeded moderation in his praises of Mary, disputing with the authors of the feast of the Immaculate Conception among the Canons of Lyons in Epistle 174, in this manner: 'We marvel enough at what seemed right to some of you at this time to change the best color by introducing a new celebration, a ritual unknown to the Church, unapproved by reason, not recommended by ancient tradition. Are we more knowledgeable or more devout than the Fathers? See the entire epistle here, worthy of reading, where he destroys the Immaculate Conception of Mary. A century later, Thomas Aquinas defended the same position in Summa Theologica, Part 2, Question 81, Article 3, firmly holding according to the Catholic faith that all humans derived from Adam, except Christ alone, contract original sin from Adam; otherwise, not everyone would

need redemption through Christ. This was also supported by Guido of Perpignan, a Carmelite Bishop of Majorca and Elven around the year 1320 in *Harmony of the Gospels* to Luke 1:35. 'It is not to Mary's honor where it detracts from the honor of the Son or subtracts the privileges of the Son. It is the privilege of the Son to be the redeemer of all and that all need His grace for the amendment of sin, as evident in Romans 3, which privilege is taken away if any person or woman is conceived without sin.' And in the year 1475, Vincentius de Bandellis in his books on the conception of the Blessed Mary, which we mentioned before, pronounced the opinion of the Immaculate Conception to be contradictory to the Scriptures, Councils, and renowned Doctors, and to be heretical. Even the Franciscans and Dominicans initially opposed it until the year 1300, as did recent scholars in the previous century such as Cardinal Thomas Cajetan in *Sentences*, Book 3, Distinction 3, Johannes Capetius in his treatise on indulgences, Dominic Bannes, and many others. Furthermore, those who defend this opinion also conflict with each other. Bellarmine refutes those who claim the Blessed Virgin did not sin in Adam; Jacobus Tirinus opposes the view of those who not only exempt the Blessed Virgin from original sin but also from the debt of contracting original sin. Whereas Angelus de Monte Filosofo, a Minorite, and Ferdinand Salazar in his treatise on the immaculate conception of the virgin, chapter XLI, try to prove from the perspective of Catharinus, Franciscus Turrianus, Jacobus Laynez, Dominic de Soto, Cornelius Mussus, Bishop of Bitonto (compiler of the decrees of the Council of Trent), Loys Carabafal, and other Fathers at the Council of Trent, that the opinion of the Virgin's exemption from the common law and covenant or debt of contracting sin was notably celebrated and approved at the Council of Trent. Others not only exempt her from the debt of contracting sin but further assert she was conceived as

Theotokos in glory, drawing upon the words of Proverbs 8:22, 'The Lord possessed me...' explaining the eternal generation of the Son of God. This interpretation was recently defended by John Baptist of Campania, Bishop of Tortosa, and explicitly stated in a particular writing by Francisco Guerrero, Archbishop of Cadiz, about the eminence of the Virgin, etc. Rarely, when the first instant of her conception was said to be sanctified by sanctifying grace according to Tirinus, so that she was never de facto subject to original sin; Robert Bellarmine agrees with those who assert that the first moment of Mary's conception, when the formless and soulless fetus began to exist in the womb, was similar to other conceptions, and that she was freed from the stain of original sin at the moment of ensoulment in Book IV on the loss of grace, chapter XVI, section. If she was freed from sin then, she was subject to sin before. Moreover, how could she have become a participant in sanctifying grace before animation, since the soul is the proper subject of sanctifying grace? And what could be more absurd than to make the Blessed Virgin subject to original sin when she did not yet exist, and free from the stain of the same when she first began to exist? Furthermore, when Pius V, as noted by Becanus in Scholastic Theology, Part 2, treatise 2, chapter 9, removed the specific office of the conception because it stated that the Blessed Virgin was immaculate and preserved, is it to be considered that he leaned towards the Dominican side? From Salazar's complaint, it is quite clear how much Paul V's edict favored the Dominicans, as previously mentioned. And from the Pope himself, it is known that the Dominicans were excused regarding the feast of the conception of the Blessed Virgin; it is clear from the Spanish legation that the preachers say they agree in celebrating the feast, although not under the aspect of immaculate conception, yet for the reason of sanctification. Finally, Gregory XV, when he

prohibited in 1622 from discussing or treating the opinion that the Blessed Virgin was conceived with original sin, excepted those to whom this was specifically granted by the Apostolic See; he added this declaration: By this, however, His Holiness does not intend to disapprove this opinion, nor to infer any prejudice against it whatsoever. If this opinion is false, why is it not allowed to refute it, why is a special indulgence needed (which, however, many who lack it freely refute it), why does Papal Holiness dare not to infer any prejudice whatsoever against a false opinion? Evidently, its infallibility here has faltered, the foundation and bulwark of the Roman Church! But let us leave this question as well.

TO GOD ALONE BE THE GLORY.