

**PART II**  
**The Doctrine of the Adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is Not a Just Cause for Separation**

**CHAPTER I**  
**The Catholic Teaching is Presented**

I. The Council of Trent teaches: "If anyone says that in the Holy Eucharist, Christ, the Only-Begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship of latria, even externally, and that He should neither be venerated with a special festive celebration nor be solemnly carried in processions according to the laudable and universal custom of the Church, nor publicly presented to the people for adoration, and that His adorers are idolaters—let him be anathema."

II. The same Council states: "No one should doubt that in the Catholic Church, the worship of latria, which is truly due to God, is to be given to this Most Holy Sacrament in veneration. Nor is it any less worthy of adoration because it was instituted by Christ the Lord to be received. For we believe that the same God is present therein, whom the Eternal Father, introducing into the world, says: 'Let all the angels of God adore Him'; whom the Magi, falling down, adored; and whom the Scriptures testify was also adored by the Apostles in Galilee."

III. Now, four different matters must be examined:

1. The adoration of Christ Jesus present in the Holy Eucharist.
2. The adoration of the Holy Sacrament.
3. The adoration of the species of bread and wine.
4. The adoration of any substance veiled by accidents in general.

IV. Regarding the first point: All Catholics believe that Christ Jesus, truly present in the Holy Eucharist, is to be adored with the worship of latria. This is stated most explicitly in the Council of Trent, as cited above. Whoever believes this is Catholic in this matter and is not required to believe or do anything further—regardless of what Crocius or others may argue rashly and without foresight.

V. Furthermore, nothing else is established in Chapter 5 of the Council's decree. It does not propose a double or distinct adoration—one directed to Christ and another to the Eucharistic species. Since the Council deduces absolute adoration from Christ's real presence through transubstantiation, and since it states: "Therefore, no room is left for doubt," it is clear that: The worship of latria is absolutely due to Christ in the Eucharist.

It cannot be due to the species themselves.

The Council declares that this worship is the same as that offered to Christ by the Magi and the Apostles, which was absolute and directed to Christ Himself.

Therefore, there is no mention here of adoring mere symbols.

VI. When the Council states that "the Most Holy Sacrament is to be adored", by Sacrament, we understand nothing other than Christ Himself, who is present in the Sacrament

both as a sign and as the very reality of the Sacrament itself. (See Véron, *Epitome of Controversies*, Vol. 1, p. 301; Vol. 3, p. 748; *General Rules*, p. 26.)

VII. Regarding the second point: Scholastic theologians teach that the whole Sacrament may be licitly adored with the worship of latria. In this way, adoration somehow extends to the symbols of bread and wine, insofar as they are perceived as one with Christ. This interpretation is based on the words of the Council, which states that “the Sacrament is to be adored” because Christ is truly present in it.

VIII. The Scholastics explain this with an analogy: "A king is honored with the same royal dignity, whether he is clothed in a robe or not. It would be absurd for courtiers or any prudent person to give a king royal honor without his robe but to deny it to him when he is wearing it. Worse still would be someone who flees the royal court when the king wears his robe, refusing to honor him in that state—when he otherwise acknowledges the king should be honored."

Likewise, Protestants behave absurdly when they refuse to adore Christ in the Eucharist because He is veiled by the species, thereby causing schism. Yet they acknowledge that Christ should not be denied adoration when He was on earth, nor when He is in heaven. If one were to apply this reasoning to royal honor, it would be ridiculous to dispute whether a king should be honored while wearing his robe or while it is stored away. Let theologians debate in schools the precise nature of the honor given to the Eucharistic species. But if Protestants claim that two distinct types of adoration are given—one absolute to Christ and another relative to the species—or if they question what kind of honor should be given to the species apart from their connection to Christ, and use this as a justification for their schism, they are to be rejected rather than refuted, since the Catholic Church does not require any particular theological opinion on this matter as an article of faith.

IX. Regarding the third point: The adoration of the species of bread and wine, considered apart from Christ, is not defined by the Council, nor does it teach that they are to be adored or in what way they should be honored. The species are inanimate objects, incapable of receiving honor except insofar as they are joined to Christ, whom they contain. This is a matter for theological debate. We shall simply say that, just as one may honor a king's robe, sometimes even kissing it out of reverence, so too do we honor Christ veiled by these Eucharistic symbols. Just as it would be impossible to honor the king while spitting upon his garments, so too, whoever adores Christ under the Eucharistic symbols also reverences those symbols, however that reverence may be called. The Council remains silent on this detail. Even the Reformers, when receiving bread in their Communion, do so with uncovered heads and reverence, yet they have never defined what kind of reverence this is.

X. Regarding the fourth point: The adoration of any substance veiled under accidents is not taught by the Council of Trent, nor held by any Catholic doctor.

XI. Kuhnæus tries to persuade his reader otherwise with the following flawed argument: "All Papists declare that the substance of Christ's body, veiled under the accidents and species of bread and wine, must be absolutely adored. Therefore, there is some substance which, when

veiled by accidents, Papists affirm must be adored. Therefore, it is false that no one teaches that any substance veiled by the accidents of bread and wine should be absolutely adored."

Who has ever heard of such a ridiculous syllogism, which indiscriminately draws any conclusion from any premise? We teach that the substance of Christ's body, veiled under the Eucharistic species, is absolutely to be adored. Therefore, we teach that a specific, determinate substance is to be adored. Does this mean we teach that any substance, in general, veiled under the accidents of bread and wine, is to be adored? Lutherans themselves teach that Christ, present in heaven, is to be adored absolutely. Does this mean they teach that any substance in heaven should be absolutely adored? It is astonishing that anyone even moderately prudent would be swayed by such absurd reasoning in support of Lutheran schism.

XII. It is thus Catholic doctrine that Christ Jesus is present in the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist to be adored. Nor do Protestants deny that the sacred symbols are to be handled and received with reverence, whatever name that reverence may be called. However, Catholic doctors, whatever they may dispute regarding the quality of the honor attributed to the species, do not hold their opinion as Catholic faith—of which faith alone we are speaking here.

## CHAPTER II

### **The Opinion of the Lutherans on the Adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist**

I. Since in what follows frequent mention will be made of the Lutheran position in this matter, it is necessary both to satisfy their opinion and to respond to some objections and evasions of Crocius.

II. Crocius, arguing for the Lutherans, writes: "That from the real presence, such as the Lutherans profess to establish, it follows equally that Christ should be adored in the Eucharist, Eilbracht does not say. Nor does it appear that he saw that the charge of idolatry should be imputed to the Lutherans just as to the Papists. This is a poetic fabrication. He could not see how the charge of idolatry could be imputed to them equally with the Papists, who do not adore the Sacrament and who oppose adoration. Granted that adoration follows from presence: nevertheless, the Lutherans do not adore, nor do they acknowledge this." Likewise: "The Lutherans today do not adore the Sacrament; rather, they vehemently oppose it in the Papists." (See *ibid.*, n. 10, p. 332.)

III. Further, he writes: "Some Lutherans, in former times, did make statements about external adoration directed toward the Sacrament. Today, by general agreement, they reject it." Likewise: "The Lutherans say that Christ is to be adored not in the bread, but in the Most Holy Eucharist, which we also acknowledge and affirm." Likewise: "They so adore Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist that they testify in no way that adoration pertains to the symbols." Likewise: "The Lutherans protest that they do not direct their adoration toward the symbols, nor do they relate it to them in any way."

IV. Crocius presents the Lutheran position in a highly convoluted and insufficiently faithful manner. And Kuhnæus so insists on caviling that he does not plainly state his own party's position. Therefore, it is necessary that Christopher Scheibler present it:

"Christ, who is in the Eucharist, is to be adored properly speaking. This is evident because Christ is truly God, who in the unity of [Greek text] assumed humanity. Now, divinity necessarily entails adorability, so that because of the unity of the person, God and man are adored as one." And this is explicitly stated in Scripture: Matthew 4:10, Philippians 2:9. Likewise: "External genuflection is indeed a beautiful ceremony and an indication of submission of mind, but in it adoration is not completed; rather, it can be performed with or without genuflection, provided it is done in spirit and in truth (John 4:23), that is, through the soul and purity of mind, as Theophylact interprets this passage."

Further: "I say this so that no one may think that where genuflection is not customary, Christ is not adored there."

He adds: "It must be observed that the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist does not necessarily require that we fix our mind or eyes upon external earthly things, which by Christ's ordinance are in the Eucharist, but that Christ can indeed be adored even while disregarding such an external view."

V. And most explicitly: "His presence ensures that one does not sin who, in the Eucharist under the form of bread, adores Christ, but not by adoring the bread, rather Christ. Nevertheless, that does not mean that adoration in this way is necessary." And shortly thereafter: "Hence, in this sense, Luther said (sermon fol. 207), 'Neither are those to be condemned who adore the Sacrament, nor those who do not adore it.'"

Therefore, according to Scheibler's position, it is permissible to adore Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist as present under the form of bread.

VI. Scheibler concludes: "It is evident that when we adore Christ truly present in the Eucharist, we do so in conformity with the doctrine of the ancient Catholics, and thus, all things being equal, we do not reproach the Pontificians for doing the same."

VII. Let the reader consider with what boldness Crocius says that the Lutherans do not adore the Sacrament, that they oppose adoration, that they deny the logical connection between presence and adoration, and that they do not adore the Sacrament today but rather vigorously oppose it in the Papists. But what will schismatics not say and invent, as they pile up falsehoods upon a badly begun schism by any means necessary?

VIII. Again, let the reader consider how, according to Scheibler, Luther himself said: "Neither are those to be condemned who adore the Sacrament," understanding "the Sacrament" as the very reality of the Sacrament—Christ Jesus present under the symbols. And after Crocius, one may marvel at finding Kuhnæus, who, by fruitless quibbles, prevents the words of the Council of Trent ("the true worship of latria, which is due to God alone, is to be given to the Most Holy Sacrament") from being understood of the reality of the Sacrament itself. Yet from the very beginning of the schism, it has been customary for schismatics to defend at home what they most bitterly accuse Catholics of.

IX. Lest Scheibler alone speak for all, let us hear the theologians of Württemberg, who, after reporting Luther's opinion on the adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, write: "It seems to us that Luther wrote nothing about adoration that in all respects agrees with the Word of God. For he expressly testifies that the adoration of Christ in the Sacrament is not prayer, but only reverence and honor, both internal and external, performed inwardly in the heart and outwardly with the whole body, and that it is neither commanded nor forbidden by Christ." And among the four orders, those who omit adoration and instead focus on the words of promise, considering what Christ accomplishes in them through this Sacrament so that they may receive it with true faith, are regarded as the best.

X. To go higher to the most esteemed forebears of the Lutherans and the Reformers, whom the Hussites have customarily called witnesses of truth: Rokyzana says: "The body of the Lord Jesus in the Sacrament must be observed with great fear and reverence by all the faithful of Christ." He further states: "Whoever does not incline toward worshiping and venerating the body of Christ in the Sacrament is not of true and living faith." And again: "Priests, together with the faithful, must bodily show reverence to Christ Jesus and His body in the Sacrament through genuflections, bowing of the head, and sometimes even prostration with the face to the ground."

XI. If it was lawful for the Hussites to write, "Whoever does not incline toward adoring the body of Christ in the Sacrament is not of true and living faith," how is it now lawful for the Reformers to write, "Whoever inclines toward adoring the body of Christ in the Sacrament is not of true and living faith but the worst idolater?" Let Crocius and Kuhnæus now go and uselessly attack the purely scholastic opinions of Catholic doctors, while among their own factions necessary truths are betrayed by their own witnesses and brethren.

### **CHAPTER III**

#### **The Opinion of the Lutherans on the Adoration of the Sacramental Species.**

I. Scheibler says: Speaking of the Sacrament as such, or in its entirety, it is not to be adored properly speaking. For the Sacrament of the Eucharist consists of two things: an earthly element and a heavenly reality, as Irenæus says. And at least according to the understanding of the Pontificians, in the Supper, the Lord is the body of Christ, and the species of bread; likewise, the blood of the Lord and the species of wine. But the earthly element or even those species are not, properly speaking, to be adored.

Likewise, I say that the Sacrament as such, in its entirety, is not properly speaking to be adored, because it is something honorable, and in Greek, *σεβασμιον* (venerable) and *τιμιόν* (worthy of honor). Sometimes, such terms are used in a latreutic sense, and although the Sacrament itself is not, in itself, an object of adoration, it is nevertheless something sacred, which pertains to the worship and adoration of God and our Savior, and which can serve us in

that regard, as D. Mejerus points out in his disputation "Jubilare," Argent. thes. 68. He also provides examples of this meaning, since even in Civil Law, sacred places, faith, baptism, and communion are called "adorable." (Novell. 79 in fine praef.; Novell. 109, c.1; & Novell. 6, c.6; & 139, c.1.) In the same way, marriage is also called τιμιόν (honorable) in Hebrews 13:4. Thus, both Baptism and the Eucharist are Sacraments that are "adorable," venerable, and honorable, just as Luther himself, in Article 6 against Louvain, calls the Eucharist an "adorable and venerable Sacrament."

II. This statement fully encompasses what we teach by Catholic faith concerning the adorability of the Sacramental species, namely, that they are to be considered adorable, honorable, and venerable in the sense that they contribute to the worship and adoration of God and our Savior and can serve us in this regard, as Scheibler holds. Whatever contributes to honor, worship, and adoration and serves us in this way, we treat with veneration.

Let theologians in their schools inquire by what name this veneration should be called, whether it is directed to Christ and the species as one entity, or whether it refers only to the species themselves. Good Catholics, who are ignorant of such subtle distinctions, adore Christ as present in spirit and truth, and they venerate the species insofar as they conceal Christ.

III. It would be desirable that the Lutherans, when presenting controversies about the Catholic faith, abstain from purely scholastic disputes, lest by confusing one thing for another, they continue to beat the air and deceive the simple-minded, to whom mere probabilities are often presented as Catholic truths and are woven into writings composed merely for applause.

Kuhnæus reports that Vasquez holds that the flesh of Christ is not to be adored with latria for itself, but only accidentally. From this alone, he could and should have understood that, according to the same principle, the sacramental species, even when united to Christ, are not to be adored for themselves but only accidentally. Hence, there are Catholic doctors who hold that latria is not applicable to the sacramental species for themselves, no matter how closely they are joined to Christ.

Furthermore, he could and should have understood that those Catholic doctors who ascribe perfect and absolute latria to the species united to Christ do not present their position as a certainty of the Catholic faith but only as a probable opinion. However, the issue at hand here is solely to vindicate what pertains to the Catholic faith against the cavils of schismatics.

IV. Some of our own theologians say that the worship given to Christ, as He is peculiarly present under the species, applies to the species only incidentally. They explain that Christ is thus adored under the species just as Christ is adored while clothed—meaning that the mind, moved by the presence of Christ, directs the worship of latria to Him as the primary object while granting a certain reverence to what is joined to Him.

This reverence, arising from the worship of latria, is sometimes also called latria, because it is frequently a single act directed toward the principal object while also involving what is joined to it, even though it is distinct in a virtual sense.

Therefore, just as the primary object (Christ, true God and man) is properly adorable with latria, and its adjunct (the sacramental species) is made adorable or honorable by association, so

the mind of the believer is moved to adore Christ in spirit and truth. The adoration, whether directed toward Christ clothed or toward Christ veiled by the species, does not split into two separate acts but remains one act that is virtually distinct.

Nor is this any more difficult to understand than the case of a person who loves both God and neighbor with a single act of love. This love would be called virtually distinct, as it is directed toward God in one way and toward neighbor in another. In the same way, the adoration directed toward Christ, whether clothed or veiled under symbols, remains a single act.

In the Gospel, the woman with the issue of blood adored Christ while He was clothed. There is no reason to say that she either gave no honor to His garments or that she separately honored Christ in one act and His garments in another. Why, then, should it not be said that her act of adoration extended to Christ clothed and, in a sense, to both Christ and His garments? Though the act was virtually distinct, it was still one act tending toward Christ precisely and toward His garments as joined to Him.

V. However, as we have said, the Catholic Church has defined nothing regarding these subtleties. It is sufficient for us to hold that Christ is to be adored with latria in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist and that the sacramental species are adorable in the sense that even the Lutherans recognize.

VI. Kuhnæus states: Latria is given to the symbols either for themselves, which would be true idolatry, or not for themselves, which is what the theologians of Walenburch affirm. However, if it is not latria properly speaking, then it is not true worship, because this implies giving the highest worship due to the Supreme Principle for the sake of something else.

Moreover, the latria given to the species is either the same as that which is due to Christ, or it is a lesser form of worship. If the former, then the created species are worshiped equally with God Himself, and thus idolatry is committed, not only because an idol is worshiped instead of the true God, but also because something else is co-worshiped alongside Him. If the latter, then it is not truly latria, since latria is the highest form of worship.

VII. Response:

1. The Council of Trent did not define that latria must be given to the symbols, so this objection is baseless.
2. It can be said that latria is given to the symbols not for their own sake but for the sake of Christ, to whom these symbols are joined. Since it is a single act tending toward Christ and toward the symbols as joined to Him, it follows that the same act should not only be considered as one—whereby it may rightly be called latria and truly is—but also as virtually distinct. Insofar as it tends toward Christ, who is per se adorable, it is properly latria; however, insofar as it tends toward the symbols, which are not per se adorable, it follows that this act, inasmuch as it is directed toward the symbols, is not true latria but rather an honor subordinated to latria. This is the same reasoning by which the object of latria (Christ) renders what is joined to Him venerable by a subordinated honor.
3. When, therefore, Christ is adored with latria in a single act along with the symbols, it remains the same latria directed toward both Christ and the symbols. However, because

this single act is virtually distinct—since it properly tends toward Christ as latria in its proper sense, whereas it tends toward the species as joined to Christ—it is latria by accident, or secondary latria. To put it more plainly, it is not the highest form of worship, but rather an honor derived from and proportionate to the supreme worship given to Christ.

4. If one were to say that there are two acts of honor—one properly latria, directed toward Christ, and the other a lesser and subordinate honor directed toward the species—perhaps no one would contradict this. Yet all would necessarily admit that just as the species are not honorable in themselves but only because of their conjunction with Christ, so too the honor directed toward them derives from the honor and latria given to Christ.

What difficulty, then, remains if one says that Christ and the species are adored in a single act that is virtually distinct? This is just as when a king, clothed in royal garments, is honored with a single act, even though that act is directed differently toward his person and toward his garments. Indeed, we sometimes even kiss a king's garments out of reverence.

#### **Chapter IV: The Opinion of the Reformers on the Adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist**

I. Eilbracht states: No matter what distinctions or convenient interpretations may be applied, the doctrine of the Papists can never be reconciled with the opinion of the Orthodox (Calvinists) in such a way that they would not be rightly accused of idolatry and solidly convicted of it. For since the controversy between the two remains clear regarding transubstantiation and the real presence of Christ's body in the sacred Supper, and since the Papists themselves admit that, if this doctrine is denied, their supreme worship of latria in the Eucharist would necessarily be idolatry, it follows that they are committing idolatry unless they can first demonstrate their transubstantiation and real presence with stronger arguments than they have provided so far.

Then he presents the Catholic position in these words: That Christ, true God and man, who is truly present in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, must also be adored therein with latria. The Reformers reply: This adoration is an execrable idolatry.

II. Daillé states: The Roman Church commands its followers to render this supreme form of servitude, which it calls latria and acknowledges as due only to the true God, to something that we believe to be a mere creature and not God—namely, the Eucharistic bread. The Church requires us to regard this Sacrament, truly holy and precious though it is, as if it were the supreme God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and the Redeemer of mankind. However, our senses, reason, and faith, informed by the Scriptures, recognize it as bread. The Roman Church wants us to attribute to this object all the praise of creation and redemption, to surround it with all the glory due to our supreme Lord, and to prostrate our hearts and bodies before it. The same Daillé discusses at length the adoration of the sacramental species, which will be treated further in its proper place.

III. Since we proposed to examine and establish this question—namely, that the worship of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist is not a just cause for the Reformers' separation from the Catholic Church—Crocus, being somewhat uncertain about his contradiction, substitutes a different question: Is the separation justified because the Papists adore the Sacrament?

If this question coincides with ours, then to adore the Sacrament and to adore Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist are identical. But if Crocius understands it differently, as will soon be evident, let the reader judge why he altered the question.

IV. Crocius explains his position as follows: We say that the Papists commit idolatry in the worship and adoration of the Eucharist. He adds: \*We do not simply accuse them of teaching that Christ is to be adored, whom they believe to be present in the Most Holy Eucharist. We ourselves adore Christ; we ourselves believe that Christ is present in the Most Holy Eucharist. Christ can be adored in the Sacrament as in prayer, as in baptism, or as in images, which are adored alongside Christ. We do not object to the first way, but the second pleases the Papists. They adore Christ as present with His body and blood through transubstantiation under the accidental species of bread and wine—not only Christ Himself.

Moreover, they do not merely adore Christ but also the species of bread and wine. It makes no difference that they deny the continued existence of bread and wine. They claim that the accidents of bread and wine remain, and they adore them as well. In fact, they adore the entire Sacrament, and the Sacrament is not complete without the symbols. The Sacrament is the visible form of invisible grace.

They wish us to adore the accidents of bread. This is an even more horrific idolatry. Who would call it idolatry to adore Christ, whom we believe to be present in the Sacrament? We ourselves adore Him; we also adore Him in the Eucharist. But not as you do, in an image. We adore Him as in prayer, as in baptism.

He frequently repeats this in the following passages: Book 6, ch. 22, n. 12, p. 311; n. 14, p. 312; n. 19, p. 316; ch. 23, n. 10–11, p. 334; ch. 24, n. 1, p. 337; n. 3, p. 338; n. 4–5, p. 339; n. 6, p. 341; n. 11–12, p. 345; n. 14–15, p. 347; n. 16, p. 348; n. 17, p. 350; ch. 25, n. 12, p. 364; n. 14, p. 366; n. 16, p. 367; n. 19, p. 369.

V. Here we briefly note how Crocius, as is customary among his party, speaks in such a way that he may appear to hold the correct position, while in reality, he strays far from the truth. The Sacrament is the visible form of invisible grace. This is stated correctly.

"Who would call it idolatry to adore Christ, whom we believe to be present in the Sacrament?" This is a very Catholic statement.

For if Christ is present in the Sacrament, and if the Sacrament is the visible form of invisible grace, then Christ is indeed present in a visible form of invisible grace. Therefore, the adoration of Christ, whom Crocius himself teaches and believes to be present in the Sacrament, cannot be idolatry.

But this is precisely the Catholic faith, which Crocius himself is professing—and which we defend.

## **Chapter V: Discussion of the Reformers' Opinion on the Adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist**

I. The Reformers accuse Catholics of idolatry in two ways. First, they claim that Catholics do not truly adore Christ, even though they believe He is present in the Most Holy Eucharist, but instead worship the bread. Second, they accuse them of rendering latria to the sacramental species of bread and wine.

II. We will deal with the latter accusation later; here, we will examine the first. We will demonstrate from the Reformers' own principles that there was no legitimate reason for their separation from the Catholic Church on this issue, and consequently, that their division was unjustly introduced on these grounds.

III. Daillé speaks of two kinds of adoration that might be involved in this matter: It is one thing to say that the body of Christ in the Eucharist must be adored; it is another to say that the Eucharist itself must be adored—that is, either the sacramental species or the substance under the species. The first kind of adoration is merely vain, useless, and, so to speak, reduced to nothing. The error in this case does not lie in directing adoration to something that is not adorable, as in the second case, but only in mistakenly seeking Christ and supposing His presence where He is not. However, the latter form of adoration is directed toward a specific object that is actually present—namely, a substance concealed under the accidents of bread and wine. If that substance is assumed to be a creature, then the adoration given to it necessarily becomes an unlawful service forbidden by God.

IV. Thus, two forms of adoration must be considered: first, if we adore Christ whom we believe to be present in the Eucharist. According to Daillé, this is merely vain, useless, and reduced to nothing, because no creature is being worshiped in place of the Creator. Rather, adoration is directed toward the Creator, as though He were present in a specific location, when in fact (according to the Reformers) He is not. The second form of adoration is directed to the Eucharist itself—that is, as Daillé claims, to a substance veiled under the accidents of bread and wine. Since that substance is assumed to be a creature, such adoration is unlawful.

V. Having identified the basis of the accusation, we now respond in defense of the Catholic Church, citing St. Optatus: Remove the slander, and you will be ours. And with St. Augustine: This great evil of schism in Europe would not have occurred if the false faction of the slanderers had not prevailed over the true reasoning of those who convict them. (*Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, Book 1, Ch. 3)

VI. According to Daillé, as cited above, it is one thing to say that the body of Christ in the Eucharist must be adored. Yet, according to him, this same adoration is merely vain, useless, and reduced to nothing. Daillé, therefore, asserts two things: first, that the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist is vain and useless; second, that it is not idolatry. In both respects, Crocius contradicts him. Indeed, regarding the second point, Daillé contradicts himself.

VII. That Crocius contradicts Daillé on the first point is evident from his words: Who would call it idolatry to adore Christ, whom we believe to be present in the Sacrament? We ourselves adore Him; we even adore Him in the Eucharist. For if, as Crocius states, the Reformers themselves adore Christ in the Eucharist, then this adoration cannot be vain, useless, and reduced to nothing. But since Daillé claims that it is so, it follows that the Reformers do not adore Christ in the Eucharist.

Therefore, either:

The Reformers both adore and do not adore Christ in the Eucharist, or

The adoration of Christ in the Eucharist is both vain and not vain, useless and not useless.

Thus, these men, who rashly oppose the Catholic Church's consistent teaching, contradict themselves.

VIII. Crocius might object that he and Daillé understand the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist in different ways. But if that is enough to eliminate their disagreement, why does he not show the same fairness toward Catholics, who also understand certain terms differently in this matter?

Crocius should remember that Daillé's words necessarily imply that the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist is merely vain, useless, and reduced to nothing—a position that is difficult to reconcile.

IX. On the second point, Daillé contradicts himself. He states: It will be objected that the Roman Church believes that what it adores in this Sacrament is not a creature but Christ the Lord, who is truly and rightfully adorable because He is the eternal God, of the same essence as the Father. Thus, given this mistaken assumption, there would be no crime in their service, since the object they adore is indeed worthy of adoration—if it were truly what they suppose it to be. However, he then claims: If we judge the quality of religious service based on the worshipers' opinion of the object, then scarcely any act of worship could justly be called adoration of a creature, nor could it rightly be condemned as something forbidden by God.

X. Since Daillé admits that the adoration of Christ's body in the Most Holy Eucharist is merely vain, useless, and reduced to nothing—even if Christ were not truly present under the species—it follows that such adoration is neither the worship of a creature nor idolatry. Therefore, Daillé knowingly and obstinately slanders Catholics when he accuses them of adoring a creature.

Did we not rightly say with St. Optatus: Remove the slander, and you will be ours?

XI. Crocius denies that the Reformers have falsely accused the Catholic Church. But what will he say about his own colleague, Daillé, who declares that the same act of adoration is and is not idolatry? If Daillé's argument holds, then Eilbracht and many other Reformers must be condemned as slanderers.

XII. Rather than opposing his brother Daillé, Crocius prefers to argue against Marcus Antonius, whom he does not count among his allies. But this does not prevent Crocius, in Daillé's judgment, from being numbered among the slanderers of the Catholic Church. Since Daillé and Crocius teach conflicting doctrines, their accusations against the Catholic Church are presumed to be made in bad faith.

XIII. But let us set aside this just defense and weigh the force of the accusation itself. Crocius says: A false assumption does not free one from the crime of idolatry, nor does good intention.

Yet Daillé, contradicting himself, made the same accusation before Crocius, and Kuhnæus later repeated it. But neither Marcus Antonius nor Daillé ever stated that any false assumption or good intention could free someone from the crime of idolatry.

XIV. Crocius argues: The Israelites in the desert intended to worship the true God, but they worshiped the golden calf instead. They falsely supposed that this was the God who led them out of Egypt. Yet they were still idolaters, according to Scripture.

We grant that they were idolaters, even though they intended to worship the true God. But Crocius must answer: What was the actual object of their worship? The golden calf. The Scripture testifies that they worshiped this idol, believing it to be divine. But Catholics do not say that natural bread is the body of Christ, nor do they claim that bread should be adored. The Israelites said that creatures were gods; Catholics deny that any creature is God.

If, according to Crocius, the Israelites were idolaters, then Catholics must be idolaters as well. But this is an absurd and slanderous conclusion.

XV. Crocius continues: The Egyptians believed that certain man-made statues of human figures were animated and divine, as Hermes Trismegistus states—that some gods were made by the Supreme God and others by men. They gave divine honors to these, as Augustine reports in *The City of God*, Book 8, Chapters 2 and 3. If Marcus Antonius' argument were valid, then these Egyptians would not have been idolaters.

The same deception, already exposed earlier, appears again here. The Egyptians believed that creatures were gods and considered something non-adorable to be adorable, rendering divine honors to creatures and to a non-adorable object. But what does this have to do with the argument of Marcus Antonius and Daillé? Do they claim that it is not idolatry to worship a creature in place of the Creator or to attribute adoration to something non-adorable?

You might say that Marcus Antonius and Daillé hold that Catholics are excused from idolatry due to false supposition, and therefore the Egyptians should be excused as well. But they do not say that Catholics are excused merely because of false supposition. Rather, they argue something else entirely: that Catholics cannot be accused of idolatry even if they falsely assume (from the Reformers' perspective) that Christ is present in the Most Holy Eucharist—because they do not direct their adoration to a creature but to the Creator, who is truly adorable. Should those be excused from idolatry who direct their adoration toward a creature, mistakenly believing it to be the Creator? While Crocius may think so, no rational person would agree.

XVI. Crocius adds: Nor were the Manichaeans idolaters when they worshiped the sun. They believed they were worshipping Christ, whose body they thought dwelled in the sun and whose wisdom resided in the moon. Indeed, they considered the sun itself to be Christ, as Augustine testifies in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, Book 20, Chapters 2, 5, and 6. If Marcus Antonius' argument were valid, then no one would have ever been, is now, or will ever be an idolater, because all idolatry is based on false supposition.

Correct this conclusion, Crocius: For all your contradictions arise from false suppositions, when you assume that idolaters are absolved from idolatry simply because of a false supposition—something no one has ever claimed or imagined.

The Manichaeans, by worshiping the sun, were idolaters. They were not excused from the crime of idolatry simply because they believed the sun to be Christ, since they were adoring a creature in place of the Creator—the sun, which is a created thing, and which they falsely assumed to be Christ.

Do Catholics direct their adoration toward a creature when they profess to adore Christ? Do Catholics, who explicitly teach that bread is not present in the Eucharist, nonetheless believe that bread is Christ, as the Manichaeans thought the sun was Christ?

The desire to slander is so perverse that it fabricates anything just to have something to say.

XVII. To Crocius' argument, let us add another from Daillé: The Collyridians, who worshiped the Blessed Virgin, could have defended themselves against St. Epiphanius, who explicitly rebuked them for idolatry, in the same way that Cardinal Baronius supposes. They could have claimed that they truly believed the Blessed Virgin to be divine, devoid of anything human. They could have said: "Even if it is an error to believe that the Blessed Virgin is a goddess, the service we render to her is not to be condemned as idolatry, because such worship is due to the nature to which it is directed."

This is the same deception at work again. The Collyridians assumed that a creature was the Creator. Do Catholics assume the same, or anything similar?

The Collyridians fabricated a divinity distinct from the true divinity and separate from divine unity. Do Catholics do anything similar? The Collyridians acknowledged that they worshiped a divinity distinct from that of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Do Catholics do the same?

The Collyridians were idolaters because they worshiped a false and fictitious divinity, attributing latria to a creature instead of the Creator—or rather, to a product of their own imagination. Do Catholics worship a false divinity? You will not say so.

What, then? The Collyridians assumed that the Blessed Virgin was a goddess, just as Catholics assume that Christ is present in the Most Holy Eucharist. So what? If false supposition did not absolve the Collyridians from the crime of idolatry, how can false supposition (according to the Reformers) absolve Catholics from the same crime?

But who actually claims that a false supposition absolves Catholics from idolatry? We do not say this, Daillé. You argue against a position we do not hold—something you fabricate at will to make your refutation seem more plausible to the uninformed.

What we do say is this: The Calvinists, by their own principles, cannot accuse Catholics of idolatry for adoring Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, even though the Calvinists believe that Christ is not present there. The reason is that Catholics do not worship a creature in place of the Creator, nor do they invent a false divinity to worship. Rather, the object of their adoration is truly worthy of worship.

Daillé himself, though sometimes insightful and sometimes blind, has recognized this. Marcus Antonius has recognized it. Daillé and Crocius, attacking something different altogether, have left the true argument untouched.

XVIII. Let Daillé claim that the adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist is vain, useless, and reduced to nothing. We do not examine that claim here. But was the Catholic Church to be accused and condemned for idolatry on these grounds? Could a fair-minded person judge that the Reformers had reason to separate from the Catholic Church on such flimsy pretexts?

Daillé himself admits: It is neither a fundamental error nor idolatry to adore Christ, whom we believe to be present in the Most Holy Eucharist.

Why, then, did you separate from us? Why was the Body of Christ torn apart?

XIX. We have already explained the grave crime of dividing the unity of the Church. But how much worse it is to establish a schism on the accusation of horrendous idolatry—not because such a crime was found in the Catholic Church, but because it was imagined or fabricated by the deceitful or malicious fantasies of schismatics!

It is horrifying to think that such a division was attempted and completed, and that its defenders now find themselves forced to invent pretexts to justify it.

XX. In order to free the Reformers from their vain and injurious delusions against God and the Catholic Church, we will present testimonies from their own ranks, compelling them to believe—if even a spark of the fear of God and love of neighbor remains in them.

The Admonition of the Book of Concord states:

"Lutherans do not distinguish themselves from the Pontifical form of adoration when they say that they do not adore the bread but Christ. For this is precisely what the Papists say."

Likewise: "Lutherans are not asked whether the visible elements should be adored; for we deny this just as the Papists do."

Could anything be stated more plainly? Could anything be more explicit?

Catholics deny that they adore the bread. They deny that the visible elements are to be absolutely adored, or that the species of bread and wine should be worshiped. The authors of the said book knew this, as did Eilbracht, who taught that Catholics direct their adoration toward Christ as hidden in the Eucharistic symbols or rather as concealed in their form.

Johannes Bergius also knew this, as he testified: "Nor do the Papists claim that the accidents or even the bread itself must be adored, although they say Christ is worshiped under the species of bread. Just as the woman with the issue of blood did not worship Christ's garment, though she worshiped Christ in his garment."

Similarly: "Nor should adoration be tied to the bread itself, but rather be equally directed to Christ in the bread, just as to Christ in heaven or wherever he is corporally present."

Yet the defender of the Carenton Decree, Daillé, falsely attributes to Catholics the adoration of bread and accuses them of idolatry as the primary justification for the Reformers' separation from the Catholic Church.

If even a learned Doctor of the Reformation can fall into such a misrepresentation, how can simpler-minded Reformers be expected to properly judge the justification for their separation, when they continue to follow their party in blind adherence?

XXI. Regarding the aforementioned testimonies from the Admonition of the Book of Concord, Crocius responds: "The Admonition records what the Papists claim to do and not to do; it does not record what they actually do not do. They say they do not adore bread because they deny that it is present. But that does not mean they do not at least materially adore it."

But this only serves to confirm rather than refute the false accusation of the Reformers—who charge the Catholic Church with idolatry on the grounds of worshiping the bread.

For if, according to the Reformers, Catholics cannot be accused unless they actually worship the material bread, then Catholics cannot be formally accused of idolatry. And since only formal idolatry is true idolatry, the Catholic Church would not be guilty of it in this fundamental matter. It follows, therefore, that the Reformers, when making this accusation, are knowingly slandering the Catholic Church.

Bergius' testimony is so clear that Crocius could not refute it except by invoking certain Catholic theologians who discussed the honor of the sacramental species in a purely scholastic manner—yet even Bergius, being more prudent, did not attribute this position to the Catholic Church as a whole.

XXII. Because the Reformers often and pointlessly raise the accusation that Catholics adore material bread, we must add the statement of Eilbracht: "Even according to the doctrine of the Papists themselves, the worship of the Eucharist is always subject to the danger of idolatry. Since it relies on transubstantiation, which they themselves teach depends on the priest's intention and can be hindered by various obstacles, they can never be certain that they are actually adoring Christ. Even if their doctrine were true, they could never adore the Eucharist with certainty, nor without the condition that transubstantiation has actually taken place. This is tantamount to saying: 'I adore you, Christ, if you are truly present here.' Since they do not actually follow this form of conditional worship, it follows that they may sometimes unknowingly worship mere bread and wine instead of the true God, their Creator."

Crocius holds a similar position in Chapter 22, Section 24, Page 320, and again in Chapter 25, Sections 10 and 11, Page 364.

XXIII. To the judgment of the Reformers on this issue, we contrast the judgment of Daillé, a fellow Reformer, so that the brethren may correct one another: "If the Host were truly adorable, as the Papists believe, then I acknowledge that if someone worshiped it when it was not actually exposed on the altar, they could not justly be condemned. The error in such a case would not be due to any guilt or negligence of the worshiper, but rather to the great similarity between what is truly present and what is mistakenly believed to be present—since there is no external sign by which to distinguish them."

XXIV. Why is there such a great diversity of opinions? Both parties belong to the Reformation; both are learned men; both assume the same Catholic doctrine. Yet one concludes that something is idolatry, while the other concludes that it is not.

But, as we have often said and must repeat here: Among the Reformers, only one principle holds: "Whatever we want is holy; whatever we do not want is a crime."

XXV. Marcus Antonius de Dominis understood this entire issue much better, as previously discussed: "Someone may object that the adoration of the bread carries an idolatrous stain and that Catholics should be avoided as 'bread-worshippers.' But I see no idolatrous crime in that adoration, provided the intention is rightly directed. Those who teach that the bread is no longer bread but the Body of Christ do not, in fact, worship the bread, but, based on their assumption (even if false), they adore Christ's true and adorable Body alone.

Neither do our opponents claim that the species of bread and wine—the accidents—should be adored. Rather, they say that the true and real Body of Christ, which lies hidden beneath these species, must be adored. And in this, there is no idolatry, for they worship nothing other than Christ's Body according to their assumption.

If they knew that Christ's true Body was not present under those species of bread and wine, or that it was only bread and wine, they would certainly offer no adoration at all. Therefore, the whole mindset of the worshipers is directed solely and immediately toward the living Body of Christ, and not toward anything else."

XXVI. We believe that what has been said is sufficient to expose the false accusation of the Reformers regarding the so-called idolatrous adoration of bread, which they claim is practiced in the Catholic Church.

However, since Daillé has distinguished between the adoration of Christ—whom we believe to be present in the Most Holy Eucharist—and the adoration of a substance hidden under the accidents of bread and wine, we declare that the Catholic Church believes in and practices only the first kind of adoration, directing worship to Christ the Savior, truly present in the Most Holy Eucharist.

Those who falsely claim that Catholics worship some hidden substance beneath the accidents of bread and wine do so deliberately against their own conscience.

Our adoration is directed solely toward Jesus Christ, our Redeemer. Whatever Crocius may argue concerning the sacramental species, further discussion will follow.

For the Council of Trent explicitly teaches: "If anyone says that Christ is not to be adored in the Most Holy Eucharist with the worship of latria (the supreme worship due to God alone), let him be anathema."

XXVII. Before we conclude, one more consideration must be proposed for the Reformers to reflect upon.

Among the Lutherans, there are many who believe in the doctrine of Ubiquity, which holds that Christ must be adored at the right hand of the Father and is therefore to be worshiped in all places throughout the world, since the right hand of the Father extends to all places.

According to Catholic teaching, as well as that of the Reformers and some Lutherans, Christ's body is not present everywhere. These same individuals judge the doctrine of Ubiquity to be completely erroneous.

Given this, those Lutherans who, according to the doctrine of Ubiquity, adore the whole Christ at the right hand of the Father, and thus his body in all places, must be considered idolaters—at least according to the reasoning of Crocius and Kuhnæus.

Their own principles hold that neither false supposition nor right intention can absolve someone from the crime of idolatry if worship is directed toward something that is mistakenly believed to be present where it is not.

Since the doctrine of Ubiquity is false according to the Reformers, it follows from Crocius' reasoning that Lutherans who adhere to it are idolaters. Likewise, from the perspective of certain Lutherans who reject Ubiquity, those who believe in it must also be judged idolaters, according to Kuhnæus' principle.

Therefore, Crocius and Kuhnæus have structured their argument against the Catholic Church in such a way that Crocius condemns his own Lutheran brethren as idolaters, while Kuhnæus is condemned by his fellow Lutherans as an idolater himself.

XXVIII. Another consequence arises from Crocius and Kuhnæus' accusation. If, according to Crocius, Ubiquitarian Lutherans are justly accused of idolatry, and if the Reformers nevertheless recognize these same Lutherans as their brethren, then the Reformers act deceitfully when they attempt to justify their separation from the Catholic Church on the basis of alleged idolatry.

For if they can maintain communion with Lutherans despite the same accusation, why, under identical circumstances, should they refuse communion with Catholics?

Unless, of course, they invoke their usual pretext:

"What we want is holy; what we do not want is a crime."

If non-Ubiquitarian Lutherans, according to Kuhnæus' reasoning, may rightly accuse Ubiquitarian Lutherans of idolatry, then the non-Ubiquitarians act deceitfully when they attempt to justify their separation from the Catholic Church on the same grounds.

Similarly, Ubiquitarian Lutherans act dishonestly when they claim that they cannot be in communion with non-Ubiquitarian Lutherans, from whom they receive the accusation of idolatry.

If non-Ubiquitarian Lutherans are allowed to be in communion with Ubiquitarian Lutherans, despite being accused of the same error as Catholics, then what reason do they have to refuse communion with Catholics under the same accusation?

And if Ubiquitarian Lutherans are permitted to be in communion with non-Ubiquitarians—who, according to Kuhnæus, accuse them of idolatry—why should they not also be allowed to commune with Catholics, whom they similarly accuse of idolatry?

XXIX. Crocius must not claim that the doctrine of Ubiquity is not held by the entire Lutheran Church but only by certain Lutheran theologians and provinces. For if, according to Crocius, the Catholic Church is justly accused of idolatry because of certain theologians who permit images of the Holy Trinity—while others within Catholicism reject them—or because of differing theological opinions on the mode of adoration or co-adoration of the Eucharistic species, then why should the Lutheran Church not be accused of idolatry for the worship of

Christ's body in all places, a belief dependent on Ubiquity, which some Lutherans uphold and others reject?

Will the Reformers here declare: "What we want must be attributed to the whole Church; what we do not want must not be attributed to the whole Church."

Shall will be made to stand in place of reason?

## **CHAPTER VI. The Sentiment of the Reformers on the Adoration of the Sacramental Species.**

I. It is now time to refute, by the testimony of the Reformers themselves, the accusation of horrible idolatry that has been persistently made by Daillé and frequently repeated by Crocius. This accusation has been opportunely and inopportunely thrown about, but we shall now demonstrate its falsehood. In doing so, we may lead them from the truth they have not yet abandoned to another truth which they have either ignorantly rejected or maliciously condemned.

II. Crocius admits that Christ is to be adored in the Sacrament, just as He is in prayer. He states: "We adore as in prayer, as in Baptism." Similar affirmations are found in Chapter 23, section 10 and 11, page 334; Chapter 25, section 6, page 359; and section 13, page 365.

III. Peter Martyr explains how Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist according to the Reformers. He writes: "Regarding adoration, I will briefly state that it consists in invocation and confession, which are twofold: of the heart and of the mouth, and in thanksgiving. These acts are due to both God and Christ whenever they reveal themselves to us. This happens in three ways: First, through internal words, when our minds are suddenly struck by a strong thought about God and Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit, adoration follows—either by confession, invocation, or thanksgiving. Secondly, they reveal themselves to us through external words, when we read the Holy Scriptures or hear sacred sermons. Then, we are often moved to invoke Him or to perform other acts of devotion. Lastly, Christ sometimes reveals Himself through external signs, as on Mount Sinai, to Isaiah in the form of a King seated on His throne, in the Ark of the Covenant, or in the Sacraments; and in these instances, adoration is also given. However, as Augustine admonished, one must not stop at the flesh but proceed to the divinity. Thus, I too warn that in adoring, when we receive the Eucharist, we must not stop at the symbols but adore Christ in spirit and in truth, seated in heaven at the right hand of the Father. Since simpler people do not understand this due to their deeply rooted error of Transubstantiation, I consider it not useless to moderate external adoration, such as prostration or kneeling, until they are taught. Internal adoration can be practiced without danger, nor is external adoration evil in itself. Many piously kneel and adore when they hear the words of the Gospel: 'And the Word was made flesh.' Yet the words themselves are not to be adored, but their signification. Why, then, should the same not apply here, provided the symbols themselves are not worshipped, but rather what they signify?"

IV. According to Crocius, the Sacrament is the visible form of invisible grace. He also states that Christ can be adored in the Sacrament. According to Martyr, nothing prohibits us from adoring while receiving the Sacrament. Who would not say that these statements are written in the Roman style?

V. But let us inquire, based on Peter Martyr's opinion, what kind of honor may lawfully be given to the Eucharistic symbols. He states: "As Augustine admonished, one must not stop at the flesh but proceed to the divinity. Likewise, I warn that in adoring, when we receive the Eucharist, we must not stop at the symbols but adore Christ in spirit and in truth."

If this comparison is legitimate, it encompasses the Catholic doctrine of adoring the sacramental species. For just as Christ's humanity is adored because of its union with the Word, such that adoration does not stop at the flesh but passes on to the divinity—whom alone the soul submits to in spirit and in truth—so too, when we receive the Eucharist, adoration should not stop at the symbols but pass on to Christ Himself, who is present. From this supreme submission arises the external and subordinate honor given both to the symbols, as they are united with Christ, and to Christ Himself, as the only One truly adorable in spirit and in truth.

VI. He further states: "Many piously kneel and adore when they hear the words of the Gospel: 'And the Word was made flesh.' Yet the words themselves are not to be adored, but what they signify. Why, then, should the same not apply here, provided the symbols themselves are not worshipped, but rather what they signify?"

Just as one who kneels upon hearing the Gospel text "And the Word was made flesh" does not adore the words themselves in spirit and in truth but their meaning, so too nothing prohibits one from kneeling while receiving the Eucharist—so long as the symbols are not considered objects of worship in spirit and in truth, but rather what they signify. This is precisely the Catholic position: that from Christ's presence in the Eucharist arises the affection to offer external honor, both to the symbols, as they are united with Christ, and to Christ Himself, who alone is to be adored in spirit and in truth.

VII. He also states that statues and images are not to be adored due to divine prohibition, but that nothing prevents us from adoring the words of Sacred Scripture and the Sacraments by hearing or receiving them, since they were instituted by divine command to lead us to the worship of God. Thus, according to Martyr, statues and images are not to be worshipped, even if God and Christ sometimes seem to reveal themselves through them, due to the divine prohibition. However, since this prohibition does not apply to Sacred Scripture or the Sacraments, it follows that we may adore by hearing or receiving them.

VIII. It might seem doubtful how Martyr can say that the words of Scripture and the symbols are not to be adored, yet also state that nothing prevents us from adoring the words of Sacred Scripture and the Sacraments. However, he correctly distinguished earlier that he was speaking of adoration in spirit and in truth, which is due neither to the words of Scripture nor to the symbols, as this supreme internal submission belongs to God alone. Yet he also calls external honor adoration, because it testifies to this internal submission and derives its subordinate honor

from it. This is exactly what most Catholic Doctors hold, even if they explain it in different terms.

IX. Hence, Crocius' accusation: "These men betray their own fraud. They say what they deny, that the elements are to be absolutely adored. This is not enough. They adore them along with Christ. Can they, in good conscience, say that Papists in no way adore the external species, not even secondarily?"

To this we respond: According to the Catholic faith, the elements are to be venerated—something neither Lutherans nor Reformers deny. We say that the Catholic Church has not defined by what name this veneration should be called. We are not concerned about the name, as every Catholic knows it suffices to adore Christ under the elements in spirit and in truth and to treat the symbols reverently as united to the Lord.

X. Eilbracht acknowledges that the ancients treated the sacred elements with reverence, as certain pledges of Christ's Body and Blood, which is not contrary to Reformed doctrine. This internal reverence arises from submission of the soul to Christ. Since this submission is in spirit and in truth, the reverence directed toward the sacred symbols originates from properly called latria—hence some call it secondary latria. External reverence, as a single act, depends on internal submission to Christ and on internal reverence toward the symbols.

XI. Since Crocius denies that Christ is present in the Eucharist as in images, though this does not pertain to Catholic faith but to scholastic disputes, it is worth noting: According to Peter Martyr, both the words of Scripture and the Sacraments are licitly adored. Either they are adored without their signification, which would be idolatry according to the Reformers, or with their signification, in which case they are adored as images with Christ.

XII. Ascending higher, we find that John Wycliffe wrote: "We, based on the faith of Scripture, adore this Host, or the Cross of the Lord, or other images made by human hands, with greater clarity and devotion."

Now, either he adored the Host and the Cross of the Lord without Christ, or with Christ. If the former, then according to the Reformers, this would be idolatry—even though he is their most esteemed Patriarch. If the latter, then it follows that the Host is lawfully adored along with Christ, and the Cross of the Lord along with the Lord. Therefore, Christ is lawfully adored in the Holy Eucharist, just as He is in images that are venerated together with Him. Thus, either the Patriarch of the Reformers is an idolater, or Crocius is slandering—unless, of course, he chooses to say: "Whatever we declare to be idolatry, is idolatry."

## **CHAPTER VII: Response to the Evasions of the Reformers**

I. The patron of the Reformers in this matter is Dimifloitaque Daillzo, as well as Philippus Eilbrachtius (whose defense is also taken up by Crocius), who has treated the subject in depth. When he was to give an account of why the Reformers consider it necessary to embrace communion with the Lutherans even though they believe in the real presence of Christ's body in

the Holy Eucharist, he first states that: Not only do they agree with the Lutherans in all other fundamental articles of doctrine, but even in the main part of this particular article on the Holy Supper—namely, the salvific enjoyment of Christ's body. Later, he adds: "In this way, the Orthodox (Calvinists) cannot maintain mutual fraternity with the Papists, since they have many more and even fundamental disagreements with them."

II. Eilbrachtius teaches that Catholics are accused of idolatry because their doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist logically leads to the necessity of adoring Christ in the Eucharist. Since this follows equally from the doctrine of the Lutherans, a man not unlearned perceived that, according to the Reformers, the charge of idolatry must be leveled against both the Lutherans and the Catholics alike.

However, lest it be inferred from this that the Reformers should return to Catholic unity after having decreed fraternity with the Lutherans, Eilbrachtius states that the Lutherans err in one fundamental article, while the Catholics err in many. Therefore, communion can be maintained with the Lutherans but not with the Catholics.

III. However, let the reader consider how these statements align with Reformed doctrine, which holds that the Church perishes if it errs in a necessary article. According to Eilbrachtius, the Lutheran Church errs in a necessary and fundamental article. Therefore, it is not the Body of Christ or a member of Christ's Body. Therefore, it is not vivified by the Spirit of Christ.

Therefore, it is a dead body or a dead member. Therefore, the Church of the Reformers seeks union with a dead member due to its decree of Lutheran fraternity. Therefore, nothing prevents the Church of the Reformers, according to its own doctrine, from returning to Catholic unity. Therefore, the Reformers have unjustly departed from us. Therefore, the Reformers contradict Scripture, which commands unity in the Church.

What else can be said, except that the Reformers arbitrarily decide when the Church perishes due to an error in a necessary article and when it does not? When it pleases them, unity is to be abandoned; when it pleases them, unity is to be retained. When it pleases them, union is to be restored; when it pleases them, union is not to be restored. What could be more absurd than this?

IV. Nor does it matter that some argue that the Lutheran Church errs in only one necessary article, whereas the Catholic Church errs in many. Just as a man is equally dead whether he dies from one lethal wound or several, so the Church is equally dead whether it errs in one fundamental article or in several.

Nonetheless, let no one think that this is the only fundamental error that the Reformers charge against the Lutherans. If one examines the "Admonition" from the Book of Concord, one will find that the matter is far different.

V. Crocius objects: Eilbrachtius argues that the Papists are solidly convicted of idolatry by the Orthodox, since there remains an open controversy between the two over transubstantiation and the real presence, and the Papists themselves admit that if their doctrine is denied, the Eucharistic bread cannot be given the highest form of worship without committing idolatry. He states that it necessarily follows that they commit idolatry unless they first prove their doctrine of transubstantiation and real presence—specifically, a physical and local presence.

He does not refer to the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist but to the adoration of the Eucharist itself. Nowhere does he argue solely about the real presence.

VI. Response 1 Eilbrachtius explicitly teaches that they err in a necessary article, from which follows the subversion of some fundamental doctrine, as we have demonstrated with his own words in its proper place. He also maintains that from the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharistic bread follows the subversion of a necessary article. Other Reformers hold the same view, including Bergius, as Crocius acknowledges. But whether such an error can justify the separation of Churches, as variously interpreted according to individual preference by the Reformers, we have demonstrated in its proper place using their own words. Hence, the consequences deduced against the Reformers, along with Eilbrachtius, remain valid.

VII. Response 2 Crocius himself acknowledges that Eilbrachtius states that we commit idolatry unless we prove transubstantiation and the real presence. Therefore, according to Eilbrachtius, we commit idolatry because, failing to prove transubstantiation and the real presence, we adore bread in place of Christ—an idolatry we would not commit if we could prove transubstantiation and the real presence. Therefore, Eilbrachtius charges us with the crime of idolatry because we adore bread in place of Christ. Nor does Eilbrachtius even dream of the adoration of sacramental species, although Crocius tries to claim this.

VIII. Response 3 Since Crocius openly states what is contrary to the truth—asserting that Eilbrachtius does not speak of the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist but of the adoration of the Eucharist itself—it is worth repeating Eilbrachtius's words previously cited, where he presents the Catholic position in these terms: "Christ, true God and man, who is truly present in the Eucharistic Sacrament, must also be worshiped therein with the worship of latria."

To which the Reformers respond:

"This adoration is execrable idolatry."

Does Eilbrachtius here speak of the adoration of the Eucharist and not of the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist? Who would not marvel at such a willingness in a learned theologian to deny and distort the truth?

IX. Crocius' Objection 2 Crocius objects that Eilbrachtius does not say that from the real presence, as the Lutherans profess, follows the necessary adoration of Christ in the Eucharist. He claims that Eilbrachtius does not appear to have noticed that the charge of idolatry would have to be applied to the Lutherans as well as the Papists. Crocius calls this a poetic invention and asserts that Eilbrachtius could not have foreseen this, arguing that the Lutherans do not adore the Sacrament and even oppose adoration. Even if adoration were to follow from presence, he says, the Lutherans do not practice it and do not acknowledge such a consequence.

X. Response 1 Eilbrachtius does not explicitly state that from the real presence, as the Lutherans teach, follows the necessary adoration of Christ in the Eucharist—but neither does he deny it. He could not deny it, since the Reformers commonly admit this, and even Crocius does not dare to openly deny it, lest he appear to be closing his eyes to the truth.

XI. Response But Crocius claims that Eilbrachtius does not appear to have noticed that the charge of idolatry would have to be equally applied to the Lutherans and the Papists. However, it

does not follow that just because it does not appear that he noticed it, therefore he did not notice it. Rather, it is clear that he did notice it, because according to Eilbrachtius, doctrine is accountable for what necessarily follows from it. And it is manifestly clear that adoration follows from presence. Since, according to the Reformers, such adoration is idolatrous, it necessarily follows that Eilbrachtius must impute the crime of idolatry to the Lutherans. This is not a poetic invention but a necessary conclusion from the Reformers' doctrine—unless, of course, one relegates the Reformers' own teachings to the realm of fables.

XII. Response 3 Again, he says: Eilbrachtius could not have foreseen this. But why, I ask? How could he not have foreseen that the charge of idolatry would be applied equally to the Lutherans as to the Papists, when the Lutherans do not adore the Sacrament and even oppose adoration? This is a theological subtlety—but a perverse one, evading the question.

You assert that the Lutherans do not adore the Sacrament. What of it? If by adoration you mean latria and by Sacrament the sacramental species or Christ with the species, then your claim is misleading. But if by adoration of the Sacrament you mean the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, then it is false that the Lutherans reject such adoration, since they have approved and still approve of it as licit.

Why, then, could Eilbrachtius not have foreseen that the charge of idolatry must apply equally to the Lutherans and the Catholics? Is it because adoration does not follow from presence? You do not dare affirm this. Or is it because Eilbrachtius does not attribute to doctrine what follows from doctrine? But you will not dare affirm this either. Therefore, you are misleading the reader when you claim that Eilbrachtius could not have foreseen what he could not have failed to foresee—as if it were necessary for the Lutherans to explicitly teach that the Sacrament must be adored.

#### XIII. Crocius' Objection 3

Crocius objects: From our position, not every Church immediately perishes when an error in a necessary article is taught. In the Church of Corinth, some taught that there was no resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. 15:12), yet the Church did not immediately perish. In the Church of Galatia, a grave error was taught, so much so that the Apostle, astonished, wrote that they were being led into another Gospel (Gal. 1:6). Yet they were not completely dead. Sometimes an error in a necessary article is believed in a Church, but the Church does not immediately perish. Some believe it, the majority may believe it, but a minority may not. This preserves the Church's life.

XIV. Response So far, this contributes nothing to the argument, for the issue is not about an error being taught by individuals within the Church, but by the Church itself. Furthermore, if your reasoning holds, then on what grounds did the Reformers justify their secession from the Catholic Church over adoration—a practice that was upheld in a certain way by particular Catholic theologians, whose position, as you well knew, was not universally held by the entire Catholic Church?

You will find no reasonable justification unless you wish to argue: What we choose is holy; what we condemn is a crime.

#### XV. Additional Argument

An error in a necessary article is not of one kind. It can be committed by rejecting a necessary article, by imposing the necessity of believing an addition, or by obscuring it. The latter type of error does not immediately bring death to the Church. The faithful living in it can distinguish the addition from the article itself.

But to what purpose is this argument?

XVI. Further Argument Crocius adds: Eilbrachtius does not call the Lutheran error concerning the presence fundamental. He does not call it an error in an article without which salvation cannot stand. But even if he did, what then? That would not mean it was the common opinion of the Reformers. Even Eilbrachtius himself warns that if some Reformers have been somewhat more indulgent toward the Lutherans (Epanorth. ch. 4, note 7), that should not prejudice others. Nor should it be prejudicial if some have spoken more harshly against them. It is clear from many declarations of our Churches that they do not consider this error fundamental. The public voice attests that there is agreement on fundamental doctrine. Thus, all the consequences that our good brothers have struggled to build collapse.

XVII. Response Eilbrachtius, a Catholic, testifies that, according to the Reformers, the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist—as the Catholics hold it—is a fundamental error. He never retracted this opinion, even when influenced by Calvinist thought, as can be seen in his Epanorthosis.

What, then, will Crocius say? That the same doctrine is a fundamental error in Catholics but not in Lutherans?

Does Sanchius teach that this doctrine contradicts the fundamental principles of faith? Did Joseph Hall, in the Synod of Dordrecht, teach that this doctrine reduces Christ's humanity to a monstrosity and nothingness?

The severe qualifications of the Reformers are noted by their own Lutheran brethren. The theologians of Württemberg cry out in their Refutation that the doctrine of local presence in the Lord's Supper establishes a Capharnaïtic butchery because it asserts that Christ's body itself, no less than the substance of bread, is physically chewed with teeth, masticated, and swallowed. For this reason, they call us anthropophagi, sarcophagi, carnivores, bloodsuckers, Cyclopes, and Thyestes—as if we were consuming an incarnate God, swallowing Him, and transferring Him into our stomachs. They even go so far as to blasphemously call our doctrine of the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ the excrement of the devil.

This, then, is the kind of gentleness that the Reformers commend—tolerating their Lutheran brethren while not accusing them of holding a fundamental error concerning the real presence.

XVIII. Response 2 We have further demonstrated in previous arguments, based on the testimony of Eilbrachtius, that the doctrine of the real presence is a fundamental error, since it leads to the subversion of a foundational doctrine.

Thus, according to Eilbrachtius and those who agree with him, all the consequences cited above stand, no matter what Crocius objects.

XIX. Response 3 Those who have been more indulgent toward the Lutherans do not prejudice the truth. Nor do those who have spoken more harshly against them prejudice the truth. There are Reformers on both sides of this issue.

Thus, the Reformed Church has yet to decide definitively whether the Lutheran error is fundamental or not—despite the many declarations of the Churches that Crocius cites. Perhaps in the future, depending on what best serves the Reformers' cause, the error will be considered fundamental or not fundamental.

XX. Response 4 We accept Crocius's confession: that the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of Christ is not a fundamental error.

Therefore, the Catholic doctrine of the real presence is not a fundamental error either.

Therefore, the Catholic doctrine of the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist is not a fundamental error.

Therefore, those Reformers who accuse the Catholic Church of idolatry because of its doctrine of adoring Christ in the Eucharist are slanderers.

Yet, as has been demonstrated, Crocius himself belongs to these accusers.

XXI. Eilbrachtius states: Communion with the Lutherans is preferable to communion with the Catholics because the majority of Lutherans do not understand the absurdities that follow from the doctrine of the real presence, nor do they approve of them, and indeed they explicitly condemn them. Therefore, they do not sin maliciously and are worthy of fraternal tolerance.

XXII. Response According to Eilbrachtius, some Lutherans understand their errors, while others—indeed, the majority—do not. However, those who do not understand their errors are worthy of tolerance and fraternal charity.

But this is not the issue in question. It is not a matter of whether those who do not recognize their errors deserve fraternal tolerance and charity. For, according to the Reformers' own reasoning, similar individuals are found among the Catholics, yet the Reformers neither offer them charity nor seek their fraternal tolerance.

The real question is: Can the Reformers, by public decree, admit the Lutherans into their communion and offer mutual tolerance to the entire Lutheran Church, despite its adherence to the doctrine of the real presence, from which (according to the Reformers) follows the abominable crime of idolatry?

What will you say to this, Eilbrachtius? Are there not Lutherans who perceive—or ought to perceive—that Christ must be adored in the Eucharist, since they believe He is present there?

Thus, if the Reformers offer mutual tolerance to the Lutherans, they either:

Offer it indiscriminately to all Lutherans—in which case, there is no valid reason for their separation from the Catholic Church, and they stand refuted by their own domestic argument; or Do not offer it indiscriminately to all Lutherans—in which case, they contradict the public decree of the Reformed Church and the prevailing sentiment among the Reformers.

XXIII. Crocius' First Objection Crocius objects: Eilbrachtius is not speaking about just a few individuals but about the majority of Lutherans, who neither understand nor approve of the absurdities that follow from the doctrine of the real presence, and who explicitly reject them.

Response: This is irrelevant to the issue at hand.

XXIV. Crocius' Second Objection Crocius continues: But now let us address the question directly. Why should the Reformers not, by decree, admit the Lutherans into their communion and offer tolerance to the entire Lutheran Church, even though it holds to the doctrine of the real presence as it is declared by them? The Lutherans do not recognize that idolatry follows from it. They do not worship the Sacrament today and strongly oppose the practice among the Papists. They compel no one to adore it. The Reformers have not yet, by a common decree, declared that idolatry necessarily follows from this doctrine. In the meantime, separation from the Papal faction was justly undertaken because it compounded the error of the real presence with the lethal error of transubstantiation, by which not only is the entire Sacrament adored, but all are compelled to adore it. Moreover, it denies salvation to all who do not hold this faith, as stated in the Bull of Pius IV concerning the form of the oath, cited by the Bishop of Bümel.

XXV. Response 1 Crocius, as is common with those who avoid clarity, heaps many arguments together. Let us analyze them one by one.

Eilbrachtius stated that communion with the Lutherans is preferable to communion with the Catholics because, among the Lutherans, many—indeed, if you will, the vast majority—condemn the absurdities that follow from the doctrine of the real presence, do not approve of them, and do not understand them.

Does Crocius defend this reasoning of Eilbrachtius? Not in the least.

For it is so absurd that it is astonishing that it could have been written by a man of learning.

XXVI. Response 2 When the question is posed to Eilbrachtius and those who share his opinion—Can the Reformed Church offer fraternity to the entire Lutheran Church while not being obligated to offer the same to the Catholic Church?—the Reformers are thus set against themselves.

For those who agree with Eilbrachtius cannot justify the decree of the Reformers regarding communion with the Lutherans, because they believe all Lutherans err in doctrine to the extent that it entails the destruction of the foundation of faith.

Or, if they do indeed approve the decree contrary to their own position, then it is evident that the only criterion among the Reformers for what is or is not heresy is their own convenience.

Does Crocius defend this position of the Reformers? Let the reader judge.

XXVII. Response 3. If the Lutherans and their entire Church can be offered tolerance by the Reformed, then the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is not, according to the Reformed, an error in a fundamental article. Crocius concedes this conclusion. Furthermore, it follows that when a supposed error among some of the Reformed is considered fundamental while among others it is not, such an error should not be regarded as fundamental with respect to the entire Church. This is proven because, otherwise, the Reformed Churches would not be able to offer fraternity despite such an error. Just as Crocius says: "The Reformed

had not yet established by common decree that the real presence was necessarily to be abominated as idolatry." Likewise, they had not yet decreed by common consent that the doctrine of the real presence was or was not a fundamental error. Therefore, it should not be numbered among fundamental errors.

Wherefore, if some Reformed theologians hold that the doctrine of the real presence is a fundamental error, while others do not, then with respect to the Reformed Church, this supposed error is not fundamental. If some Reformed theologians hold that adoration follows from the real presence, while others do not, then with respect to the Reformed Church, it should not be absolutely stated that adoration follows. If some Reformed theologians teach that from real presence and adoration follows abominable idolatry, while others deny this—as shown by Daillé—then according to the Reformed Church, it is not to be said that abominable idolatry follows.

Therefore, when Crocius claims that from the doctrine of real presence and adoration follows abominable idolatry, he is not speaking from the perspective of his Church. Consequently, when Crocius and other Reformed theologians bring forth this supposed idolatry as a just cause for their separation from the Catholic Church, they do not act from the authority of their Church. And since in matters of schism, the issue concerns the Church against the Church, whoever objects to this supposed idolatry without acting according to their Church's position presents a false cause as if it were true, and, by their own principles, they are calumniators.

XXVIII. Response 4. You say that the Reformed offer tolerance to the entire Lutheran Church, even though it holds the dogma of the real presence as they declare it. But how do they declare it? Do they deny what they originally taught? The reason given for offering tolerance to the Lutherans is this: Lutherans do not acknowledge that abominable idolatry follows from their belief.

Do Catholics acknowledge that abominable idolatry follows from it? Why then is tolerance not offered to both?

Moreover, the Reformed say that Lutherans do not adore the Sacrament today but rather vehemently oppose it among the Papists. If by "Sacrament" you mean Christ present under the symbols, they teach that adoration is lawful and do not oppose it. If by "Sacrament" you mean the symbols themselves, they teach that they are venerable in a broader sense, which also suffices for Catholics. If by "Sacrament" you mean Christ with the symbols, they only oppose that which leaves the Catholic faith unchanged, and which consists merely in scholastic terms.

Why then is tolerance offered to Lutherans rather than Catholics? Is it because Lutherans do not compel anyone to adore, while Catholics do? This does not pertain here but rather to the matter of tyranny. Is it because Catholics teach Transubstantiation? But that is a different question. Thus, Crocius has provided no valid reason in this matter of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist and its adoration as to why fraternity should be offered to Lutherans rather than Catholics.

XXIX. Finally, Eilbrachtius says: "Therefore, communion can be had more easily with the Lutherans than with the Catholics. This was judged to be altogether expedient for the public

edification of the Church of Christ: namely, that with unnecessary contentions ceasing and mutual tolerance and peace established, truth—which is often lost in disputation—might be more easily recognized, propagated, and defended against common adversaries with united effort."

XXX. Response. According to Eilbrachtius, unnecessary contentions are those which the Reformed raise against the Lutherans. Thus, the question of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and its adoration is unnecessary. Consequently, this same question is unnecessary when the Reformed raise it against Catholics. Therefore, the Reformed did not separate from the Catholics over this question unless they admit that they separated over an unnecessary question. Wherefore, instead of seeking fraternity with Lutherans, they should have rather returned to the Catholics.

XXXI. Let the reader consider the inconsistency of the Reformed. According to Eilbrachtius, the Lutherans err in a fundamental article, and yet a question concerning a fundamental article is deemed superfluous. Why is it superfluous? Because, according to Daillé, the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is not a fundamental error. However, according to Eilbrachtius, whenever it suits him, it is both a fundamental error and a superfluous contention. Truly, it is a superfluous contention—one that has caused a dreadful division without any just cause.

XXXII. Crocius objects: Eilbrachtius never said, nor can it be solidly inferred from his statements, that the Reformed raised the question against the Lutherans. Much less did he call the question of Eucharistic adoration superfluous. Moreover, a question is not immediately superfluous simply because it is contentious. One may exceed proper bounds in contention, even if the question raised is not entirely superfluous.

XXXIV. Response: By "superfluous question," we mean one that pertains to a non-fundamental article, as is evident from what has been stated. Therefore, the question concerning the real presence must be counted among the superfluous ones—something that Crocius, who does not consider it a fundamental issue, can hardly deny. If the question of the real presence is superfluous, then the question of the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist must also be superfluous, for the two are intimately connected; neither should be blamed more than the other.

XXXV. Another objection: The Reformed could establish fraternity with the Lutherans regarding the real presence of Christ's body and blood, not only because they reject adoration of the Sacrament but also because they reject transubstantiation, consubstantiation, impanation, in-existence, coexistence, inclusion, and so on.

XXXVI. Response: Whether the Lutherans teach contradictions is irrelevant here. Their doctrine on the real presence is well known. As for whether they reject adoration in the Holy Eucharist, this has already been addressed multiple times. Regarding the adoration of the Sacrament as it includes the species, this has likewise been discussed. The question of transubstantiation and related matters does not pertain to this issue.

XXXVII. Another objection: The question of the "Papist" adoration of the Eucharist is neither superfluous to Eilbrachtius nor to Daillé. The Papist adoration of the Sacrament is considered by both to be a fundamental error. Furthermore, they argue:

Why are we not content to adore Christ in the Eucharist as in Baptism?

Why insist on adoration of the Sacrament itself?

This is a horrendous idolatry, a just cause for secession.

Moreover, they call Papist adoration a fundamental error because it involves adoring the Sacrament, that is, the species together with Christ. They consider this a horrific idolatry, as is commonly held by the Reformed. Bellarmine acknowledges, when writing about Protestants in his *On the Eucharist* (Book 4, Chapter 29), that they all call this kind of adoration idolatry. Thus, Bellarmine refutes the accusation of inconsistency that these men would lightly cast upon us.

XXXVIII. Response: The question of adoring Christ in the Holy Eucharist is distinct from the question of adoring the Eucharist or the Sacrament as it includes the species. The Reformed do not agree on condemning the former. Crocius confuses both, contrary to our position and to explicit words, in order to free his side from contradiction. But this does not free them; they remain entangled. Daillé teaches that the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, as practiced by those who believe He is present—as Catholics believe—is not idolatry. Reason itself teaches that such adoration cannot be accused of idolatry, except by malicious slanderers. Why should it be idolatry to direct worship toward an object that is truly worthy of worship?

Any Reformed theologians who regard the question of real presence as non-fundamental cannot consider the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, which is connected to it, as fundamental, unless they wage war against manifest reason. But Crocius and most Reformed theologians regard the question of real presence as non-fundamental. Therefore, they cannot consider its related question—adoration in the Holy Eucharist—as fundamental, unless they openly oppose reason and even their own Daillé. Yet, as has been shown above, Crocius and other Reformed theologians accuse Catholics of idolatry for adoring Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Thus, they all contradict Daillé and manifest reason and are therefore calumniators.

XXXIX. Response 2: What relevance is there to whether the question of adoration of the Sacrament, as it includes the species, is fundamental or not to Daillé and Eilbrachtius? But on what basis does Crocius assert that this question is fundamental to Eilbrachtius? On what basis does Crocius claim that Daillé is attacking Catholic dogma rather than merely a scholastic opinion?

XL. Response 3: If Christ may be lawfully adored in Baptism, with honor also rendered to the Sacrament, as we have shown from Peter Martyr, then why should He not be adored in the Holy Eucharist, with honor also given to the symbols instituted by Christ and joined to Him? Whatever name one gives to this honor that terminates on the symbols—whether it be singular or distinct—Christ and the symbols are to be honored. The Reformed have not yet determined with precision or unanimity the proper definition of this honor as it relates to the symbols. Therefore, to call such adoration and honor a horrendous idolatry is an impudent slander, one that prudent men would not commit if they truly understood Catholic teaching.

XLI. Response 4: Bellarmine does not excuse the Reformed from inconsistency regarding their differing views on the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, for he had not yet read the treatises of Daillé or Eilbrachtius, which we have shown to expose this inconsistency clearly. Indeed, Bellarmine reports that some Calvinists admitted that they would adore Christ in the Holy Eucharist if they believed with the Catholics that His true body was present there.

XLII. From the foregoing, it is clear that since the Reformed have, by public decree, admitted the Lutherans into their communion even though they believe in Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist, those same Reformed cannot allege the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist as a fundamental error or a sufficient reason for separating from the Catholics. Thus, Peter Martyr rightly states: "The dispute here is not about whether the flesh of Christ should be adored, but about whether it lies hidden under the accidents."

And shortly after: "For Augustine says in this place: It is sinful to adore the flesh of Christ, but it is sinful not to adore it."

XLIII. Crocius objects: When Peter Martyr recited Augustine's words about adoring the flesh of Christ, he added: "These words of Augustine do not work against us, for we do not deny that Christ's flesh should be adored because of its union with the divine nature."

And he further contends that if Christ were not in the Sacrament, and if only bread were there, then such adoration would be idolatry.

To this, we respond: The same danger falls upon them. For if they wish to avoid idolatry, they ought to remove the accidents lest they be adored, and they ought to transubstantiate the chalice itself. However, in the Sacrament, we distinguish between the symbols and the realities they signify. We attribute some honor to the symbols, meaning that they should be treated with reverence and not discarded, for they are sacred and have been dedicated to God. As for the realities they signify—namely, the body and blood of Christ—we fully and readily grant that they must be adored. For as Augustine states: "It is not sinful to adore the flesh of Christ, but it is sinful not to adore it."

Would this statement please the Papists? If our adversaries do not object to this, we rejoice at their progress. But if they do object, why do they deceive the reader? Martyr himself holds that the Papist adoration is idolatry.

XLIV. Response: We have shown from Martyr's own words that the flesh of Christ is to be adored. If Martyr indeed teaches this—as he certainly does—then by what plausible argument can the Reformed accuse us of idolatry when we direct our adoration toward the flesh of Christ, truly present in the Holy Eucharist, and genuinely worthy of worship? What does Crocius say to this? What does Martyr say? Nothing. Why, then, do they deceive the reader? Is it because we do not approve of everything Martyr says? But what need is there for that? If Catholics, therefore, should not be condemned for idolatry on these grounds, then acknowledge that those Reformed theologians who do condemn us on this point are calumniators. For Crocius himself is unwilling to fully accept the premise at the heart of this argument.

XLV. Response 2: Martyr may say that we do not avoid idolatry. But on what grounds? Is it because we direct our adoration toward Christ as truly present in the Holy Eucharist? If so,

then Crocius must beware lest he accuse his own brethren. Indeed, let the reader consider how well Martyr is consistent with himself—let him review what we have already cited when discussing the sacramental species. Meanwhile, let Crocius explain to us, in defense of Martyr's accusation of calumny: Why do we supposedly not avoid idolatry? Is it because we do not remove the accidents? What necessity is there for that? When Christ was clothed on earth, the faithful adored Him, and they did not think they had to remove His garments in order to adore Him lawfully or to avoid idolatry. If Christ was rightly adored while clothed, why should He not be likewise adored under the accidents? Or, if it is necessary to remove the accidents to avoid idolatry, then should we not also remove His garments? Should we, then, transubstantiate the chalice itself? What need is there for such nonsense? Martyr is merely spinning empty sophistries. Did the Magi think they had to transubstantiate the manger in order to adore Christ lying in it? Did John the Baptist expect the Virgin Mary to be transubstantiated in order to adore Christ in her womb? We had not thought it necessary to expose these absurdities of Martyr before now. If Crocius rejects them, then why does he bring them forth and, together with Martyr, deceive the reader? But if he approves of them, then let him at least defend what he has put forward.

## CHAPTER VIII

### **That, According to the Reformed, Catholics Hold a More Consistent View than Lutherans on the Adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist**

I. The Reformed of this age act most unjustly when they attempt to justify their separation from Catholic unity on the grounds of adoring Christ in the Holy Eucharist, as if this were a crime of abominable idolatry. For, as stated in the Admonition from the Book of Concord, the Lutherans are asked: "Is Christ to be adored as bodily present in the place where the bread is?" The Papists affirm this, displaying greater coherence in this matter than those theologians who wish to be known and called Lutherans alone.

Thus, dear reader, you see that, in the judgment of the Reformed, the Catholic position on the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist is more consistently connected to the belief in the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist than is the Lutheran doctrine, which affirms the real presence but denies adoration.

II. Crocius objects: "That adoration of Christ in the species of bread is more consistent with the doctrine of local presence than its denial does not mean that the Papists are more correct than the Lutherans regarding the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist. Lutherans do not attach the adoration of Christ to the species; Papists do. Lutherans deny that adoration pertains secondarily to the species and that they are co-adored with Christ, while the Papists assert this. It does not follow that if Christ is truly present in the species of bread, therefore the species of bread must be adored with Christ. Just as it does not follow: Christ was adored while lying in the manger, therefore the manger had to be adored with Christ."

III. Response: If adoration of Christ in the species of bread is more consistent with the doctrine of the real presence, how is it not also more rightly taught? Should those who teach inconsistencies and contradictions be considered correct among the Reformed? Let the Reformed keep their own praise for themselves: they treat the Catholic teaching on the real presence as a fundamental error at one time and as a non-fundamental error at another; they treat Catholic teaching on the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist sometimes as a non-fundamental error, sometimes as a fundamental one.

IV. Response 2: But, it is said, "Lutherans do not attach the adoration of Christ to the species; they deny that adoration pertains secondarily to the species and that the species are co-adored with Christ."

What conclusion does Crocius wish to draw from this? If the Lutherans deny that Christ, present in the Holy Eucharist, is to be adored, as Crocius often implies, how could they ever admit that such adoration pertains secondarily to the species? Would this not make them appear entirely irrational—admitting co-adoration while denying adoration itself?

If the Lutherans deny both secondary and primary adoration, do not Catholics hold the more correct position by affirming primary adoration, which the Reformed themselves acknowledge to be consistent with the doctrine of real presence—whereas the Lutherans reject it?

As for secondary adoration, we have addressed this elsewhere.

V. The same Admonition from the Book of Concord proves that Christ is to be adored in the Holy Eucharist if He is truly present there: "If Christ is present there with His body, it necessarily follows that He must be adored in the bread or at the bread."

Again: "If Christ were corporally present in the Eucharistic bread, we would necessarily be turned toward the bread to offer Him the reverence and adoration due to God."

Moreover, the adoration is bound to the human nature assumed by the Son of God, so that wherever He is present—whether according to our senses or His own word—adoration and honor must be directed to Him both in soul and body. As it is written: "Let all the angels of God adore Him."

And the impious and blasphemous fiction of certain Lutherans is rejected, when they claim that Christ is present in this bread with His body not to be adored in it, but only to be eaten—asserting that He neither commanded nor willed to be adored there, but only to be consumed.

But the universal command of God to adore Christ is sufficient to give Him due honor. If, therefore, it is certain that He is present there with His body, we do not need a special commandment to offer Him divine reverence and honor in this bread, just as Thomas did not wait for a special command to adore Christ when he saw Him standing before him but, recognizing Him, immediately fulfilled his duty by falling down and exclaiming: "My Lord and my God!"

VI. Crocius objects: "From this, it does not follow that Papists are more correct than the Lutherans regarding the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. The only point at issue is this: even if we concede that the doctrine of Christ's local presence in the bread implies that He

should be adored there, it does not follow that the entire Sacrament is to be adored with absolute adoration, nor that the species of bread should be adored along with Christ with a secondary adoration of latria. Moreover, modern Lutherans deny that Christ's body is locally and physically in the bread, whereas Papists affirm this of the species of bread."

VII. Response: Crocius continues to evade the issue. Are those who teach coherence not more correct than those who teach contradictions?

It is a small skill to confuse the questions of Christ's adoration in the Holy Eucharist and of the honor due to the species. But such confusion does not refute arguments.

If modern Lutherans deny that Christ's body is locally and physically in the bread—or even if they do not—the fact remains that they teach the real presence.

If, at the same time, they deny the real presence, then they teach contradictions and fall into the absurdities of Weigelian scholasticism.

VIII. But let us return to the main point. The same foundations from the Admonition from the Book of Concord, along with others, are cited by Johannes Bergius, who concludes that from the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the necessary consequence follows: that Christ must be adored in the Holy Eucharist. Thus, Catholics cannot be accused or convicted of idolatry by the Lutherans on this ground.

IX. Crocius objects: "This does not prove that Papists are more correct than the Lutherans regarding adoration according to the judgment of the Reformed. Why? Because Lutherans can accuse the Papists of idolatry for adoring the entire Sacrament and for adoring the species together with Christ."

X. Response: Whether or not the Lutherans can accuse us of idolatry for adoring the entire Sacrament and the species with Christ is not the issue here. The present question concerns only the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

XI. From this, it is evident that Crocius has thus far brought forward nothing that actually concerns the matter at hand. The reader also sees that, according to the judgment of the Reformed, the Lutheran doctrine—which refuses to adore Christ, whom they believe to be present in the Holy Eucharist—is an impious fabrication and an insult to Christ regarding the fundamental reason for their rejection of adoration. The Reformed cannot say the same about the Catholic position.

Crocius remarks: "Not all Reformed theologians have accepted this harsh judgment about an impious fabrication that insults Christ. I myself have never accepted it."

We grant this to Crocius as a sign of his moderation, that he does not judge his Lutheran brethren so harshly. We also acknowledge that his stomach cannot endure the Catholic doctrine regarding the honor due to the sacramental species, which he attacks everywhere with slanderous and virulent accusations.

In the meantime, either Crocius approves of the Lutheran foundation for not adoring Christ in the Holy Eucharist, or he does not.

If he does not approve, what does it matter if he does not personally adopt the severity of the judgment?

If he does approve, why has he not refuted the contrary arguments but instead passed over them in silence?

Furthermore, if Crocius is allowed to say, "Not all Reformed theologians have accepted this harsh judgment," then how can it be asserted that any particular statement made by a Catholic doctor necessarily reflects the belief of all Catholics?

If he can appeal to the authority of a book composed by common agreement among the Reformed, why should we be considered bound by whatever Crocius might cite from a particular Catholic doctor regarding the honor of the sacramental species?

XII. But let the reader hear Balsam defending the Neustadt Admonition: "Whether under the bread or under the species of bread, the true body of Christ is believed to be hidden, the cult of adoration is necessarily expressed, even by those who resist it, and indeed in such a way that both mind and eyes are turned toward the bread or the place where that bread is found."

Again: "You Lutherans cannot refute (the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist) with solid reasoning, for your belief in His bodily presence is its very foundation; and if the foundation stands, so does the conclusion, or else both fall together."

Moreover: "The Lutheran rejects the adoration of the bread. But the question is about Christ, who is hidden in the bread. If you deny this so-called 'Papist' adoration while asserting the bodily presence of Christ in the bread, you cannot escape the charge of impiety and offense against Christ—neither among Papists nor among any rational person. For if bodily presence is affirmed in the bread, then necessarily the honor of adoration follows, since wherever Christ is present in His body, He must be adored."

Thus, Balsam not only asserts that the Lutherans commit an act of impiety and offense against Christ, but he adds that they cannot escape this charge in the eyes of any rational person.

Yet Crocius, in his great love for his Lutheran brethren—who consider him a schismatic and a heretic—would rather be counted among the irrational by his fellow Reformed than accept this severe judgment or acknowledge its necessary consequences.

XIII. However, let no one think that there is some peculiar difficulty in this matter arising from the fact that Catholics believe in Transubstantiation, while Lutherans believe in Consubstantiation or the real presence with the substance of bread remaining.

The Reformed themselves admit that the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is not founded upon Transubstantiation but upon the real presence of Christ.

Indeed, they even suggest that some Lutherans adore Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Although we do not press this point here, Johannes Bergius holds that it is impossible for a Lutheran, believing himself to receive the true body of Christ, not to adore Him. (On the Words of the Supper, Chapter 17, §4, p. 107.)

XIV. Crocius objects: "This Papist assumption is an unfortunate one. I call it unfortunate because it does not align well with Lutheran doctrine. It treats consubstantiation and real presence as equivalent, whereas modern Lutherans do not. They affirm one and deny the other. Certainly, they denied it and rejected it together with us in the Leipzig Colloquy."

XV. Response: It does not follow that because the Saxon theologians rejected consubstantiation, therefore Lutherans today do not regard consubstantiation and real presence as equivalent.

When did the Lutheran Church officially make this rejection its own?

If they once held these to be equivalent, but later changed their position year by year, let Crocius commend his brethren for their inconsistency—what can he conclude from this?

XVI. Crocius further objects: "This Papist assumption is of little use. First, the Reformed do not concede that the adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is founded on real presence as the Lutherans and Papists define it. This is evident. The Reformed themselves adore Christ in the use of the Eucharist, even though they do not recognize His presence in the same way. Second, even if the Reformed were to admit that adoration of Christ in the bread or its species is founded upon the local presence of His body in the bread or species, there is still difficulty on the Papist side. If you take away transubstantiation, then local presence cannot stand in their theology. Therefore, neither can the adoration of Christ in the species of bread, much less the adoration of the Sacrament itself."

XVII. Response 1: Crocius clearly plays with equivocations. This discussion is not about just any kind of adoration of Christ in the Holy Eucharist or about any kind of reception of Christ. Nor is it about whether any form of adoration is based on the real presence as Catholics and Lutherans define it. We know that Calvinists claim to adore Christ in His body, which they believe to be present only in heaven. But that is irrelevant to the issue at hand.

XVIII. Response 2: The Reformed admit that adoration of Christ in the bread or its species is founded on the local presence of Christ's body in the bread or species. How, then, does this create difficulty on our side? Is it because local presence does not stand if transubstantiation is denied? What follows from that?

Is it because, if transubstantiation is denied, the adoration of Christ in the species of bread does not stand? But adoration is not based on whether Christ's body is under the species or under the bread; rather, it is based on the real and substantial presence of His body, whether it is under the species, with, or under the bread.

For it is not the mode of real and substantial existence that makes Christ adorable, but rather His real and substantial presence itself that demands adoration.

Crocius knows this, even though he pretends not to, so that he may appear to have made a contradiction.

XIX. Since, therefore, it becomes clear, according to the judgment of the Reformers, that Catholics are more correct than the Lutherans regarding the adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, let us return to the main point. The Reformed, through their decree of union with the Lutherans, show that the supposed error concerning the real presence of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist—whom they believe to be present—is not fundamental. The same opinion is held by the Admonition concerning the Book of Concord, and it is the most common sentiment among the Reformers. According to their judgment, Catholics teach more consistently that Christ, whom they believe to be present in the Most Holy Eucharist, must be adored, whereas the Lutherans,

though believing in His presence, deny adoration. Indeed, the Lutherans, in this matter (as it pleases the Reformed), are guilty of impiety—although Crocius absurdly claims that the Lutherans do not deprive Christ of His honor and raises many irrelevant objections. But it is the custom of the Reformers that what some accuse of impiety, others defend, and that various questions are confused together.

XX. Who, then, would believe or persuade himself that it is a greater crime for Catholics to believe and adore Christ Jesus as present in the Most Holy Eucharist than for the Lutherans, who believe Him present yet deprive Him of His honor? If the faith of the Lutherans, which believes in the real presence but impiously denies that Jesus Christ must be adored where He is truly present, is not a fundamental error—then by what reasoning will it be a fundamental error to believe in the real presence of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist and to render to Christ, who is believed to be present, the adoration that cannot and must not be denied to Him without peculiar impiety? Is it a crime to adore God, whom we believe to be present? And is it not much more a crime to deny due honor to God, whom the Lutherans themselves believe to be present? Should we seek peace with those who teach that Christ must not be adored where He is present and flee from the concord of those who render due honor to their God?

XXI. Let the Reformers show that Catholics err in a necessary article of faith by saying that Christ must be adored wherever they believe Him to be present, while at the same time claiming that the Lutherans do not err in a necessary article by saying that Christ must not be adored where they believe Him to be present. Unless they prove this, they have withdrawn from Catholic unity in vain and without any just cause. Nor should the Reformers say that we are raising new difficulties by reducing the question of division to necessary articles of faith; for we are led to this by the Reformers themselves as our guides. For if it was permissible for Johannes Bergius to reduce the question of oral manducation in the Most Holy Eucharist to necessary articles of faith against the Lutheran Johannes Himmel, in order to show that the Lutherans do not have sufficient grounds to refuse fraternity with one another—why should it not also be lawful for us to take the same approach to demonstrate that the Reformers had no sufficient foundation for their secession?

XXII. Furthermore, while Crocius repeats many things uselessly and outside the proposed question, he loudly claims that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is a fundamental error, as is also the adoration of the Sacrament. Nevertheless, he grants our entire case when he states: The crime of the Papists does not lie in the fact that they adore God, whom they believe to be present. Then in what, indeed, does it consist? He claims that it lies in the fact that they adore the Sacrament as God—that they adore the host in procession, which, he asserts, is neither God nor His Sacrament, but rather a morsel of bread, which worms and mice can gnaw upon. Yet it does not matter that they believe it to be God, etc. Behold, in the very same paragraph, what Crocius affirms, he then denies.

If it is not a crime to adore God whom we believe to be present, then how is it a crime to adore Christ in the procession, where we believe Him to be present? Is it because we adore the host? That is not the question when the matter at hand is the adoration of Christ, whom we

believe to be present in the Most Holy Eucharist. This Crocius convolutes with many distractions—sometimes affirming the presence as the Reformers pretend, sometimes deviating to other matters—so that he may not seem to have given no answer when, in fact, he had nothing solid to respond with.

XXIII. Therefore, blessed shall you be, O Catholics, when men hate you (the Reformers), and when they separate you (refusing your communion), and when they reproach you (for the adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist), and cast out your name as evil, for the sake of the Son of Man. For you confess Him as present in the Most Holy Eucharist; you adore Him as the true God. Nor should you be condemned or abandoned by the Reformers on account of this confession and adoration.

### **Chapter IX: If the Reformed Were to Unite with the Lutherans, the Adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist Would Not Be Condemned**

I. As an additional consideration, let us examine what judgment a united Lutheran-Reformed Church (if such peace were to be established between these Churches) should form regarding the Catholic practice of adoring Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist. This consideration is not useless but rather confirms what we have already stated. Suppose that peace were established between the Lutherans and the Reformed, in the manner desired by Johannes Bergius. Suppose also that the Lutherans no longer regarded the real presence of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist as a necessary article of faith. Then it would become even more evident that the Reformed did not depart from Catholic unity due to an error in a necessary article of faith. For although they are currently ready to unite with the Lutherans, it would be an even greater and more explicit approval of Lutheran doctrine if they were to actually unite with them.

II. We are not speaking here of an approval of errors that treats error as truth (though Crocius imagines this), but of an approval that regards the error as tolerable, since it is not fundamental. However, since not all Reformers agree on this qualification, and they would necessarily have to agree if such a union were to take place, this would be a clearer declaration of the entire Church rather than just of individuals whose opinions are not universally accepted.

III. Just as the Lutherans in Poland accepted the Reformed, reaching an agreement that stated: "By mutual consent, we accept and will strive to persuade all our fellow brethren and invite them to embrace, cultivate, and preserve this Christian and unanimous agreement, and to nourish and confirm it, especially through the hearing of the Word of God (by frequently attending the gatherings of both this and any other Confession) and the use of the Sacraments—while maintaining due order and rank in both discipline and the customs of each Church."

Let us suppose that the same union were found in Germany, as Johannes Bergius ardently desired.

IV. Now, we ask the Reformed: Where does Scripture say that they err in a necessary article of faith by refusing communion with those who teach that Christ must be adored in the

Most Holy Eucharist? And where does Scripture say that the Lutherans do not err in a necessary article of faith and that communion can be maintained with them—despite the fact that they teach the real presence of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist? Reformers themselves admit that this doctrine necessarily implies that Christ Jesus should be adored in the Most Holy Eucharist.

V. To this, Crocius responds that the Reformed do adore Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, but only as in prayer—therefore, those who teach that Christ must be adored in the Most Holy Eucharist are in error. However, those who teach that the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist must be adored and force dissenters to do so are in error. But this Reformed adoration "as in prayer" is irrelevant here, and the adoration of the Sacrament is a different question altogether. The issue of coercion pertains to an alleged tyranny. Thus, everything is mixed together so that nothing is actually addressed.

VI. Again, we ask: Where does Scripture teach that the Reformed can, with a safe conscience, receive the Most Holy Eucharist from the hands of a Lutheran minister who believes Christ is really present, but cannot, with a safe conscience, receive the Eucharist from the hands of a Catholic priest who believes the same?

VII. Crocius replies that the Reformed can receive the Sacrament from a Lutheran minister under certain circumstances—namely, when it does not appear that their doctrine is being denied, condemned, or renounced, because Lutheran teaching is considered a minor issue, not a fundamental error. If this is the case, then since circumstances are not the issue here, the Reformed should also be able to receive the Most Holy Eucharist from a Catholic priest, even though he teaches that Christ is really present. If Lutheran doctrine on this point is a minor issue, it must also be a minor issue with respect to Catholics. The additional points Crocius raises—about creating a creator, uncertainty of presence, and adoration—are irrelevant.

VIII. Again, we ask: Where does Scripture teach that the Reformed can, with a safe conscience, receive the Most Holy Eucharist while kneeling with the Lutherans, following their order and discipline, but cannot receive the Most Holy Eucharist kneeling with the Catholics, following Catholic custom?

IX. Crocius responds: Not all Lutherans receive the Most Holy Eucharist while kneeling. But it is enough that many do, even in Poland, where the Reformed have accepted their order and discipline. Those Lutherans who do kneel consider kneeling an indifferent ceremony. But who does not know that kneeling is indifferent by nature? However, kneeling when receiving the venerable Sacrament is not considered indifferent by all the Reformed. The Papists kneel before the host out of adoration. They adore what they do not know. But there are also Lutherans who kneel before the host out of adoration. So then, must they also be accused of adoring what they do not know? There is no escape from this conclusion, so we omit all irrelevant points.

X. Further, we ask: Where does Scripture teach that the Reformed can, with a safe conscience, receive the Most Holy Eucharist with the Lutherans—whom they believe adore Christ in the Eucharist—but cannot receive it with the Catholics, whom they know adore Christ in the Eucharist?

XI. Crocius responds: If there are Lutherans who, by inclination of the soul and bodily gesture toward the bread, teach that Christ must be adored in it and force every communicant to do the same, the Reformed cannot commune with them in good conscience, for Scripture commands that superstition be avoided, no matter who introduces it. However, those Lutherans who adore Christ in the Eucharist do so in such a way that they deny adoration applies to the symbols themselves. Since the Reformed do the same, they can, in this case, receive the Sacrament from them in good conscience, provided everything else is in order.

XII. Crocius, to please his Lutheran brethren, avoids answering the real issue. We are discussing Lutherans who teach that Christ is lawfully to be adored in the bread and who, in fact, do so—both in their hearts and by bodily gestures directed toward Christ present in the bread. The question is not whether some Lutherans compel others to do this. Why then introduce this clause, if not to evade the actual question?

XIII. Crocius argues that Papists commit idolatry by adoring the host because they adore bread that remains bread. But how does he prove that Catholics adore bread that remains bread? And why does he not apply the same reasoning to those Lutherans who believe the bread remains bread, yet still adore it?

XIV. We adore Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, not merely as symbolically present, but as truly present under the species. If He is truly present under the species—whether under the form of bread, by transubstantiation, or by another means—adoration is due to Him because of His real presence. The Lutherans who adore Christ as truly present in the bread do so in the same way Catholics adore Him as present under the species. Why, then, should Catholics be accused of idolatry, while these Lutherans are not?

XV. What will you say, except what the erring ones said in St. Augustine's time: What we will is holy? If you determine, according to your own arbitrary will, what articles of faith are necessary, what errors are in necessary articles, and with whom communion should or should not be maintained—then it is evident to all that you have withdrawn from Catholic unity without any just cause.

XVI. Finally, let us consider what judgment a united Lutheran-Reformed Church would render concerning Catholic adoration of Christ in the Eucharist. The Reformed themselves admit that the Lutherans cannot convict Catholics of idolatry for adoring Christ in the Eucharist. Therefore, a united Lutheran-Reformed Church could not condemn Catholics for idolatry. Thus, the Reformed are wrong to claim that adoration of Christ in the Eucharist is a just cause for leaving the Catholic Church.

XVII. Crocius, in order to escape the force of these conclusions, argues that the Lutherans can convict Catholics of idolatry on the grounds of their adoration of the Sacrament, since the adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist as present in the Sacrament differs from the adoration of the Sacrament itself. But what does this have to do with the issue? We are speaking of the adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist as present in the Sacrament—which we have repeatedly affirmed.

**Chapter X:**  
**Catholics Are Wrongfully Accused of Idolatry by the Reformed for Adoring Christ  
in Processions**

I. It is necessary to address this matter due to the numerous slanders and false accusations made by Crocius. He states: "We departed for a just cause, lest we be stained by communion with idolatry, into which they tried to drag us. Papists not only adore Christ but also the entire object they carry, etc." Likewise, he claims: "Those in the Papist communion are forced not only to adore Christ but also the species. Again, they are compelled in processions to adore what is carried and displayed. There, it is not the Sacrament, for nothing outside of its use has the nature of a Sacrament. Therefore, the body of Christ is not present under the species of bread, no matter what the Papists may think." See also Chapter 23, n. 10, p. 333, and Chapter 24, l.16, p. 349.

II. Crocius, always quick to accuse, charges Catholics with idolatry because they claim to adore Christ in ciboria, monstrances, processions, and outside the use of the Sacrament—when, according to the Reformed, no Sacrament remains outside its use, since its essence consists solely in its use. However, Johannes Hus, whom the Reformed regard as a witness to the truth, holds the contrary view. He writes: "After the words of consecration, the Body and Blood of the Lord remain in the Sacrament as long as the species of bread and wine endure." Elsewhere, he states: "If priests keep the Sacrament in churches, it is always ultimately for the purpose of communion, so that the sick, unable to approach the altar, may receive it and be nourished unto salvation." (*De sanguine Christi*, fol. 162).

III. Let us examine how much weight this accusation holds. We will not here dispute whether the essence of the Sacrament consists solely in its use, for it is unnecessary to refute the accusation through that argument. A more concise approach is available, and we shall take it.

IV. If the Reformed wrongly accuse the Catholic Church of idolatry for adoring Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, truly present under the species of bread within the use of the Sacrament, then they also wrongly accuse the same Church of idolatry for adoring Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, truly present under the species of bread, outside the use of the Sacrament. But the first accusation is false, as we have already shown in previous chapters. Therefore, the second must also be false.

V. The truth of the first point is evident from what we have previously discussed. The connection to the second follows logically: there is no greater reason to condemn Catholics for idolatry because they adore Christ outside the use of the Sacrament than for adoring Him within its use. The entire argument that Crocius offers rests on the assertion that, outside the use of the Sacrament, according to the Reformed, there is no longer a Sacrament. However, that argument does not prove that it is more idolatrous to adore Christ in the Eucharist outside the use of the Sacrament than within it.

This is demonstrated by the fact that, according to the Reformed, neither the general nature of a Sacrament nor the specific nature of the Eucharist makes Christ's body more or less

adorable under the species of bread or as existing under the bread. Therefore, Christ's body is no more or less worthy of adoration within the use of the Eucharist than outside of it. Consequently, if adoring Christ in both instances is either equally idolatrous or equally not idolatrous, then if the Reformed falsely accuse Catholics for adoring Christ in the Eucharist within its use, they also falsely accuse them for adoring Christ outside its use.

VI. What do you say to this? Have we not already proven that Catholics cannot be accused of idolatry for adoring Christ, whom they believe to be present under the species of bread and wine—unless the Reformed are also willing to accuse their own Lutheran brethren of the same crime? The Lutherans, after all, declare this adoration licit. Yet the Reformed do not dare to charge them with idolatry, due to their Polish agreement, their shared communion in Germany and elsewhere.

So, I ask you: What reason have you brought forward to show why we, rather than the Lutherans, should be accused, defamed, and condemned?

VII. You have alleged that we believe in the real presence through transubstantiation, whereas the Lutherans believe in it through some incomprehensible mode of existence. But have you, upon reflection, truly satisfied your conscience with this reasoning? Does this distinction not, in reality, force you to affirm merely what you desire to be true?

For Christ's adorability, as we believe Him to be present in the Most Holy Eucharist under the species, does not depend on transubstantiation in such a way that, if He were present by another means, He would not be adorable. Who would be so foolish as to imagine such a thing? From this, it would follow absurdly that the true God, when present, would not be adorable—such that Christ would not have been adorable in the manger or on the cross, which no sane person would admit.

Nor are the Lutherans so absurd as to say that Christ is or is not adorable in the Eucharist, under the bread, merely because of His incomprehensible mode of existence. Christ was not present in the manger or on the cross by transubstantiation, nor by the Lutherans' incomprehensible mode of existence, and yet, by universal agreement, He was truly adorable there.

VIII. Nor should you claim that Catholics would not adore Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist under the species unless they believed in His presence through transubstantiation, which the Lutherans do not believe. For this is just as frivolous. Lutherans themselves would not believe that Christ is adorable in the Eucharist under the bread unless they believed in His presence through some incomprehensible mode of existence.

So what will you impute to us regarding our belief in Christ's presence through transubstantiation that you are not equally forced to impute to the Lutherans for their belief in an incomprehensible mode of presence?

Moreover, those who adored Christ affixed to the cross would not have adored Him there unless He were present through crucifixion. Yet the impious act of crucifixion by the Jews was not the reason for adoring Christ on the cross, but rather His real presence there. In the same way, no matter how much the Reformed slander transubstantiation, this does not mean that Christ

is not adorable in the Most Holy Eucharist under the species of bread, since adorability arises solely from real presence.

IX. Furthermore, Crocius has argued that Catholics should be accused of idolatry rather than the Lutherans because the latter do not adore the bread, whereas Catholics, he claims, co-adorate the sacramental species. But this argument is unsatisfactory if you weigh it without prejudice.

The key question is not whether the sacramental species are also to be venerated, but whether Catholics commit idolatry by directing honor to Christ, whom they believe to be truly present in the Most Holy Eucharist under the sacramental species. If this directed adoration is not idolatry, as we have already demonstrated from Reformed principles, then how can the same adoration become idolatry simply because we believe it results in a subordinate honor directed toward the sacramental species—which Catholic faith does not require?

Explain this mystery to us, O Reformed, for we do not understand it. Nor do we believe that you have persuaded yourself of it when you wrote these things.

X. Therefore, since the Reformed, according to their own principles, cannot accuse the Lutherans of idolatry without both affirming and denying that they are idolaters, neither can they accuse the Catholics of idolatry for adoring Christ as truly present under the sacramental species—whether that adoration is directed to Christ within the use of the Sacrament or outside of it.

## **Chapter XI: Catholics Are Wrongfully Accused of Idolatry by the Lutherans in This Matter**

I. It is truly remarkable that, in this day and age, there are still people so driven by the urge to slander that they do not hesitate to malign either themselves or their own brethren, so long as they can burden the Catholic Church with their venom. This is evident in the Reformed theologian Crocius and must now also be shown in the Lutheran Kuhnze. We have already refuted his error regarding the alleged honor given to the sacramental species; it remains for us now to confront him regarding the same slander.

II. He claims: "Although, under the erroneous assumption of transubstantiation, Papists believe that they are not adoring any created substance, nevertheless... in reality, they do honor the substance of bread. For that erroneous concept and false assumption of the transubstantiation of bread do not change the actual substance, but only exist in empty persuasion. Therefore, Marcus Antonius was mistaken when he excused his mother from idolatry by saying that her intention was directed solely to the body of Christ and not to the bread, which she falsely supposed to be transubstantiated."

Although Georg Calixtus, in his Disputation on Transubstantiation (II, n. 72), embellishes and attempts to defend this excuse, we rightfully reject it—unless we are also willing to absolve most pagans from guilt, for they likewise regarded their idols as gods and, had they known

otherwise, would certainly never have worshiped them. To absolve them on account of their erroneous assumption and misguided intention would be to excuse idolatry unjustly.

III. Let us assume with you, as the Lutherans claim, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is erroneous—so that we may more clearly examine the strength of your reasoning. As far as we can see, your argument runs as follows:

- I. Every erroneous concept changes nothing in reality.
- II. The concept of transubstantiation is erroneous.
- III. Therefore, the concept of transubstantiation changes nothing in reality.

But from these premises, we fail to see how you can conclude what you assert: "In reality, they honor the very substance of bread." Nor do we see how you justify your claim that Marcus Antonius misunderstood the issue. He recognized that the intention of Catholics is not directed toward the bread, which they believe is not present. You reject this argument, but on what basis?

Is it because most pagans would, by the same reasoning, be absolved from guilt? But what kind of proof is that? Do you mean to say that because "pagans regarded their idols as gods and, had they known otherwise, would never have worshiped them," that therefore Catholics must be guilty of idolatry? This is a grave error on your part, which you would immediately recognize if you set aside the prejudice of blindness for even a moment.

Everything that is worshiped exists in the intellect affirming its presence—whether by a true or a false representation. The pagans worshiped their idols because they believed them to be gods.

- I. Therefore, the idols they worshiped existed in their intellect affirming them as gods—whether by a true or false representation.
- II. Conversely, whatever does not exist in an affirming intellect—whether by a true or false representation—cannot be worshiped.
- III. The bread does not exist in the Catholic intellect as something affirmed to be present, whether by those adoring Christ or honoring the sacramental species, or in any other manner.
- IV. Therefore, the bread is not worshiped.

Furthermore, whatever is denied by an intellect cannot be willed by that person's will. But Catholics deny that bread is present in the Most Holy Eucharist. Therefore, their will does not direct worship toward bread.

Thus, when Kuhnze argues that if the pagans had known their idols were not gods, they would not have worshiped them, his reasoning is based on the fact that the will does not worship what the intellect judges not to be present. Since the Catholic intellect judges that bread is not present in the Most Holy Eucharist, and Catholics explicitly declare that they neither do nor wish to adore bread, is it not a grave slander to claim that "they honor the very substance of bread"—which their intellect denies is present and whose adoration their will abhors?

IV. Furthermore, if Catholics are accused of honoring the very substance of bread, then Lutherans must be accused of doing so even more. (We proceed according to the views of those Lutherans who deem the adoration of Christ under the bread to be licit.)

The argument follows:

One who believes the bread to be present in the Most Holy Eucharist is more rightly judged to be adoring the substance of bread than one who believes it to be absent.

But the Lutherans believe that the bread remains, while the Catholics believe it is absent.

Therefore, the Lutherans are more rightly judged to be adoring the substance of bread in the Most Holy Eucharist than the Catholics.

Thus, Lutheran Kuhnze, by his own reasoning, condemns his fellow Lutherans of idolatry—and perhaps even himself. He thereby imitates the Reformed theologian Crocius, slandering Catholics in the same unjust manner.

## **Chapter XII: Conclusion**

I. It has been shown thus far that Protestants have no just cause for schism on the grounds that the Catholic Church teaches Christ Jesus is to be adored in the Most Holy Eucharist, as He is truly present and contained under the sacramental species—since He is a truly adorable object. The objections of Crocius and Kuhnze are so weak, so contrived, and often so slanderous that it would hardly have been worth the effort to refute them—were it not for their use of convoluted, ambiguous, and irrelevant arguments, by which they have attempted to instill scruples in an unsuspecting reader.

II. The Catholic Church has never defined anything concerning the honor due to the sacramental species considered separately, for there was no need. Likewise, the Catholic Church has never taught that any substance in general, contained under the sacramental species, is to be adored. Yet among Protestants, there are those who are not ashamed to fabricate this accusation in order to slander their Mother with false charges.

III. Nearly the entire argument of the adversaries is directed against the alleged co-adoration of the sacramental species along with Christ—though in this very matter, the Protestants themselves teach what pertains to the Catholic faith. Let them argue with our scholastics about scholastic terminology and the precise meaning of words, even if, in substance, the difference is minimal or perhaps nonexistent.

Whatever the case may be, just as Crocius does not consider himself bound or refuted by the opinions of particular Protestant doctors, it is utterly unworthy of a theologian to insult the opinions of particular Catholic doctors, to attribute these opinions to the entire Catholic Church, and to base the cause of schism upon them.

To this and similar accusations, we say: Remove the slander, and you will be one of us.