

Contents

CHAPTER I. On the Foundations of Faith.....	4
CHAPTER II. On the Rule of Faith	4
CHAPTER III. On Sacred Scripture	5
CHAPTER IV. On Canonical and Apocryphal Books.....	5
CHAPTER V. On Traditions	5
CHAPTER VI. On the Perfection of Holy Scripture	6
CHAPTER VII. On the Judge of Controversies	7
CHAPTER VIII. On the Perpetual Visibility of the Church.....	8
CHAPTER IX. On the Promised Immunity of the Church from Errors.....	9
CHAPTER X. On the Marks of the Church	10
CHAPTER XI. On the Primacy of St. Peter and His Successor.....	14
CHAPTER XII. On the Ministers of the Church.....	15
CHAPTER XIII. On Purgatory.....	16
CHAPTER XIV. On Suffrages for the Dead.....	17
CHAPTER XV. On the Veneration of Saints.....	18
CHAPTER XVI. On the Intercession of Saints.....	19
CHAPTER XVII. On the Invocation of Saints.....	20
CHAPTER XVIII. On the Knowledge of the Saints.....	21
CHAPTER XIX. On the Relics of Saints.....	23
CHAPTER XX. On the Images of Saints.....	24
CHAPTER XXI. On the Efficacy of Sacraments.....	26
CHAPTER XXII. On the Number of Sacraments.....	28
CHAPTER XXIII. On the Necessity of Baptism.....	28
CHAPTER XXIV. On the Minister of Baptism.....	32
CHAPTER XXV. On Confirmation.....	34
CHAPTER XXVII. On Indulgences.....	37
CHAPTER XXVIII. On the Deniers of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ Under the Species of Bread and Wine.....	38
CHAPTER XXIX. Approximation of the Reformed.....	38
CHAPTER XXX. Catholic Doctrine Is Proposed.....	41
CHAPTER XXXI. The Reason of the Mystery in the Holy Sacrament is Examined.....	46

CHAPTER XXXII. Catholic Truth from the Words of Institution.....	49
CHAPTER XXXIII. The Holy Fathers on the Real Presence.....	51
CHAPTER XXXIV. On Transubstantiation.....	53
CHAPTER XXXV. The Doctrine of the Greek Church on the Holy Eucharist.....	54
CHAPTER XXXVI. On the Sacrifice of the Mass.....	57
CHAPTER XXXVII. On the Antiquity of the Mass, Received by Authority.....	58
CHAPTER XXXVIII. The Catholic Opinion Concerning the Mass Is Proposed.....	59
CHAPTER XXXIX. Proofs from the Holy Fathers for the Mass through Scripture.	62
CHAPTER XL. On the Order and Ceremonies of the Mass.....	66
CHAPTER XLI. On the Adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist.....	68
CHAPTER XLIII. On Communion Under One Species.....	69
CHAPTER LXIII. On Extreme Unction.....	70
CHAPTER LXIV. On the Sacrament of Orders.....	70
CHAPTER LXV. On the Sacrament of Matrimony.....	71
CHAPTER XLVI. On Mortal and Venial Sin.....	71
CHAPTER XLVII. God Is Not the Cause of Sin.....	72
CHAPTER XLVIII. On the Sin of the First Man.....	73
CHAPTER XLIX. On Original Sin.....	73
CHAPTER L. Whether Concupiscence in the Renewed Is Truly Sin?.....	73
CHAPTER LI. On the Evils Consequent to Original Sin.....	74
CHAPTER LII. On Grace and Its Division.....	74
CHAPTER LIII. On the Communication of Grace.....	75
CHAPTER LIV. On Predestination and Reprobation.....	76
CHAPTER LV. On Free Will According to Itself.....	76
CHAPTER LVI. On Free Will in Natural and Civil Matters.....	77
CHAPTER LVII. On the Harmony of Cooperation with Free Will.....	77
CHAPTER LVIII. On the Powers of Free Will in Moral Matters.....	77
CHAPTER LIX. On the Powers of Free Will in Supernatural Matters.....	79
CHAPTER LX. Man Freely Consents to the Grace of God.....	80
CHAPTER LXI. On the Name of Justification and Its Causes.....	81
CHAPTER LXII. On the Object of Justifying Faith.....	82
CHAPTER LXIII. On the Subject of Justifying Faith.....	83

CHAPTER LXIV. Is Faith Knowledge or Assent?	84
CHAPTER LXV. Does Faith Alone Justify?	84
CHAPTER LXVI. Can Faith Be Alone?.....	85
CHAPTER LXVII. On the Perfection of Inherent Justice.....	86
CHAPTER LXVIII. On Justice Both Inherent, and Given or Imputed	86
CHAPTER LXIX. On the Formal Cause of Justification	87
CHAPTER LXX. In What Confidence Should Be Placed	88
CHAPTER LXXI. On the Certainty of Justice	89
CHAPTER LXXII. On the Certainty of Predestination	89
CHAPTER LXXIII. On Good Works.....	90
CONCLUSION.....	90

TRACTATUS I. - COMPENDIUM OF PARTICULAR CONTROVERSIES.

WARNING TO THE READER.

This Treatise was published in the year 1612, under the Title "Approximation of Protestants to Catholic doctrine": and it was the fourth motive of the Most Serene Prince Ernest Justus Landgrave of Hesse, whom we call here "Malumuthi." It is called "Compendium of Controversies," because it contains almost everything, and has relation to the following Treatises, in particular.

CHAPTER I. On the Foundations of Faith.

Protestants teach with Catholics that the formal object of faith is Divine revelation as a revealed truth; and that the material object is the articles of faith proposed to be believed, as we declare.

They teach that the articles of faith are in the Symbol, which is called Apostolic; in Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament; and in the five Ecumenical Councils. And that the Symbol itself, through the Five Ecumenical Councils, namely that of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, has been declared and explained.

The Apostolic pronouncement is acknowledged on both sides: "Faith comes through hearing, hearing moreover through the word of Christ," which is understood from the word of Christ preached: "How shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? How then shall they preach unless they are sent?" This preaching is preserved in Divine Scripture, and in Apostolic traditions: for whoever accepts the Holy Scripture, receives also that which is evangelical and apostolic, and the genuine traditions which are contained in the Divine law. All therefore agree on this point; that the immovable and immutable foundation of our faith consists in the truth of God revealing, who can neither deceive nor be deceived.

CHAPTER II. On the Rule of Faith

The Protestants teach with the Catholics that Holy Scripture is the most certain, most firm, infallible, and necessary rule of faith, which has received its authority from God inspiring His Word to the Prophets, Apostles, and Canonical authors. But the question is: Whether Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith, so that nothing else should be acknowledged as a rule? The Protestants deny that anything else should be admitted; the Catholics affirm it. From Holy Scripture, the Protestants cannot prove that the Holy Bible is the only rule of our faith, with the exclusion of any other. The Catholics, however, prove that the unwritten Word of God should also be admitted as a rule, as the Apostle says: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." But, because this question depends entirely on the matter of Traditions, we will not be lengthier here.

CHAPTER III. On Sacred Scripture

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the original writings of the Prophets and Apostles no longer exist, and that what we now use are copies of their writings. No one doubts that various difficulties and confusions have been caused in copying and printing these. Now the world is filled with various translations; and although some are better than others, who would assert that any of them is completely without imperfection? Despite these issues, the Protestants acknowledge with us that God by His power has preserved His Word contained in the Old and New Testaments, although there may be some difficulty concerning certain passages.

CHAPTER IV. On Canonical and Apocryphal Books

In this matter, the Protestants largely agree with the opinion of the Catholic Church. For although the Lutherans, at the beginning of their movement, called into doubt the Apocalypse of John, the Epistle of St. James, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, now they accept all of these, and so in this matter there is peace.

Regarding the Old Testament, the Protestants accept the Canon of the Jews; but the Catholics do not think that after the announcement of the Gospel, the Protestants wish to Judaize or resurrect the Synagogue, which the Apostles buried with honor.

They say that those books which they consider Apocryphal were not recognized in the Council of Laodicea. The Catholics show that they were recognized in the third Council of Carthage, by St. Augustine, and by other Fathers and Councils.

The Protestants would easily acquiesce if they considered that there was doubt about certain books until the Council of Carthage, which was held in the year 397. For since they themselves acknowledge the purity of the first four centuries, they cannot reject the decree of that Council unless they prefer their own particular judgment to the judgment of the Church, which is contrary to the custom of Protestants, who want individuals to acquiesce to the judgment of the Synod, and Ministers to sign the acts of the Synod with a declaration of submission.

CHAPTER V. On Traditions

Two kinds of tradition are established: Apostolic and Ecclesiastical. The Protestants necessarily hold with us that Ecclesiastical traditions must be admitted, as they unanimously accept the ordinations and constitutions of their Pastors, contained in ecclesiastical disciplines. The Catholics call such constitutions Ecclesiastical traditions. So here there is peace.

The Protestants do not deny that God revealed more than is contained in the written books we now have. For they commonly acknowledge that some books of Holy Scripture have perished, and that Christ Jesus said many things that are not written. Indeed, Zanchius says: "But some traditions were instituted and left in the Church by the Apostles unwritten but by word, not all of which have come down to us." And others do not disagree in this.

The Protestants acknowledge that infants should be baptized, which St. Augustine teaches is held from Apostolic tradition. The Protestants acknowledge that those who have been baptized by heretics should not be rebaptized, which St. Augustine likewise teaches is derived from Apostolic tradition. Book 2 against the Donatists, chap. 7, page 42 A.

The Protestants teach with us that Holy Scripture itself is held from Apostolic tradition as necessary for the Churches; Zanchius and others teach this. They also confess that certain words must be pronounced in baptism, which can probably be derived from Holy Scripture alone, but can be proven by much more necessary argument. They also accept the abrogation of the law concerning things strangled and blood, about which we read in the Acts of the Apostles; thus, the abrogation is derived from tradition alone. They likewise acknowledge the sanctification of the Lord's Day from unwritten Apostolic tradition. Calixtus, *Epitome of Theology in the prolegomena*, page 43. Zanchius, *loc. cit.*

Therefore, the question is not whether Apostolic traditions should be recognized. For who would be so shameless as to say that faith should be given to the writings of the Apostles but not to their words?

But the Protestants say that there are no traditions necessary for all. If by this they mean that Holy Scripture contains, either explicitly or implicitly, all that is necessary for everyone's salvation, they will have the Catholics in agreement. But it is easily agreed by both sides that Holy Scripture does not include in express words or equivalents, in an evidently necessary sense, whatever is necessary for everyone's salvation. Therefore, some Protestants admit that there is need for consequences and interpretations; the Catholics also admit that the true sense of necessary things must be taken from tradition.

So the whole difficulty ends in this: Whether those things which are necessary for all should be determined from Holy Scripture by private interpretations and consequences of each person, or through Apostolic tradition, received by the Churches, preserved in the Churches, proposed through general Councils and the practice of the universal Church? Let the Protestant Lords judge which is more equitable, more certain, more solid: either to trust in private interpretations and consequences, or in the consenting authority that has come down to us from the Apostles.

CHAPTER VI. On the Perfection of Holy Scripture

The Protestants think that the Catholics accuse Holy Scripture of imperfection and insufficiency because they admit traditions; but if they considered that they themselves acknowledge Holy Scripture from tradition and admit various traditions, they would not accuse in Catholics what they themselves are bound to defend.

Indeed, they rather accuse Holy Scripture, as if it did not refer us to traditions, when in fact we are most clearly referred to traditions, and they themselves admit various traditions.

It is recognized on both sides that Holy Scripture, whether explicitly or implicitly, contains all that is necessary for salvation. But in order to extract from what is implicit that which must be explicitly believed, and so that the necessary sense of the words may be held securely and without danger of error, the Protestants want each person, having invoked the Holy Spirit (however much they admit they can err), to determine what is to be believed from the sacred text, and not to trust in any ecclesiastical authority in this matter, but only in their own reasoning and interpretation, which they persuade themselves is certainly directed by the light of the Holy Spirit; and to entrust to that determination their eternal salvation or eternal damnation.

But the Catholics want no one to entrust so important a matter securely to private determination, but that the sense of Holy Scripture should be received from Apostolic tradition, entrusted to the Church, proposed by the Church.

Therefore, the Catholics are unjustly accused of making Holy Scripture imperfect, since Holy Scripture itself confirms traditions; and these traditions are nothing other than the unwritten Word of God, of equal authority and truth with the written Word of God, which Word of God the Protestants themselves acknowledge in some instances.

And those who cannot be satisfied by the written Word of God and the traditional Word of God to find what suffices for obtaining salvation, unless each person adds their own private and fallible consequences, which do not deserve the name of the Word of God, must be considered much more to accuse Holy Scripture of imperfection.

But since it is confessed on both sides that Holy Scripture, whether explicitly or implicitly, contains all that suffices for man's salvation, it is not necessary to further insist on refuting this accusation.

CHAPTER VII. On the Judge of Controversies

This question, which is most serious, can be cleaned up with little effort, as it disturbs all. For the Protestants would agree with the Catholics fully if they did not disagree with themselves.

It is known to everyone that a rule is one thing, a worker or craftsman another; a law is one thing, a judge another. Those who say that Scripture alone is the judge of controversies confuse the law with the judge, unless by judge they mean a norm and rule; and thus in good sense this proposition is admitted among Catholics, because Holy Scripture either explicitly or implicitly contains all things necessary for our salvation.

When the Protestants say that the true sense of the divine Word must be sought from the Holy Spirit, the author of the Holy Scriptures, they assert the very thing that the Catholic Church teaches. For the Councils say, following the example of the first Apostolic Council: "It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us," for men do

not give the sense of Scripture, but the Spirit of Christ, remaining with the Doctors and Pastors of the Church until the consummation of the world, and who uses the Ministers of the divine Word as His organs, teaching them all truth. John 16:3.

Therefore, the Church does not judge principally about the sense of Holy Scripture, but the Holy Spirit presiding in Councils, residing in the Church, declaring from the beginning the sense of His words to all: for who knows the Spirit and mind of the Lord, if not the Lord Himself of the letter, Spirit, and sense?

From this it is clear with what injustice the Roman Catholic Church is accused of making men judges of God and His Word, as if it exalted men above the authority of the Holy Scriptures, when it attributes that authority to the Holy Spirit present in the Church, using the Pastors as His organs, and opening His sense to the faithful.

The Protestants distinguish three kinds of judgments: The first is of discretion, which belongs to each person to test the spirits and discern them, and to determine what agrees with the Holy Scriptures and what is repugnant to them. The second judgment is of definitive and supreme authority, which belongs only to the Holy Spirit, whose role it is to interpret His words. The third is mixed from discretion and non-supreme authority, to which the faithful voluntarily submit, according to what the Apostle says, that the spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets; namely, the sense of individuals to the sense of the community and of Synods.

In these things, they largely approach the opinion of the Catholic Church, which first does not reject the judgment of discretion, because it is a singular grace of God. Second, it does not deny that the Holy Spirit judges about the sense of Holy Scripture, but says that the Holy Spirit does this both in Holy Scripture and through the Pastors gathered in Council. Third, the Protestants attribute this supreme authority to the operation of the Holy Spirit through their Synods, although they do not acknowledge this in word.

An example is in the Synod of Dort, where the Arminians, not willing to acquiesce to the judgment of the Synod, were removed from their functions and declared schismatic. And let them not say that their Synodal judgments bind no one's conscience, but that it is free for each person to examine them according to the Scriptures: for thus their excommunication and anathematization would be ludicrous against those who, according to the principles of the Protestants, commit no error, but using the spirit of Christian liberty, as spiritual persons judge all things and submit themselves to no one's judgment.

It is therefore clear from the practice of Catholics and Protestants that controversies of Religion are terminated by Synods and Councils, and that these propose the sense of Holy Scripture to be accepted by their subjects.

CHAPTER VIII. On the Perpetual Visibility of the Church

The Protestants teach with the Catholics that the Church of the called is visible: But that the assembly of the elect, in the visible Church, as a part hiding in the whole, is

invisible: Similarly, that the faith of those who are in the visible Church is invisible, unless external profession is added.

It is taught on both sides that the Church will last until the end of the world: And, what is the head of the matter, that the preaching of the divine Word and the administration of the Sacraments always belong to the Church. Hence no question remains about the perpetual visibility of the Church predicted and promised in the Holy Scriptures. For the Church is visible through the preaching of the divine Word and through the administration of the Sacraments: which since they perpetually belong to the Church, it cannot be but that perpetual visibility belongs to it.

Perpetual visibility does not belong to the Churches of the Protestants, because perpetual preaching of the divine word and perpetual administration of the Sacraments are not found in them, since they cannot designate where the true Church of Jesus Christ was at the birth of Luther, preaching the divine word and administering the Sacraments.

But the Roman Catholic Church, communicating in faith with the Roman Bishop in the first five hundred years after Christ, was the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ; nor can any other true and visible Church of Jesus Christ be shown which has remained until now, and from whose unity the Roman Catholic Church has defected; consequently, the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ, to which everyone desirous of their salvation should join themselves, since the Protestants teach with the Catholics that there is no salvation outside of Communion with the Church, through external Communion.

CHAPTER IX. On the Promised Immunity of the Church from Errors

The Protestants hold with the Catholics that particular Churches are not such that promises of not erring have been made to them in Holy Scripture: and therefore neither are the Synods of particular Churches, by virtue of such promises, immune from errors. And since the Protestants teach that their Churches are not universal, but particular, it is not surprising that they confess them to be liable to errors.

But the Protestants further teach with the Catholics that the universal Church does not err in foundation, that is, in necessary articles of faith and morals. But what reason can be adduced from the Holy Scriptures why they say the universal Church, by virtue of divine promises, is immune from fundamental errors and liable to non-fundamental errors? which is said without any such limitation to be the pillar and ground of truth; which is said to be built upon a rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; with which Christ the Lord will remain until the consummation of the world; at whose petition the Holy Spirit was given, teaching all things, suggesting all things which Christ has said; remaining with the Church forever; and as the Spirit of truth teaching all truth.

These and similar things cause us to be unable to admit the Protestants' restriction of divine promises and predictions to immunity from fundamental errors only.

However, the Protestants approach the doctrine of the Catholic Church when they say that the universal Church does not err in foundation: For who would not securely commit himself to the Church in fundamental doctrine, not erring by virtue of divine promises, and to which, as the Protestants confess, a more eminent judgment about matters of faith belongs than to any particulars? "For I do not deny," says Calvin, "that the whole society of the faithful, endowed with a manifold variety of gifts, is furnished with a far more ample and richer treasure of heavenly wisdom than each individually."

Similarly, the Protestants approach the doctrine of the Catholic Church by their practice, when they want National Synods to decide definitively and resolve all ecclesiastical matters, and to excommunicate and declare schismatic those who contradict them. For this very thing is what the Catholics teach about the universal Church, to which it is all the more safely yielded, the more ample promises the universal Church has, compared to particular ones, among whose number the Protestants themselves place their Churches.

It is indeed to be wondered at how the Protestants attribute so much clarity to Holy Scripture that anyone can discern what is to be believed from the sacred text, and yet (though to the prejudice of domestic practice) are unwilling for their Pastors and Doctors gathered in Synod to decide controversies of faith with absolute certainty.

It is similarly to be wondered at how the Protestants teach that each of the faithful is certain, with the certainty of divine faith, of his justification and predestination, and yet an entire Synod, which claims such certainty for each of its members, cannot or will not determine the articles necessary for obtaining justification, so that whoever does not admit them cannot attain justification.

Since, therefore, the doctrine of the Protestants concerning the promised immunity of the Church from errors wavers so greatly and so manifestly, let us consider how the Church of Jesus Christ was true, which in the first centuries communicated in faith with the Roman Bishop, whose decrees of faith, as immune from errors, were proposed to the whole Church with the obligation of acquiescing and accepting: Let us consider that the same Church perseveres to this day, and that no other can be designated from which it has defected, and in which the divine promises have had their effect: And we will not doubt to entrust ourselves to the bosom of that Church, in which through the continued series of times the divine promises have been brought to effect by the powerful virtue of the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER X. On the Marks of the Church

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that there are marks, or signs, of the true Church, by which we are led to recognize the true Church. But that those signs are most certain which are found in the Holy Scriptures, admitted on both sides, no one doubts. For, as St. Augustine rightly says, "In Scripture we learn Christ, in Scripture we learn the Church."

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the Church is to be believed one. But the Protestants do not acknowledge unity as a sign of the true Church, because indeed by their division from the Roman Catholic Church, they have abandoned the former unity.

But Christ places unity as a sign of the true Church, when He says: "I do not pray for them only, but also for those who will believe in me through their word, that they all may be one, as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that you have sent me." That this treats of unity under the aspect of a sign is read in the words "that the world may believe"; for the world must receive faith from those who have unity.

And again Christ says: "I in them, and you in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that you have sent me." The reason of the sign is in the words: "That they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know," because faith is to be learned from those who are made perfect in one. Similarly, Christ says: "By this all will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another," for the continued charity of the faithful induces all to recognize the genuine disciples of Christ the Lord.

Unity of faith does not belong to the Churches of the Protestants, because formerly believing the same thing with the Roman Catholic Church, they ceased to believe the same; nor can they show a visible Church with which they have always believed the same thing, up to these times, so that in them is verified that saying of the Apostle: "Having the same Spirit of faith." Let them see, therefore, whether they are of those about whom St. John says: "Whoever departs and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God."

We have also shown in the preceding that the principles and foundations of the Protestants are so arranged that they cannot hope for solid unity even in their particular Churches.

But unity of faith belongs to the Roman Catholic Church, because it has never changed its faith. Nor can any other Church be designated which, when the Roman Catholic Church changed its faith, did not depart from the prior faith.

Unity of charity does not belong to the Churches of the Protestants. Because these Churches were in union and communion with the Roman Catholic Church, of which they were members, and afterward had separate congregations. "God is not the author of dissension," says the Apostle, who also warns: "That there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care for one another." And what is the reason? "For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one." Certainly, great diligence must be used to preserve the unity of charity. "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is." "But let us be solicitous to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Therefore, it is permitted to say of the Protestants: "These are they who separate themselves." For Christ Jesus

"made both one"; but they made two out of one, two and more Churches out of one Church.

Unity of charity belongs to the Roman Catholic Church, because from the beginning it has remained in the union of charity, and has never been divided from the former communion. The Protestants also cannot designate a Church which they call Orthodox, from whose communion the Roman Catholic has separated itself. Therefore "we are not of those who draw back unto perdition, but of faith to the saving of the soul."

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the Church is to be believed holy. But the Protestants do not acknowledge holiness as a sign of the true Church, if it is a matter of the holiness of miracles, because indeed no miracles are found among them.

But Christ places holiness as a sign of the true Church, when He says: "And these signs will follow those who believe: In my name they will cast out demons." That this treats of true miracles is clear to the reader; nor are they restricted to these or those believers, to these or those times. That they have the nature of a sign is expressly read. Thus Christ says: "But that you may know that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sins, then he said to the paralytic, 'Arise,'" etc., for miracles lead men to the knowledge of things to be believed. Therefore faith is preached: "God also bearing witness both with signs and wonders." Therefore believers say: "We know that you have come from God as a Teacher," and from where? "for no one can do these signs that you do unless God is with him." And the Prophet says: "Tell the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that you are gods."

The holiness of miracles is not found in the Churches of the Protestants, because for a whole century they have not adduced any miracle that has happened among them.

But the holiness of miracles belongs to the Roman Catholic Church, where in all centuries not a few miracles have happened, the Magdeburg Centuriators themselves reporting many that were manifest in successive times. Nor does it prevent that false miracles are predicted: for just as it does not take away the truth and efficacy of Christ's miracles, that false miracles were predicted in the Old Testament, so it does not diminish the truth and efficacy of miracles that happen under the New Testament, that false miracles are predicted. Nor do we believe that moderate Protestants will object to miracles, which do not cease to happen in a believing world, what the Jews with most impudent temerity dared to object to the miracles of Christ.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the Church is to be believed Catholic, that is, spread throughout the whole world. But the Protestants do not acknowledge that diffusion as a sign of the true Church: But Christ places diffusion as a sign of the true Church, when He says: "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in all the world, as a witness to all nations, and then the end will come."

Preaching throughout the whole world has the nature of a sign, because it is done as a witness to all nations. So also it is predicted by the Prophet: "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, who shall stand as a sign to the people; the Gentiles shall seek Him." And therefore he adds: "Pass through, pass through the gates, prepare the way for the people, make smooth the road, pick out the stones, and lift up a sign to the peoples." The very diffusion of the Church is established by so many and such predictions that the Apostle rightly said: "According to the common faith."

The Churches of the Protestants are not Catholic, for they are not spread throughout the whole world. They say indeed that the Apostles preached the Gospel throughout the whole world, but that under the Roman Bishops the Church failed, a few true faithful being preserved here and there, until with Luther, Zwingli, and others extraordinarily raised up by God, the Church flourished again: But we read in the Holy Scriptures that the establishment of the Church in all nations was predicted; but they do not read that that defection of the Church from all nations was predicted, or that a few pious people were to be preserved for many centuries in universal corruption, without the sincere preaching of the divine Word, without the legitimate administration of the Sacraments: They do not read that Luther, Zwingli, and others were promised, who by discordant effort would restore the ruins of the collapsed Church. Since they do not read this in the Holy Scriptures, how is it that what was soon to perish is predicted by so many and such testimonies, but the misery of so many centuries is passed over in silence? How are false Prophets predicted, but true Restorers of the Church completely neglected?

But the Roman Church is truly Catholic, because considering all the centuries from the time of Christ, it is most widely spread throughout the whole world: nor can any other Church be assigned to which the promised diffusion more belongs.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the Church is to be believed Apostolic, in which is a continued succession of Doctors. But the Protestants do not acknowledge that succession as a sign of the true Church, because succession is not found among them. But the Apostle commends the succession of Doctors as a sign: "And He Himself gave some to be Apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, that we should no longer be children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the trickery of men, in the cunning craftiness of deceitful plotting." Here we read that Doctors are given by God: we read of the continuation of Doctors, "till we all come," etc.: we read the reason of the sign, "that we should no longer be children, tossed to and fro." Wherefore, the obedience due to the Doctors of the Church discerns true believers from those who err, since we read: "He who knows God hears us; he who is not of God does not hear us. By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error."

The Churches of the Protestants are not Apostolic, because in them is not found a continuous succession of Doctors from the Apostles up to our times. They say indeed that succession of persons is nothing without succession of doctrine. But, because succession of doctrine cannot be found where there is not succession of persons, we succinctly show from the defect of succession of persons, the defect of succession of doctrine.

The Roman Catholic Church is Apostolic, because it has a continued succession of Doctors from the Apostles up to these times: And the Protestants themselves not rarely enumerate the order of our Bishops. If they do not want the Roman Catholic Church to be Apostolic, let them assign another Church which is Apostolic, and which they judge Orthodox, in which is found a continued succession of Doctors. But if they do not find such a one, it remains that they acknowledge the Roman Catholic Church to be Apostolic.

Therefore, only the Roman Church is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. Consequently, only the true Church of Jesus Christ. Only it has the scarlet sign, by which one may arrive at the house of faith. "Your testimonies are very sure." Ps. 92:5.

CHAPTER XI. On the Primacy of St. Peter and His Successor.

Protestants are accustomed to declaim most gravely against the Primacy of St. Peter and his successor, the Bishop of Rome. But since both parties agree that Jesus Christ is the head of the Church, who alone rules it through the internal influence of grace, and in whom He cannot have a Vicar: there is no need to dispute about the title of head, which the Protestants will not deny can be given to others, as they know that by this title we understand nothing other than the Pastor and Ruler appointed by Christ.

The Protestants themselves in their Synods elect Presidents and Moderators; and what among them is elective and temporary, among Catholics is believed to be perpetual in the Roman Episcopate, whose Bishops have presided in eighteen general Councils.

Many Protestants do not deny that St. Peter had some preeminence among the Apostles, but they do not want him to have had greater jurisdiction than the individual Apostles considered separately. And yet to Peter alone Christ most clearly said: "Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." The same supreme power that was granted to St. Peter alone was also granted to the College of Apostles: and thus we teach that the same supreme power still persists in the Successor of St. Peter and in the general Councils.

So again Christ says to Peter alone: "Feed my sheep," where all the sheep without exception are understood, as the Protestants will not find difficult to concede. But that singular granting of power should not be without its proper effect. This was acknowledged by John Hus in his Treatise on the Church, p. 9, fol. 211.

And since the Protestants confess that those things which are of ordinary power are perpetual in the Church, and they acknowledge the use of the keys, as well as the function of feeding as pertaining to the ordinary office, they easily perceive that the power granted to St. Peter ought to be continued in his Successor. This again is acknowledged by John Hus in his Treatise on the Church, chap. 13, fol. 219, and in his Question on Belief, fol. 170. Nor is there reason for them to dispute about the succession of the Roman Bishop, as long as they do not designate another Successor of St. Peter, which they have not done up to now. St. Justin Martyr uses a similar method of concluding. Dialogue with Trypho, Library of the Holy Fathers, Vol. 2, p. 12 B, and p. 19 A, and p. 27 A.

CHAPTER XII. On the Ministers of the Church.

If the Protestants would follow the guidance of Holy Scripture, which they want to be the only rule of ecclesiastical matters, there would remain little difficulty concerning the other Ministers of the Church. For Catholics acknowledge Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; Protestants in England have Bishops, in Germany Superintendents and Inspectors; for Presbyters they have Elders; they have Deacons.

Calixtus says: "It indeed seems to have been established by the Apostles themselves, or by the closest Successors of the Apostles, that from the number of presbyters someone outstanding either in age or in prudence and learning should be placed over the others, who afterward came to be called by the proper and peculiar name of Bishop." In writings on the Collection of the Reformed, those teaching that a Presbyter and a Bishop are the same do not hold their doctrine as an article of faith, lest they condemn their brothers in England as erring in an article of faith because they hold that a Bishop is not the same as a Presbyter. Since, therefore, they judge that controversy with their brothers not to be fundamental, let them show us on a solid Scriptural foundation why the controversy about the Superiority of St. Peter and his Successor, the Roman Bishop, should rather be called fundamental.

The Lutherans also will not deny that there was a constant distinction in the primitive Church between Bishop and Presbyter, which, if it does not seem to descend most manifestly from Holy Scripture, nevertheless cannot be denied to have its origin from the Apostles.

But it is especially to be wondered at how the Protestants, against the most attested consensus of the primitive Church, place their Elders, whom they want to be Bishops, below ordinary Pastors, to whom they concede neither the name of Presbyter nor the name of Bishop. For what is more clear from the practice of antiquity than that Bishops held the first place among Ministers in particular Churches?

Similarly, it is to be wondered at how they appoint their Elders, whom they judge to be Presbyters and Bishops, for a certain time, after which they are to be returned to the order of Laymen, when it is most certain that this practice has no foundation in

Scripture and is contrary to the custom of the primitive Church, to which temporary Bishops and Presbyters were unknown.

Nor can it seem less strange that those who regard their Elders as Bishops appoint Inspectors who are in reality nothing other than Bishops, and yet deny them the name of Bishop, however much they do not differ from Bishops in the matter of superiority. But as to how they subject their Elders, whom they teach by divine right to be Bishops, to Inspectors constituted by human right, let them see for themselves.

We think that the Protestants themselves will judge in this matter that there is nothing to reproach in the Roman Catholic Church, but much to be found in their own Churches that should be brought back in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and the usage of the primitive Church.

CHAPTER XIII. On Purgatory.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that all sins, whether mortal or venial, whether as to guilt or as to punishment, are not remitted without the merit of the most precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the Apostle says: "Making purification for sins."

The Protestants teach that in this life our sins are indeed remitted and covered, but not properly taken away. But when sins are properly taken away from those to be saved is not entirely clear among them. Daillaeus wants the faithful to be absolved from sin by Christ the Judge in the last judgment, and their sins to be remitted to them. And since he holds with the later Reformed that the souls of the faithful enjoy the beatific vision immediately after death, it is necessary that the same souls arrive in heaven burdened with their sins, although according to the Holy Scriptures no one who is defiled enters there.

But the Catholics teach much more suitably that no faithful person arrives in heaven with the guilt of any sin, nor with the debt of temporal punishment to be paid. And because it frequently happens that when guilt is remitted, there remains a temporal punishment to be paid, it also frequently happens that when the temporal punishment is not paid, it remains to be paid after this life. But the payment of that punishment, however certainly it happens after this life, is nevertheless not entirely certain where it happens, or by what kind of punishment it happens.

Some Protestants teach that the souls of the faithful, having left their bodies, do not immediately enjoy the beatific vision, but wait until the day of the general resurrection for reunion with their bodies and entrance into heavenly glory. And thus they admit a third place, distinct from heaven and hell, which they are nevertheless accustomed to reject. Indeed, they acknowledge something more serious than what the Catholic Church teaches: For the latter does not teach that all souls of the faithful need the temporal punishments of purgatory; those Protestants teach that all souls are subject to the same privation of the beatific vision: Catholics teach that some souls experience the punishments of purgatory for a short time, among which the privation of the beatific vision is by far the greatest: those

Protestants teach that all souls endure that most grievous punishment of purgatory, which consists in the privation of the beatific vision, until the day of the last judgment. There is nothing, therefore, on account of which they should rather criticize the doctrine of the Catholic Church than the opinion of their own brothers.

But the Catholics read in Holy Scripture: "Whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come." Why, I ask, would Christ say that some sin would not be forgiven in the future age, if no sin were forgiven there? St. Augustine from this understood that certain sins are forgiven in the future age, in Book 4, ch. 4, on the Miracles of God, question 5, §3, Vol. 2, Col. 181, Book 21 of the City of God, ch. 13, Vol. 5, col. 1432 A, and *ibid.*, ch. 24, col. 1446 C, and Book 6 against Julian, ch. 15, Vol. 7, p. 440 D. And St. Gregory, Book 4 of Dialogues, ch. 39, Vol. 3, col. 337.

The same Catholics read: "If anyone's work is burned, he will suffer loss; but he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire." Among those to be saved, some are found whose works are burned, and there is not sufficient reason why this should be said to happen only in this age, and not also in the future. St. Augustine understood this passage in this way in Psalm 37, beginning, Vol. 8, p. 127 A, 50 homilies, 16th homily, on the resurrection of the Lord, Vol. 10, p. 165 D. St. Gregory, Book 4 of Dialogues, ch. 39, col. 337, 338, and in the 1st Penitential Psalm, Vol. 2, p. 917 E, F, and on ch. 2 of 1 Kings, towards the end, Vol. 2, col. 218 C. St. Jerome on Matt. 3, Vol. 6, p. 3. St. Basil on Isaiah 9:19, Vol. 1, p. 216. St. Caesarius, Homily 8, Library of the Holy Fathers, Vol. 5, part 2, p. 75 A, F. St. Eligius, Homily 8, Library of the Holy Fathers, Vol. 7, p. 241 G, H.

Similarly they read: "At the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and of those on earth, and of those under the earth." The damned under the earth do not bend their knee in the name of Jesus, but those who are faithful, and are understood by the name of those under the earth.

Informed by these and other testimonies of Holy Scripture, and instructed by the explanations of the Holy Fathers, the Catholic Church teaches that there is a purgatory, where the souls of the faithful, after this life, patiently endure temporal punishments, if they owe any.

From the witnesses of truth of the Protestants, Wyclif acknowledges purgatory, Dialogue, Book 4, ch. 22, fol. 87, ch. 40, fol. 168. Hus, on the Church, ch. 2, fol. 198, and Sermon on Funerals, fol. 42.

CHAPTER XIV. On Suffrages for the Dead.

That the Jews at all times, both under the Old and under the New Testament, prayed for the dead, the Protestants will not easily deny. It is also clear from the books of the Maccabees that sacrifice was offered for the dead: although the Protestants do not want these books to be Canonical, the Church nevertheless considers them Canonical, as St. Augustine testifies; nor would the Protestants say that what is narrated in these books is a fable made up at will.

That the primitive Church prayed for the dead is so evident that it is not denied even by the Protestants. Peter Martyr says: "Concerning the Fathers, I have nothing else to report except that the greater part of them are inclined to the opinion that they concede purgatory." And soon after: "It is usually objected to us that the Church has always prayed for the dead. Which indeed I do not deny." But the Apology of the Augsburg Confession goes further: "As for what the adversaries allege about the Fathers concerning oblation for the dead, we know that the ancients speak of prayer for the dead, which we do not prohibit." Hence Grotius not undeservedly says: "No writer of any authority is known who has contradicted this custom [of praying for the dead]; which indeed is sufficient." The same will deservedly suffice for those who are not perversely contentious. And all the more so if they consider that John Hus admitted suffrages for the dead. On the Elucidation of his Faith, fol. 51, Sermon on Funerals, fol. 50 and 51.

CHAPTER XV. On the Veneration of Saints.

We think that no dispute will remain in this matter if anyone wishes to consider the thing itself with moderate inquiry, rather than to raise an empty conflict about words. For it is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the saints are to be honored: And the Wittenberg Confession says: "There is no doubt that the memory of those Saints who, when they were in this bodily life, helped the Church, is most sacred among all the pious." And the Augsburg Confession: "It is profitable to recite true Histories of the pious, because examples usefully teach and are rightly proposed." The later Helvetic Confession: "The Saints are to be honored for the sake of imitation."

By what name the honor that is given to the Saints is to be called, the Catholic Church has not defined. The Protestants acknowledge no other honor than divine or religious, and civil or political: of which the former belongs only to God, and to the holy humanity of Jesus Christ, as personally united to the divine Word; the latter to men because of some eminence. Thus they do not leave to the Saints a honor distinct from civil honor, although meanwhile their particular expressions posit the very thing that Catholics commonly teach.

We say that there is a twofold act of religion, one elicited, the other commanded: or one immediate, the other mediate. Concerning elicited and immediate acts, there is no contention that they are to be attributed to God alone. But concerning commanded and mediate acts it is read: "Religion before God is to visit orphans and widows in their tribulation." And thus St. Augustine says: "The Christian people celebrates the memories of Martyrs with religious solemnity."

The Protestants are not alien to this way of speaking. For thus Ames says: "God's creatures are to be honored from religion towards God, not from religion towards themselves; religion (as the Scholastics say) commands, but does not elicit this honor." Again: "It is commanded only that the seventh day, which God Himself designates in His word, be religiously observed." And the later Helvetic Confession:

"If Churches, for Christian liberty, religiously celebrate the memory of the Lord's Nativity, Circumcision, etc., we highly approve." The Strasbourg Confession speaks of religious fasts. The Augsburg Confession, concerning ecclesiastical power and the power of the sword, says: "Both are to be religiously venerated and honored because of God's command." Indeed, Luther himself: "Magistrate, Emperor, king, prince, consul, doctor, preacher, teacher, disciple, father, mother, children, master, servant, etc., are persons (or masks) which God wants to be acknowledged as His creatures and religiously honored, which also must be in this life, but He does not want divinity to be attributed to them."

Since, therefore, no difficulty can be raised about the word "religious," we distinguish the honor of the Saints from divine honor, from which it is infinitely distant, and from civil honor, which is given to men only because of natural gifts or civil dignities, because the honor of the Saints is given because of supernatural grace and glory, and consequently has an object far more excellent than civil honor. The Helvetic Confession acknowledges this difference: "Ministers are to be respected not only as ministers, but as Ministers of God," and others do not disagree.

But, since we do not dispute about the name, let us call it the honor of Christian observance, honor because of supernatural gifts, or by some other more suitable name, if one can be found. Honor and glory are variously attributed to God and creatures. St. Basil on the Holy Spirit, ch. 24, Vol. 2, p. 342 E.

CHAPTER XVI. On the Intercession of Saints.

The Protestants do not deny that in this life the prayer of the faithful for the faithful is lawful, without prejudice to the titles of Advocate and Mediator belonging to Jesus Christ. Having, then, the command of the Apostle James: "Pray for one another," we lawfully ask in this life for the intercession of other faithful, instructed by the example of St. Paul.

It seems strange how the Protestants do not judge that the petition for intercession from the living prejudices the titles of Mediator and Advocate, and yet want these same titles to be prejudiced by the petition for intercession from the Saints reigning with Christ. For why should not he who interpellates the living, of whose sanctity he has no certainty, prejudice those titles more than he who invokes the Holy Apostles, of whose sanctity no one doubts? Why should Christ not allow those to be invoked, without prejudice to His honor, whom He wanted to be sharers of His glory, and yet permit those to be interpellated, of whose future glory He wanted us to be uncertain?

The Protestants commonly confess that the Saints living with Christ pray for the Church existing here in general, without prejudice to the titles of Advocate and Mediator belonging to Jesus Christ. There is, therefore, no reason why the same titles should be prejudiced if they intercede for the faithful in particular. Indeed, if they intercede in general for the Church, since they themselves know that it is the custom in the Church for the saints reigning with Christ to be invoked, why should

we not say with St. Augustine that a general prayer benefits in particular, with the Saints praying generally for the need of the supplicant, "just as we pray for the dead, although we are certainly not present to them, nor know where they are or what they are doing?"

Why do we scrupulously investigate, "In what way do the Martyrs help those, by whom it is certain that they are helped?" Would not the certainty of help be sufficient, even if we were not certain about the manner of providing help?

It is especially to be wondered at how the Protestants now teach that the Saints pray for the Church in general, when their Gallican Confession says: "We believe that, since Jesus Christ is given to us as our only Advocate, etc., whatever men have devised about the intercession of dead Saints is nothing but the fraud and fallacies of Satan." And the Helvetic Confession: "We neither adore nor honor the heavenly Saints, or Divinities, nor do we invoke them, nor do we acknowledge them before the Father in heaven as our intercessors or mediators." But it is good that the Protestants approach more to the Catholic doctrine.

The Protestants do not deny that the Saints pray for the Church militant, because they know that this Church sustains many conflicts before it transmits its faithful to glory; hence they are rightly thought to expend their charity on those placed in danger. And because ordered charity is more solicitous for its own relatives and benefactors, who will doubt whether the faithful, passing from this life to heaven, also pray in particular for their relatives and benefactors, the Apostle saying, "Charity never fails"? For if ordered charity here requires that we be mindful of relatives and benefactors in our prayers, why should we think that blessed souls forget them, if the charity possessed does not fail? Thus it is clear from the foundation of Holy Scripture that the prayers of the Saints for the faithful in particular are not universally to be repudiated.

But furthermore we read in Holy Scripture how the Angel prays: "O Lord of hosts, how long will you not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which you have been angry?" This is a special supplication for Jerusalem and the Cities of Judah. Similar things are found not a few throughout all of Holy Scripture; and the primitive Church held the same most constantly.

CHAPTER XVII. On the Invocation of Saints.

The Bishop of Bellay and others rightly observe that the Invocation of Saints is not necessary for salvation: Nor is there an ecclesiastical precept about invoking the Saints, although no Catholic is permitted to contradict the Invocation of Saints as an evil thing or divinely prohibited.

The foundations of Holy Scripture for the Catholic opinion are most clear. The Apostle says: "Where there is no law, there is no transgression." But there is no law prohibiting the invocation of Saints; there is, therefore, no transgression in invoking the Saints, but a lawful action, which suffices for us.

Then, thus the Angel speaks to Lot: "Behold, I have accepted your prayers in this also, that I will not overthrow the city for which you have spoken." If the Angel has accepted prayers, Lot must have poured them out.

Afterward, Jacob prevailed with the Angel, and was strengthened: he wept, he asked him. Why should the same not be lawful for us? See Judges 6:12, 13, 15. It is added that Jacob, blessing his children, said: "The Angel who has redeemed me from all evils, bless these boys, and let my name be invoked upon them, and also the names of my fathers Abraham and Isaac."

Finally, St. John says to the seven Churches that are in Asia: "Grace to you and peace from Him who is and who was and who is to come, and from the seven spirits who are before His throne." Where he asks for the Churches grace and peace, not only from God, but also from the seven spirits who are before the throne.

Nor let the Protestants say that Angels may lawfully be invoked because they are ministering spirits, because they are around us, because God has commanded His angels concerning us: for it is clear from the places alleged that Jacob implored the blessing of the Angel for his boys, without making any mention of either presence or absence; and that St. John sought a blessing from the Spirits who are before the divine throne.

By these and similar motives, as well as by the most attested consensus of antiquity, the Protestants will easily determine that the Invocation of Saints contains nothing illicit. Wyclif himself acknowledges the Invocation of Saints, Dialogue, Book 3, ch. 30, fol. 95. Hus, in the Elucidation of his Faith, fol. 51, Epistle 22, fol. 5, and elsewhere.

CHAPTER XVIII. On the Knowledge of the Saints.

If the Protestants would search both their domestic doctrine and the words of Holy Scripture, they would not deny the knowledge of the Saints. For they commonly teach that Angels are not mute, but that an Angel can speak to an Angel through the direction of the will, so that the speaking Angel, by the very fact that he wants his thought to be known to another Angel, opens his thought and makes it known to the other Angel. And since the operations of Angels do not depend on fantasy, nor are they impeded by the medium, there is nothing to prevent an Angel from speaking to another Angel, however far distant. And if we have a way through letters of opening our thoughts to the absent and far distant, what reason persuades us to remove all communication from distant Angels? If our eye sees the highest stars, why do Angels not see what other Angels want to be known to them? If, therefore, through the direction of the will, other Angels know the thoughts directed to them, by the same reason they will know our prayers directed to them through our will; nor should the direction of the rational soul be considered to have less value in this than Angelic direction. We indeed would not know the thoughts of Angels, even if they were directed to us, because the operations of our soul, in knowing external things, depend on fantasy: but this does not prevent Angels from knowing our prayers, which we direct to them, since Angelic operations do not depend on fantasy. Nor do

we thereby make Angels either omniscient or searchers of hearts, because they do not know all the thoughts either of other Angels or even of men, but only those thoughts which are directed to them, and which the director wants to be known to them.

If this knowledge is to be granted to Angels, how will it be denied to the Saints reigning in heaven? For Christ says of them: "Nor can they die anymore. For they are equal to angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection."

The Protestants are accustomed to speak of the Saints as if of the dead, who nevertheless live a more eminent and worthy life, participating in the uncreated light and eternal glory. The Apostle says: "We know in part and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect has come, then that which is in part will be done away." For God bestows greater gifts on the saints reigning in heaven than on the faithful journeying on earth. If the Prophet Elisha saw his servant Gehazi, absent in body, receiving the gifts that Naaman the Syrian gave him, how much more will the Saints see, even if they are absent, the prayers directed to them? With the Prophet Elisha not needing eyes to see his servant, why will the Saints need eyes to see our supplications? And if he was divinely and wonderfully helped to see what was not present, how much more do they abound in this gift, among whom God is all in all? The Prophet Daniel knew the hidden explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream; Samuel knew all that was in Saul's heart; Ahijah knew the simulation of Jeroboam's wife; Elijah, translated to paradise, rebukes Jehoram the King of Judah by letter: and will God grant lesser things to the Saints, now obtaining what is perfect, with what is in part done away?

But to show examples from the Holy Scriptures themselves: who will say that Jacob invoked the Angel to bless his sons unless he was most persuaded that Angels understand the prayers of suppliants directed to them? Who will say that Blessed John asked for grace and peace for the Churches of Asia from the seven spirits who are before the throne, and yet was ignorant of whether they understood his petition? Did not the Royal Prophet understand the same when he said: "In the sight of the angels I will sing to you"? Did he think to sing in the sight of Angels who neither see nor hear?

There is an illustrious example, of which Christ Himself bears testimony, when He says: "There will be joy in heaven over one sinner who repents." For the Angels will not rejoice over an unknown thing, or only in general over the conversion of sinners, but over one particular and determined sinner. Let the Protestant Lords tell us what and of what sort is this joy of the Angels, whence conceived, if they are ignorant of the conversion of the sinner; let them tell us whether they have this knowledge from natural powers, or from the gift of grace. We indeed think that there will be no one among them who will solidly determine that mode of Angelic cognition, and not at the same time posit this very thing, which confirms the opinion of the Catholics.

Various Holy Fathers have labored to explain the mode of Angelic cognition: all, however, posit as a certain thing that Angels, like the Saints reigning with Christ, have that knowledge which suffices for their intercession to be sought; if the Protestants imitate them, they will not scrupulously inquire about the mode of knowledge, after the certainty of help is established. "I charge you before God and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels." 1 Tim. 5. It is related by St. Basil on the Holy Spirit, ch. 12, Vol. 2, p. 316 B. Nor are Angels in several places at once. St. Basil, *ibid.*, ch. 22, p. 342 A.

CHAPTER XIX. On the Relics of Saints.

The Protestants teach with the Catholics that true relics of the Saints are due honor, and that they were honored in the ancient Church. Chemnitz, Examination of the Council of Trent, part 4, 16. Andrew Rivet, Animadversions on the annotations of Grotius in the consultation of Cassander on article 21, p. 157.

We also read in the Acts of the Apostles how "God did extraordinary miracles by the hands of Paul, so that even handkerchiefs or aprons were carried away from his body to the sick, and the diseases left them and the evil spirits came out." And indeed these handkerchiefs and aprons were neither received nor applied without honor, as proceeding from a holy man, and carrying with them, as it were, the power of working wonders. When Catholics do as much in this time, they are immediately accused of superstition and idolatry by certain zealots not weighing the examples of the Holy Scriptures. What was more worthless than the shadow of St. Peter? And yet God worked his wonders through that shadow; and so great was the people's reverence toward St. Peter that they even held his shadow in honor. What shall we say about that woman with a hemorrhage, who received health from touching the hem of Christ's garment? What about other sick people who were made well from touching Christ's garments? And St. John the Baptist testifies that he is unworthy to loosen the strap of Christ's sandal. Mark 3. And as St. Basil says on the Holy Spirit, ch. 15, Vol. 2, p. 323 D: "Whose sandals I am not worthy to carry." Let the Protestants tell us whether these and similar examples do not abundantly suffice for honoring the relics of the Saints, when God has worked such great powers through even the most worthless of their necessities.

Isaiah predicted of the sepulcher of Christ Jesus that it would be glorious. After Elisha had struck the waters with Elijah's cloak, the waters were divided, as if rising for the sake of honor, and conceding passage to Elisha. When the corpse of a dead man was thrown into the sepulcher of Elisha, and touched the bones of the Prophet, the man was revived by the vital contact, and raised by divine power, he stood on his feet. When Moses departed from Egypt, he transferred the bones of Joseph, about which Chemnitz says: "Nor is there any doubt that the children of Israel reverently preserved the bones or relics of Joseph." And soon after: "The Israelites without doubt reverently carried those relics of Joseph from Egypt to the promised land."

Having considered these things, the Protestants themselves will determine that true relics of the Saints are to be held in honor, and that suitable honor is lawfully shown to them, especially if they consider that the constant usage of antiquity militates for that honor.

CHAPTER XX. On the Images of Saints.

The Protestants do not teach that the arts of painting and sculpture are to be abolished, since among them are found those who excel in those arts. But they do not observe sufficiently the difference between an image and an idol, although the Apostle says: "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is no God but one." For however much idols represented men or other creatures, they did not represent God, who is one, but a creature for God: and the idols themselves, which were adored as Gods, had nothing of divinity, so that it is rightly said: an idol is nothing in the world. Images of Jesus Christ and the Saints do not represent false things, nor things that never existed, even the Protestants acknowledging this. The Saints reigning with Christ are not Gods, nor are they held as Gods among the Roman Catholics, but as creatures, all the more humble before God, the more worthily they are sanctified by divine grace: although the name of God in Holy Scripture was communicated to Moses: "Behold, I have made you a God to Pharaoh, and Aaron your brother shall be your prophet," not to mention other places. Consequently, neither can the Roman Catholics hold images as Gods, who do not hold the saints themselves as Gods: nor do they bestow divine honor on images, which they teach is not to be given even to the saints themselves.

The Protestants ask what is that honor which is given to images. We respond: it is not the honor due to the one and only God, in which all Catholics absolutely agree. Indeed, we say that to the most holy humanity of Jesus Christ, insofar as it is conceived as cut off and separated from his divinity, the honor due to the one and only God is not to be given, which does not belong to that most holy humanity except insofar as it is personally united to the divine Word. If, therefore, we do not attribute that supreme honor to the most holy humanity of Jesus Christ, under that consideration, how much less do we attribute the same honor to other saints? How much less do we attribute the same honor to the images of the Saints! Let those, therefore, who are not ashamed to argue that Catholic doctrine confirms idolatry, see on what foundation they rely.

But again the Protestants ask what is that honor which is given to the images of the Saints. The Roman Catholics could promise a response after the Protestants have determined the honor which is to be given to the Saints reigning with Christ, which they have not explained for a whole century: but we say that the memory of the Saints is in blessing, and that the images of the Saints are memories of the prototypes. We say that the material of an image merits no honor in itself, nor is anything to be sought from the form of the image, nor is divinity, virtue, or trust to be placed in it; and yet before images the saints are lawfully honored, and the images themselves because of the saints; the saints, indeed, because of the grace and glory

which God has conferred on them. The Protestants do not deny that a Prince is affected by contumely when his image suffers it, because of the relation between the image of the Prince and the prince himself: and thus we say that images are to be honored because of the relation to the saints, whose memory they present to us, so that that honor is terminated through the images to the Saints themselves, and their sanctity. If it is lawful for Protestants to bend their knees before a wall, to adore God, why is it not lawful for us to bend our knees before the image of the Crucified, which reminds us more strongly of the benefits received?

We read in the Holy Scriptures that the Jews adored God at the Ark of the covenant, which they held in great honor and reverence: and yet some Protestants confess that that Ark was a figure of God; figures of Cherubim were also over the Ark, which they venerated with the Ark itself. That the bronze Serpent was a figure of Christ, the Protestants will not deny, to whom it is known what Christ said about it. But that those struck by the fiery Serpents approached that bronze one with veneration, who will doubt?

According to the Reformed, in the Holy Supper a sign, image, figure, or representation of the body of Christ is taken, and Calvin wants the Eucharist to be received reverently by his followers. But if they will explain to us what that reverence is, they will also undoubtedly explain what honor is to be given to images.

That words are signs of things, the Protestants do not deny: among whom are found those who uncover their head at the name of an earthly Prince, meanwhile exhibiting no honor to the most sacred name of our Savior, although the Apostle says: "At the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and of those on earth, and of those under the earth." For the name of Jesus itself is honorable, not indeed because of the letters and syllables, but because it signifies our Redeemer, and presents Him to our memory. So the first faithful signed themselves with the sign of the Cross with great piety, because it was a figure of the Crucified.

It is not alien to the foundation of the Scriptures if images are honored because of their relation to the Saints themselves: For many things are called holy, because of their relation to true holiness. Thus it is read: "Worship at His footstool, for it is holy." But the honor given to that footstool was because of a certain participation of holiness, and relation to true holiness, which honor is not merely civil; and the dishonoring of the Ark was more than once punished as sacrilegious. And again: "Worship at His holy hill," or as the Protestants: "Bow yourselves down at the mountain of His holiness." That is, at Mount Zion. For the mountain is called holy from a certain participation of holiness; and just as they bowed themselves down to the mountain of holiness with honor, adoring true holiness, so Catholics bow themselves down to the sacred images of the Saints with honor, venerating true holiness. Thus it is said to Moses: "The place on which you stand is holy ground." Why holy? If not because of the presence of God, or of the Angel representing God. Thus it is said: "The first day shall be holy, and the seventh, venerable by the same

feast day." Thus the Sabbath is called holy. Thus we call the Word of God holy, Holy Bibles, Holy Scriptures, Holy Gospel.

According to Calixtus, Angels under the Old Testament frequently represented God, and spoke from the person of God, as His legates. But that great honor and great veneration was shown to those angels, no one doubts: And yet that honor was given to Angels as representing God. Why, therefore, is it not lawful for Catholics to give some honor to images, representing in figure the Saints reigning with Christ?

John Hus will be able to teach the Protestants in this matter, when he says: "Although before the image of Christ, or of any Saint whatever, men may lawfully bend their knees, pray, offer, place candles, and thus they do not do these things in the name of the image, but in the name of the one whose image it is, just as the image is not carved, placed, or painted before men for its own sake, but for the sake of what is imaged. Secondly, it is clear that it does not follow: That man prays before an image; therefore he prays to the image. Similarly, it does not follow: He kisses the image; therefore with that kiss he adores the image. Hence, although such a kiss is the matter of latria, it is nevertheless not latria or dulia itself. Just as, although the distribution by which a man virtuously distributes temporal things at one time, and viciously at another time, is the matter of a virtuous work, it is nevertheless not virtue itself, since every virtue is good in itself. From which, thirdly, it is clear that it is false that he who adores the Savior by kissing His image, by the same adoration, which is a kiss, adores the Savior and His image, since no such kiss is adoration, although it is the matter of adoration. Fourthly, it is clear that it is lawful for the faithful to perform many external signs of adoration before the image of Christ, or of some saint, with which it is not lawful to adore them, or which it is not lawful to exhibit to them."

CHAPTER XXI. On the Efficacy of Sacraments.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that there are Sacraments: It is agreed that Sacraments are visible signs of invisible grace: It is agreed that God alone can institute Sacraments, and that Jesus Christ is the author of the Sacraments of the new law. It is agreed that a promise of grace is joined to Sacraments.

But there is difficulty concerning the efficacy of Sacraments. Here the question is not whether Sacraments are the primary and properly effective causes of the grace that is conferred; for this belongs to God alone; but whether grace follows from the work performed (*ex opere operato*). The question is not whether they are instrumental causes of grace; for the principal Protestants acknowledge this: Daillaeus proves from Holy Scripture that Baptism gives remission of sins and the grace of the Holy Spirit, which giving, since it is not properly effective of grace, must necessarily concur as an instrumental cause to the conferral of grace. By this they very closely approach the opinion of the Roman Catholic Church, where by "*opus operatum*" is understood that grace follows from the force of the Sacramental action itself instituted by God for this purpose, and not from the merit of the agent or

recipient. But what is baptism giving the grace of the Holy Spirit if not grace being conferred by virtue of baptism instituted by God?

Crocus calls the Sacrament not a bare sign, but an exhibiting sign: Indeed, he says with indignation: "That our people dispense Sacraments which are only signs of grace is an open lie." He also reports from the first Helvetic Confession, article 2: "Baptism, by the institution of the Lord, is the laver of regeneration, which the Lord exhibits to His elect by the visible sign through the ministry of the Church, as was explained above." And from the later Anglican Confession, article 27: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and a mark of distinction by which Christians are distinguished from non-Christians, but it is also a sign of regeneration, through which, as through an instrument, those rightly receiving baptism are grafted into the Church, the promises of the forgiveness of sins and our adoption as sons of God through the Holy Spirit are visibly sealed, faith is confirmed, and increased by the power of divine invocation." He says the boys in Hesse respond: "Baptism is a divine action, in which God, by the external and visible washing of water, not only represents invisible grace, that is, the blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit, but also seals and exhibits it."

Crocus rejects the opinion that "a certain spiritual and hidden power of regeneration has been instilled in the water by God," but it is not the opinion of the Catholic Church (whatever may be the scholastic probability of some) that water works the remission of sins and regeneration by itself and by the performed work, by some inherent power. But St. Basil speaks thus on the Holy Spirit, ch. 15, Vol. 2, p. 323 A: "If there is any grace in the water, it is not from the nature of the water itself, but from the presence of the Spirit." We know that the remission of sins belongs differently to God and to the Sacraments. We know God to be the only principal cause of those benefits: and it suffices us if instrumental efficacy is acknowledged, so that Sacraments, as divine instruments, give the grace of the Holy Spirit; are exhibiting signs, which exhibit regeneration through the ministry of the Church; instruments increasing grace by the power of divine invocation: or as Crocius reports from the Belgic Confession, article 33: "Sacraments are visible signs and symbols of internal and invisible things through which, as means, God Himself acts in us by the power of the Holy Spirit."

But Crocius says that baptism seals grace, either previously given, if someone is just before receiving baptism; or that which is given in the very act of baptism; or that which is given after baptism, when someone is baptized as a hypocrite, and is later converted.

We think the Protestants easily judge that there is nothing in Catholic doctrine that they should rightly reproach, indeed that they themselves do not hold: and therefore there should not be a dispute about the manner of speaking. For the sealing of grace, or the sealing of the covenant through baptism, is acknowledged by St. Basil, on the Holy Spirit, ch. 1, Vol. 2, p. 316 B.

CHAPTER XXII. On the Number of Sacraments.

If there were something certain among Protestants about the number of Sacraments, they would more easily agree with the Roman Catholics: for it would be hoped that from the very method of determining, the true number would not be hidden. But now most of them acknowledge only two Sacraments; others three; others either four, or five, or six, or even seven.

But what Wyclif wrote in this matter is memorable: "As for this matter of signs, I am poor in spirit; since I know that many statements in this matter have too weak a foundation, and because of aggregation and institution in terms, it is difficult for speakers to have an invincible way of truth. For I do not see why any sensible creature is not really a Sacrament, because it is a sign instituted by God to signify an insensible sacred thing, such as the Creator, and creation, and the grace of the Creator. Nor have I learned the rules by which this name 'Sacrament' should be limited univocally to these seven. Therefore, despairing of univocation, I disclose narratively the order of these seven common Sacraments." Again: "Christ in His own person is a sensible sign. And as it seems to me, the Sacrament of Sacraments, since the description of a Sacrament supremely fits Him." Again: "It is clear concerning the seven works of Spiritual mercy, which ought to be a Sacrament among the faithful, and especially Presbyters."

Thus all those, with their Wyclif, are poor in spirit who think that they can define the number of Sacraments from the sacred text, setting aside Ecclesiastical tradition: for how greatly they are mistaken, he shows by his own example, who, despairing of univocation, posited infinite Sacraments.

CHAPTER XXIII. On the Necessity of Baptism.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that if any adult despises baptism, he is excluded from salvation. It is agreed that if the baptism of water cannot be had by an adult, the baptism of spirit or of blood suffices. It is agreed that infants are to be baptized by the necessity of divine precept.

But the question is: whether baptism is necessary for infants by necessity of means, so that without baptism they cannot attain to eternal salvation? Some Protestants admit this necessity; most deny it. If they perceive the origin of this error, they will more easily set it aside. Wyclif taught: "It seems probable to me that Christ could, without baptism, spiritually baptize infants, and consequently save them. And if so, when Christ said: 'Unless one is born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God,' the Geneva Gloss adds: 'of water,' that is, of spiritual water, establishing the Wyclifite probability." Of which he further says: "God, if He willed, could damn such an infant (not baptized) without injury done to Him, and if He willed, He could save it. I do not dare to define either part." But he speaks of the infants of the faithful.

Because St. Augustine rightly says, "we ought to speak for infants the more urgently, the less they can for themselves," it will be worthwhile to explain the opinion of

those Protestants more fully, so that they themselves may see how dangerously they err.

I. The Reformed do not believe with certainty of faith that original sin is not imputed to all infants of the faithful, and that they are regenerated and justified before baptism. See Synops. pur. Theol. disp. 15, thes. 20, p. 167. Synod. Dordrecht. p. 177. Gomarus, Synod. Dordrecht, on art. 1, p. 41.

II. The Reformed, teaching that the infants of the faithful are holy, do not understand this of inherent holiness, which is opposed to the corruption of original sin, but of Ecclesiastical holiness, that the children of the faithful have the right of receiving the Sacrament before pagans, and thus the external right of the Covenant. See Crocius, Comment. on the Augsburg Confession, Section 9, q. 2, ch. 26, p. 400, ch. 27, p. 417, and ch. 50, p. 695.

III. Among the Reformed it is uncertain whether all infants of the faithful who receive baptism are regenerated. Indeed, it is more probable among the Reformed that not all infants of the faithful who receive baptism are regenerated. See Crocius, Comment. on the Augsburg Confession, Section 9, q. 1, ch. 45, p. 614. First Helvetic Confession, art. 21, p. 91. Gomarus in Synod. Dordr. on art. 1, p. 31. Against this is St. Augustine, Enchiridion to Laurentius, ch. 43, Vol. 3, p. 73 B, C.

IV. Among the Reformed it is not absolutely certain that all baptized infants of the faithful are saved, even if they die without actual sins, as is clear from what has been said.

V. Among the Reformed it is not absolutely certain that all unbaptized infants of the faithful are saved, even if they die without actual sins.

VI. Among the Reformed it is uncertain whether infants of the faithful, dying without baptism and without actual sins, are saved or damned. See Festus Hom. disp. 58, thesis 6. Judgment of the Theologians of Great Britain in the Synod of Dort on Thesis 7, heterodox on election, p. 11. Helvetic Theologians, Thesis 8, *ibid.* p. 46. Echardus does not doubt the internal regeneration of infants dying without Baptism: and he does not restrict this to the infants of the faithful. Pandect. ch. 1, q. 14, obj. 2, p. 96.

The Protestants see that the uncertainty about the necessity of baptism handed down by Wyclif is also revived in this time. And here it should be noted in passing that the Reformed excite envy against Catholics among parents who are anxious about their infants, because Catholics teach that infants of the faithful dying without baptism do not attain to the kingdom of heaven: with them supposedly stating the contrary. But it should be considered whether the Reformed do not rather delude anxious parents when they call their infants holy and participants in the covenant; yet they do not understand any holiness other than Ecclesiastical, which does not imply inherent holiness and regeneration: When they call their infants elect; and do not speak except from presumption, and judgment which they think probable, without certainty of faith. Indeed, they themselves teach that not all infants,

legitimately baptized, dying without actual sins, belong to the number of the elect and attain to eternal salvation. Hence that horrid dogma of the Reformed, sung in Belgium 30 and 40 years ago: "Of two infants, born from the same mother at the same time, baptized at the same time, dying at the same time immediately after baptism, one sometimes belongs to the elect, and is saved, the other to the reprobate, and is damned." We freely confess that similar things are not found in the writings of the modern Reformed: but the root has not been removed. For they say that they establish from the law of charity that baptized infants who die in their infancy are regenerated: for it is not certain among them that Christ wanted all infants to be cleansed whom He wanted to be washed; that Christ wanted all infants to be regenerated whom He wanted to be baptized. Why, I ask, are infants baptized among the Reformed, if the unbaptized are saved, and the baptized perish, depending solely on election or reprobation? Is it not because, since you reject the necessity of baptism, it has been decreed among your people not to baptize in private houses, nor to help infants in danger with the remedy of baptism? The Gallican Discipline says: "Baptism shall not be administered except in ecclesiastical assemblies." By what authority of Holy Scripture, by what consensus of antiquity has that decree been fabricated? But an opportunity for this will return in the following.

Now it must be shown how St. Augustine declared the necessity of baptism from Holy Scripture: "What the Apostle says in 1 Cor. Ch. 7:14, 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified through her believing husband; otherwise your children would be unclean, but now they are holy': if this is to be understood as meaning that examples had already preceded, both of men whom their wives, and of women whom their husbands had won for Christ, and of little ones for making whom Christian the Christian will of even one parent had been effective; or if some other sanctification is to be understood there, which is not openly proposed: that, however, is to be held without doubt, that whatever that sanctification may be, it is not valid for making Christians and for the remission of sins, unless they are made faithful by the Christian and Ecclesiastical institution of the Sacrament. For neither are unbelieving spouses, however holy and just their marriages may be, cleansed from iniquity, which separates them from the kingdom of God and compels them to come into damnation: nor are little ones, procreated from any holy and just parents whatever, absolved from the guilt of original sin, unless they have been baptized in Christ."

St. Augustine continues, against the Pelagians and the Reformed: "He who preaches that little ones departing from the body without baptism will not be in damnation, is much deceived and deceives." Again: "What Christian would bear it, when it is said that anyone can arrive at eternal salvation if he is not reborn in Christ, which He wanted to happen through baptism."

But he also proves most solidly: "Let them hear the sentence of the Lord, saying: 'Unless one is born again, he will not see the kingdom of God.' Which, when He was explaining, He said, 'Unless one is born again of water and the Spirit, he will not

enter the kingdom of heaven.' No doubt can arise from this." And more fully: "If they were not moved by this sentence, they would think that little ones should not be baptized at all. Those who understand should be satisfied with what was said: 'Unless one is born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' And, 'Unless one is born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' Why should he be born again except to be renewed? From what old state, if not that in which our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed?"

Again: "No one ascends into heaven but He who descended from heaven, the Son of man, who is in heaven." Unless, therefore, they gather together into the unity of Christ to be changed and washed, who descended, so that He Himself may ascend, considering His body, that is, His Church, as no different from Himself, they will not be able to ascend at all.

Again: "That whoever believes in Him may not perish, but have eternal life." The little one would have perished, nor would he have had eternal life, if through the Sacrament of baptism he had not believed. "He who believes in Him is not judged, but he who does not believe is already judged." Where, then, do we place baptized little ones, if not among the faithful, as the authority of the Church everywhere proclaims? Therefore, they are among those who have believed, for this is acquired for them through the power of the Sacrament and the response of those who offer them. And therefore those who are not baptized are among those who have not believed. Now if those who are baptized are not judged, these, because they lack baptism, are judged.

Here is another proof: "What Christian would bear it, when it is said that anyone can attain to eternal salvation if he is not reborn in Christ? which He wanted to happen through baptism at that time when such a Sacrament was to be established for regeneration in the hope of eternal salvation. Hence the Apostle says: 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us through the washing of regeneration.' Who would dare to affirm, therefore, that little ones can be saved eternally without this regeneration?" The Reformed dare.

Here is another proof: "He who preaches that little ones departing from the body without baptism will not be in damnation is much deceived, since the Apostle says: 'Judgment came by one offense to condemnation.' And a little later: 'Through one man's offense judgment came upon all men to condemnation.' Therefore, they are born in the flesh subject to the sin and death of the first man, and they are reborn in baptism as associates of the righteousness and life of the second man."

He also proves from the manner of administering baptism: "What shall I say about the form of the Sacrament itself? What does my exorcism do, if he is not held in the family of the devil? How will he be said to renounce the devil, when there is nothing of the devil in him? How to turn to God, from whom he was not turned away? To believe, among other things, in the remission of sins, when no sins would be attributed to him? A false or deceptive form of baptism would be given to little ones,

in which it would sound as if something were being done, yet no remission of sins would take place, nothing more execrable and detestable can be said or thought." Yet the Reformed say and think this, teaching that the infants of the faithful are frequently sanctified in their mothers' wombs. But that form of baptism, which St. Augustine reports was observed in antiquity, and which the Catholic Church still uses, the Reformed have abrogated, lest they be convicted by this very form along with the Pelagians.

These arguments of St. Augustine are no less valid against the Reformed than against the Pelagians; for the latter did not teach that little ones without baptism attain to the kingdom of heaven, which the former teach; but they wanted them, outside the kingdom of heaven, to be blessed with some invented salvation. See St. Augustine, *On the Merit and Remission of Sin*, book 1, ch. 10.

We hope the Protestants sufficiently perceive from these what is to be held concerning the necessity of Baptism.

CHAPTER XXIV. On the Minister of Baptism.

With the Lutherans, we have no difficulty in this matter; See Calovius Synop. Contr. disp. 25, th. 6, p. 154, but with the Reformed. For they say: "Baptism administered by one who has no vocation or commission is entirely null." But no proof of this opinion can be produced from Holy Scripture. And to prevent anyone not called from baptizing, they further determine: "Baptism shall not be administered except in ecclesiastical assemblies, in places where the Church is publicly erected."

St. Jerome refutes both errors from Holy Scripture: "Unless perhaps the Eunuch baptized by Philip the Deacon is to be believed to be without the Holy Spirit, of whom Scripture speaks thus: As they went along the road, they came to some water, and they both went down into the water, and Philip baptized him... No one should have blamed Philip, [who] had the same Church, preached the same Christ, was certainly a Deacon, etc." Here baptism was administered without an ecclesiastical assembly, without the form of the Church, such as the Reformed nevertheless require, in places where no Church is publicly erected. Here is a Deacon baptizing; although according to the Reformed Discipline it must be said: "It is not the office of Deacons to preach the word of God and administer the Sacraments." The Reformed Deacons also have no vocation, but only an election, and confirmation through solemn prayers, without the imposition of hands; and their office is not perpetual.

The whole ancient Church received those baptized by heretics, in whom, however, it did not recognize either vocation or special commission, although it recognized ordination in them. And St. Jerome expressly says: "We know that laymen are also permitted to baptize." For that was determined in antiquity in the Council of Elvira, Canon 38, Vol. 1, Concilia, p. 195.

But let us examine somewhat more attentively the new mysteries of the Reformed. They say: "Bishops, Officials, Archdeacons, such as they now are, have no civil or Ecclesiastical jurisdiction by right." Again: "It is neither lawful nor expedient to hear

the sermons of the Roman Church, or of others who have intruded themselves without legitimate vocation." Again: "Hands should not be imposed on Monks and Presbyters except by the judgment of the Synod." And Molinaeus: "To a Presbyter who has come out of the Roman Church, we confer a new ordination." And a little later: "When a Presbyter of the Roman Church is received among us for the Ministry, hands are imposed on him again, and a new ordination is conferred on him."

From this it follows first: All those who are baptized in the Roman Church at this time are to be considered unbaptized, as having received baptism from those who do not have a vocation. It follows second: Calvin, Zwingli, and other first Reformers were not legitimately baptized, nor did they gather a Church of the baptized, but of the heathen. It follows third: All those baptized by Calvin, Zwingli, and other first Reformers are baptized invalidly; since they did not receive a new ordination, nor could they receive it from those not ordained. It follows fourth: All the Reformed are invalidly baptized; because among them there could not be a beginning of legitimate ordination, and consequently of vocation.

The Reformed openly contradict the premises in their Gallican Confession: "Because in the Papacy the substance of baptism remained, whose efficacy does not depend on him by whom it is administered, we confess that those baptized there do not need a second baptism." But it is most well-known that among Catholics it frequently happens that, because of the infirmity of infants, laymen baptize: and yet the Gallican Confession does not want such baptized to be rebaptized, because the substance of baptism was intact, and its efficacy does not depend on him by whom it is administered. But on what foundation do you confess that those once baptized among Catholics do not need a second baptism, if baptism conferred by one not having a vocation is null, and if among Roman Catholics there is no vocation? You easily perceive that these things do not cohere.

But your Calvin also writes: "You will not find in my letters, I know, that the power of baptism depends on the intention of the consecrator. I only said, if I am not mistaken, that it is efficacious (among Roman Catholics) insofar as it is administered for this end, to insert us into the body of Christ, or to be a symbol of our renewal." Now it matters nothing to me whether it is a Lucianist man who baptizes, or a devil. But the Council of Nicaea defines: "Concerning Paulianists fleeing to the Catholic Church, a definition has been issued that they must be rebaptized completely." But the reason why the Council judges that only Paulianists, or Samosatenes, are to be rebaptized consists in this, that they did not baptize in the name of the Trinity. For St. Augustine observes this: "The Paulianists think Christ to be nothing more than a man. The Council of Nicaea decreed that these were to be baptized in the Catholic Church. From which it is to be believed that they did not keep the Rule of baptism, which many heretics, when they departed from the Catholic [Church], took with them, and which they guard." But to Calvin it is the same whether it is a Lucianist man who baptizes or a devil, whether he has a vocation or does not have one, whether he baptizes with due form or with undue form, for who would persuade

himself that a Lucianist man, or a devil, would baptize in the name of the Holy Trinity?

Again, Synop. pur. Theol. disp. 44. Thes. 14 says baptism conferred by heretics who directly overturn the fundamental dogmas of Baptism is to be repeated: against the Nicene Council, which they allege.

But Wyclif teaches: "We believe that any old woman, or abject person rightly washing a man, with the Sacramental words, God completes the baptism of the Spirit (of internal regeneration)." What does this opinion have in common with that of the Reformed?

CHAPTER XXV. On Confirmation.

Protestants in England for many years used confirmation; elsewhere also they observe something similar in admitting younger people to their supper: However, they commonly repudiate the ancient practice of the Church founded in Holy Scripture. Of this St. Jerome says: "This is the custom of the Churches, that to those who, in smaller towns, have been baptized by Presbyters and Deacons, the Bishop runs out to invoke the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands." And a little later: "But if you ask why one baptized in the Church does not receive the Holy Spirit except through the hands of the Bishop, whom we all assert is given in true baptism, learn that this observance descends from this authority, that the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles after the ascension of the Lord." Acts 2:4. We find the same thing done in many places. And a little later: "Because, 'When the Apostles who were in Jerusalem had heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent to them Peter and John, who, when they had come to them, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit: for He had not yet fallen upon any of them,' Acts 8:14. Learn why this was done in what follows, for he himself says: 'But they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.'"

In a similar way, Pope Innocent of Rome proves confirmation from Holy Scripture, as do other Holy Fathers.

CHAPTER XXVI. On Penance.

With the Catholics, the Protestants teach that penance is necessary for sinners. There is no difficulty about sorrow for past sin, with Holy Scripture commending it and all celebrating it.

The Protestants acknowledge a fourfold confession. First, that which is made to God. Second, that which is made to the offended neighbor, so that one may return into grace with him. Third, that which is made to the Church, which has suffered scandal from a public sin or pernicious example. Fourth, that which is made to a Pastor, so that by his admonition, the conscience may be rendered tranquil and made secure about the reconciliation obtained. This recognition approaches much to the

doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, which commends and praises those species of confessions.

Among those whom the Protestants call their predecessors, John Hus acknowledges Confession, such as is acknowledged by us, in his Response to the Writings of Eight Doctors, ch. 5, fol. 300. Rokyzana on the Sacraments, ch. 17, ch. 486.

But the much more ancient St. Leo proves it from the rule of the Church: "That the doubt of the one consulting may be instructed, I will not be silent about what the Ecclesiastical rule holds concerning the state of penitents. The manifold mercy of God so comes to the aid of human lapses that not only through the grace of baptism, but also through the medicine of penance, the hope of eternal life is repaired, so that those who had violated the gift of regeneration, condemning themselves by their own judgment, might come to the remission of sins; the protections of divine goodness being so ordered that the forgiveness of God cannot be obtained except through the supplications of priests. For the Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, gave this power to the leaders of the Church, that they might both give the action of penance to those confessing, and admit the same, purged by salutary satisfaction, to the communion of the Sacraments through the gate of reconciliation. In this work the Savior Himself unceasingly intervenes, and is never absent from those things which He committed to His Ministers to execute, saying: 'Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world,' so that if anything is fulfilled by our service with good order and joyful effect, we should not doubt that it has been given through the Holy Spirit." And soon: "It is very useful and necessary that the guilt of sins be loosed by priestly supplication before the last day. Hence it behooves every Christian to have judgment of his conscience, lest he delay conversion to God from day to day, nor set the time of satisfaction for himself at the end of life, when the severity of approaching judgment constrains a man; so that he reserves himself to an uncertain hour, and cannot merit the Lord through satisfaction, expecting the straits of that time, which can scarcely find patience, either in the penitent for Confession, or in the Priest for Reconciliation."

"But even in the necessity of such persons, help is to be given in such a way that neither the action of penance nor the grace of Communion is denied to them, if, even having lost the office of voice, they are proven to seek it by the judgment of an intact mind."

And St. Basil: "Since conversion is one means of receiving hope again from sins, and it is necessary that prayer be made, which is worthy to receive supplication, it is necessary that one be liberated from the consortium of iniquity through confession, lest the devil hinder penance from God. For in the Acts, having heard of baptisms, all confessed their sins."

And St. Jerome: "Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven. Not only upon Bishops and Presbyters

as in a superior grade, but for all, when the confession of sins is made, and it is a matter of binding and loosing."

Concerning the absolution of sins, Christ most clearly said: "Receive the Holy Spirit. Whose sins you remit, they are remitted to them, and whose sins you retain, they are retained." The Protestants approach when they teach the announcing of the remission of sins, and declaring that their sins are remitted: when they recall those excommunicated to their communion after penance, and proclaim them reconciled. Calovius says: "Absolution, which is made by the words of the Minister announcing in his office, is such that whatever is loosed on earth is loosed in heaven." Again: "The Sacrament of Penance is not properly so called, although absolution in a broader sense can be called a Sacrament." *Ibid.* disp. 30, Th. 7, p. 172.

But the Protestants abominate the name of satisfaction; although their predecessor John Hus admits satisfaction, *On Penance*, fol. 37.

The Protestants acknowledge that a sinner can make satisfaction to his neighbor. Catholics acknowledge that satisfaction for the guilt of sins and eternal punishment is to be sought solely and only from the infinite merits and infinite satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

But because Holy Scripture shows by many examples that God, after the guilt of sins and eternal punishment is remitted, chastises sinners with temporal punishments, Catholics think that voluntary afflictions, undertaken from the love of God and faith working through charity, strengthened by the merits and satisfaction of Jesus Christ, appease the wrath of God, and obtain from His mercy the remission of those temporal punishments: And this they call penitential satisfaction, and satisfactory works.

The Protestants do not recede so much from this doctrine as some think: For they do not deny that penitential works, which the grace of the Holy Spirit works in the converted, and through the converted, are pleasing to God, and please Him. They do not deny the saying of the Apostle: "Do not forget beneficence and communion, for with such sacrifices God is propitiated." The Apostle indeed admonishing that in such things there is an odor of sweetness, a sacrifice acceptable, pleasing to God.

But the practice of the Protestants hands over the whole case to us. For why do they institute public fasts, public prayers, when they are pressed by war, or afflicted by plague, or by famine, or subjected to other temporal scourges of God; if they do not think those works pleasing to God avert divine indignation, and serve to obtain remission from those temporal punishments? But for the same end, Roman Catholics pray, fast, give alms, and do other works worthy of penance, which they call satisfactory, as pleasing to God, and founded in the satisfaction of Jesus Christ; and therefore such as appease divine indignation, and obtain the remission of the temporal punishments of sin, whose guilt and eternal punishment, by divine mercy, from the sole consideration of the merits and satisfaction of Jesus Christ has been

remitted. Curtius therefore, *Theological Dissertations on Fundamentals*, sect. 5, n. 5, p. 112, is vain in dreaming about a fundamental error.

CHAPTER XXVII. On Indulgences.

Indulgences concern the temporal punishments which God inflicts on sinners, after the guilt of sin and eternal punishment is remitted. The Protestants are accustomed to cry aloud at this point, disapproving what they do not know, and doing what they disapprove. They persuade themselves that one act of faith by which Jesus Christ is apprehended with all His merits effects a Jubilee, and a plenary Indulgence both of guilt and of temporal and eternal punishment. But we, finding in the merits of Christ the remission of guilt and eternal punishment, seek in the same merits, through penitential works, the remission of temporal punishment; which works would be useless among them, for averting those punishments, after such an act of faith, unless they held with us that penitential works are to be done, through which, by virtue of the merits of Christ, temporal punishment would be remitted.

Molinaeus says: "Faithful Pastors have the power of remitting sins. Just as Holy Scripture says that Pastors save souls, because God uses them in saving them, so it teaches that Pastors remit sins, because God uses them in their remission." He also adds: "Thus they remit all and each sin also as to all punishment." And this is what we call a plenary and most full indulgence, when sins are remitted as to all temporal punishment. It is agreed, therefore, between Catholics and Protestants that there is in the Church the power of remitting sins, not only as to guilt and eternal punishment, but also as to temporal punishment: for this is founded on the texts of Holy Scripture, Matt. 16:19, John 20:23.

Ancient Councils imposed a time of penance according to the quality of sin, which they also abbreviated for various reasons: But those penances were imposed not only for the satisfaction of the Church, but additionally for compensation of the temporal punishment to be borne either in this life or in Purgatory for sins. But when those Canonical punishments were remitted, the temporal punishment due to sins was remitted, otherwise the Church, granting an indulgence, would have remitted the faithful to punishments to be expected from God, and would have brought them not an advantage, but rather a detriment. Therefore, since the Protestants confess that there is in the Church the power of remitting temporal punishments for sins, it must be said that ancient Councils remitted those punishments through indulgences. Of which indeed there are not obscure vestiges in the Apostolic process, when he says: "Sufficient to such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by many." And below: "But to whom you have forgiven anything, I forgive also: For I also, if I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ." And these things we think sufficient for those who are not contentious.

CHAPTER XXVIII. On the Deniers of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ Under the Species of Bread and Wine.

If we bring forward the account of those whom the Protestants name their predecessors, and call witnesses of truth, it will not be easily repudiated.

John Hus writes: "The Apostles and their Catholic successors preach Christ, who is crucified, to be living and really in the venerable Sacrament, with His blood and body." And soon: "But the Gentiles are scandalized at this, that we truly say that Christ, His body and blood, are in the venerable Sacrament. Of whose number was the Commentator Averroes, who, seeking philosophical wisdom, and thus made foolish, said: 'The worst sect, which devours its God,' by this denoting Christians." Therefore, the Gentiles were scandalized because of that Catholic doctrine; they rejected the same along with the whole of Christianity.

Afterward, John Hus reports, Christians were also found who denied the same truth: "There was a great heresy of Berengarius, by which he was defamed, namely, because he denied that the bread which is placed on the altar before consecration is unconsecrated bread, but after consecration is only consecrated bread, not the true body of Christ."

Přzibram the Hussite, condemns as heresy the opinion of Wyclif, denying the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, and testifies that the same opinion has been condemned as heresy by many others.

It is also clear from the books of Wyclif that he denied the real presence in the Holy Eucharist; although he writes: "It can be said that that sacramental bread is, in that spiritual mode, the body of the Lord." And he adds that Christ has a spiritual being in the host. Yet the same, explaining himself most clearly, speaks: "Since the mind of a Catholic does not comprehend that bread is the body of Christ, unless understanding it figuratively, since identification is not possible, therefore, without any ambiguity, this is figurative: This is my body."

The Theologians of Württemberg, of the previous century, name the Anabaptists, Karlstadt, Zwingli, as authors denying the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist: of whom they report eight different opinions.

CHAPTER XXIX. Approximation of the Reformed.

The Helvetic Confession posits a triple manducation; one bodily, by which food is received into the mouth by man, is ground by the teeth, and swallowed into the stomach, which kind of manducation the Capharnaites once understood. Another spiritual, by which, the body and blood of the Lord remaining in their essence and property, they are communicated to us spiritually. The third sacramental, by which the faithful not only spiritually and internally participates in the true body and blood of the Lord, but externally also coming to the table of the Lord, receives the visible sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord. And afterward: "The consequence is

that we do not have the Supper without Christ, while nevertheless we have a bloodless and mystical supper, as the whole of antiquity has called it."

But Catholics repudiate Capharnaitic manducation: Catholics acknowledge spiritual manducation, about which (according to the testimony of the same Confession) St. Augustine speaks: "Why do you prepare the tooth and the stomach? Believe and you have eaten." Catholics believe and teach sacramental manducation: in which, whoever with true faith receives the Sacrament externally, that one not only receives the sign, but also actually enjoys the reality, for the supper is not without Christ, but nevertheless bloodless and mystical. If they had explained that sacramental manducation more, perhaps their intention would have been more apparent.

The Gallican Confession: "We affirm that the Holy Supper of the Lord, namely the other Sacrament, is for us a testimony of our union with our Lord Jesus Christ, since He has not only died once, but also truly feeds and nourishes us with His flesh and blood, so that we, made one with Him, may have a common life with Him." Thus the Catholics say, Christ truly died and was raised for us, and thus truly feeds and nourishes us with His flesh and blood, so that we might become one with Him. It adds: "Although He is now in heaven, and will remain there until He comes to judge the world: nevertheless, we believe that He, by the arcane and incomprehensible virtue of His Spirit, nourishes and vivifies us with the substance of His body and blood apprehended through faith." Thus the Catholics say: Although Christ is now in heaven, and will remain there until the last judgment, we believe, nevertheless, that He, by an arcane and incomprehensible virtue, nourishes and vivifies us with the substance of His body and blood, if we have faith in His words, and approach with a pure conscience. They conclude: "But we say this is done spiritually, not to substitute imagination or thought in place of efficacy and truth; but rather, because this mystery of our coalescence with Christ is so sublime that it exceeds all our senses and indeed the whole order of nature: finally, because, since it is divine and heavenly, it cannot be perceived and apprehended except by faith."

These words are so Roman that the opinion of our Church can hardly be explained unless we say either the same or something similar. For they show excellently what sacramental manducation has that is different from merely spiritual manducation, about which the Helvetic Confession speaks. For this is not so sublime that it can be called a mystery: whereas sacramental manducation has truth and efficacy, and is so sublime a mystery that it exceeds the order of nature, and cannot be perceived and apprehended except by faith.

Again: "We believe that God in reality, that is, truly and efficaciously gives us whatever He there sacramentally figures, and therefore we join with the signs the true possession and fruition of that thing which is there offered to us. Therefore, we affirm that those who bring pure faith to the sacred table of the Lord truly receive

what the signs there testify, namely, the body and blood of Jesus Christ to be no less the food and drink of the soul than bread and wine are the food of the body."

Who would not say that these words, as they sound, were written with a Roman pen? After the public Confessions, Davenant says: "The most learned Bucer from all sides pronounced that in the matter there was concord, in words only and modes of speaking some variety. For Luther himself said: If you believe and teach that in the Holy Supper the true body and true blood of the Lord are exhibited, given, and received, and not bread and wine only, and that this perception and exhibition truly happens and not imaginarily, there is agreement between us. At the same time Bucer and his associates conceded that the true body of the Lord and the true blood, with the visible signs of bread and wine are exhibited, given, and received."

It is agreed, therefore, that the true body and true blood of the Lord are exhibited, given, and received: and to understand the manner, Davenant must be heard. He continues and says this was the opinion of the Helvetic Churches: "Although they deny that Transubstantiation happens, nor do they think that a local inclusion in the bread, or any durable conjunction outside the use of the Sacrament happens, nevertheless they concede that by a sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ, and with the bread extended, the body of Christ is simultaneously present and truly exhibited."

The question here is not whether Transubstantiation happens, whether a local inclusion happens, or a durable conjunction: It is acknowledged here that the bread by sacramental union is the body of Christ, and with the bread extended, the body of Christ is simultaneously present and truly exhibited: which if they did not understand only of spiritual presence and exhibition; but also that the giving of the Sacrament through the Minister of the Church was the true exhibition of the body of Christ sacramentally present, no dispute would remain here.

Hales says: "Second is concerning the mode of perceiving Christ in the Eucharist: Both sides confess that the body of Christ is truly and really exhibited and eaten there, and is received together with these earthly elements." And soon: "We easily concede that the unworthy, even though unworthy, eat that which by the sacramental union is the body of Christ; and therefore they are guilty of the body and blood of Jesus Christ." Soon: "How far the power of union extends, where again the sacramental multiplication of manducations whether oral or spiritual, let the schools of Theology discuss in detail; there is no need for Christians to investigate it too anxiously." See Augustine, book Against the Donatists after the Conference, ch. 25.

If the Reformed had followed this counsel from the beginning, and had made as much effort for retaining Catholic unity, which they do not yet omit for obtaining fraternal unity with the Lutherans, it would not have been necessary to come to an ecclesiastical division in this chapter. For if they had simply believed that in the Holy Eucharist the body of Christ is truly and really exhibited and eaten: If they had

conceded that the unworthy eat that which by the sacramental union is the body of Christ; and consequently they become guilty of the body and blood of Jesus Christ: they would not have anxiously inquired how far the power of sacramental union extends, no one would have necessarily departed from the unity of the faith.

Calvin says: "Truly in the supper the body of Christ is given to us, to be food for our souls to salvation: that is, our souls are fed with the substance of the body of Christ, that we may truly be made one with Him and His power. Therefore, not an empty and inane sign is proposed to us, but we are truly made participants of the flesh and blood of the Lord, who receive this promise by faith."

Again, he teaches that to eat the flesh of Christ is not only to believe, but to truly become a participant of His flesh, and posits an example: "Just as by eating bread the body is nourished by the substance of the bread, so by true participation in Christ the soul becomes strong and powerful. In the Holy Supper (if there is a sincere faith) there is a true signification and effect, when the grace is joined with the figures, so that they truly make that, what they signify."

Again, he teaches that this mystery cannot be comprehended by the intellect, but by faith alone: "Nothing," he says, "is of these curious admirations which are presented, unless the law is satisfied by them, nor can their inept figments be pleasing by themselves." And again: "Concerning the mode of manducation, if it happens, there is no doubt it is arcane, which neither can be comprehended or narrated except through faith."

If Calvin had stopped here, he would have found no reason to dissent from the Catholic Church. For it teaches that in the Holy Eucharist the body of Christ is given to us, so that our souls are fed with His substance, and we truly become one with Him: It teaches that not an empty and inane sign is proposed to us, but we truly become participants of the flesh and blood of the Lord, who receive this promise by faith working through charity: It teaches that our souls truly and thoroughly become participants in Christ; and with the symbols of bread and wine, His body and blood are taken; and it should not be doubted that He truly proffers, and we truly receive: It teaches that the depth of this mystery is wonderful, which neither the mind conceives, nor the tongue utters; because it is an arcane more sublime than can be comprehended by the intellect.

We think the Reformed themselves will not find it difficult to perceive how greatly in the aforesaid things the public Confessions and the Authors named approach Catholic doctrine: And if they sincerely meant what they say, we do not see any reason why they should dissent from us.

CHAPTER XXX. Catholic Doctrine Is Proposed.

The Council of Trent expresses the sum of Catholic doctrine in these words: "First, the holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that in the nourishing holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord

Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things."

We believe Christ to be present truly; and as the same Council says, not only in sign or figure. Thus the alleged Helvetic Confession says, the faithful in sacramental manducation not only spiritually and internally participate in the true body and blood of the Lord; but those who with true faith receive the Sacrament externally, not only receive the sign, but also actually enjoy the reality. Thus the Gallican Confession says that Christ truly feeds and nourishes us with His flesh and blood, and imagination or thought is not substituted in place of efficacy and truth: but God gives us in reality, that is, truly and efficaciously, whatever He there sacramentally figures, and therefore we join with the signs the true possession and fruition of that thing which is there offered to us. And Hales: In the Eucharist the body of Christ is truly and really exhibited and eaten, and Calvin: Not an empty and inane sign is proposed to us, but those who by faith receive this promise truly become participants of the flesh and blood of the Lord.

We believe Christ to be present really. And thus Hales says, the body of Christ is really exhibited and eaten.

We believe Christ to be present substantially. And by this we understand that Christ is not present in this Sacrament by virtue alone. Thus the Helvetic Confession says, the faithful not only receive the sign, but also actually enjoy the reality.

But the reality itself is not some virtue alone, but Christ Himself. The Gallican Confession does not stop at virtue alone, but teaches that Christ by the arcane and incomprehensible virtue of His Spirit nourishes and vivifies us with the substance of His body and blood: It adds; the body and blood of Jesus Christ to be no less the food and drink of the soul, than bread and wine are the food of the body.

We believe the body of the Lord to be contained under those sensible species. And here is the knot of the principal difficulty; where it is necessary to consider what the Reformed concede, and where they are mistaken.

The Helvetic Confession concedes that in sacramental manducation, the visible sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord is received. This sacramental manducation has efficacy and truth, and is so sublime a mystery that it cannot be perceived and apprehended without faith; as the Gallican Confession says: since the body and blood of Jesus Christ are no less the food and drink of the soul than bread and wine are the food of the body. And hence with the approval of Davenant, and the attestation of Bucer, there is concord in matter and spirit; since in the holy supper the true body and true blood of the Lord are truly exhibited and given; the Helvetic Churches confessing that by a sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ, and with the bread extended, the body of Christ is simultaneously present and truly exhibited. Therefore, Hales does not badly say that even the unworthy eat that which by the sacramental union is the body of Christ; and consequently become guilty of the body and blood of Jesus Christ: and it should not be scrupulously

inquired how far the power of that sacramental union extends; until the same is further decided by some legitimate Synod, according to the admonition of Zanchius: for we are not ashamed to confess it is an arcane more sublime than can be comprehended by us, or narrated in words.

If the Reformed sincerely concede all these things, how can it be that they would want to deny that our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the sensible species? For if the mystery is so great, the arcane so great that it cannot be perceived and apprehended without faith, and no one suffices either to attain it by thought, or explain it by narration; it is necessary either to say this very thing, in which the reason of such a mystery exceeds our comprehension; since spiritual manducation, and the adjunction of symbols, does not contain such sublimity. And if the Eucharistic bread because of the sacramental union is the body of Christ; and with the bread extended, the body of Christ is simultaneously present, is given, and is truly exhibited; so that the unworthy eating it become guilty of the body and blood of Christ; we think no one will be who does not judge that the Reformed teach the very thing that we teach, accepting their words in their proper and accustomed signification.

But that those who act moderately may more easily notice where they are mistaken, we will try, by the grace of God, to explain the foundation of the whole matter (after Milleterius) according to our own slightness; asking them to set aside prejudices and weigh the very essentials of the matter.

When, therefore, concerning the communion of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Reformed do not apprehend the most precious body and blood according to the causes and reason of the mystery, which indeed are the same causes of our communion with them; but they apprehend the body and blood of the Lord according to the conditions and circumstances of its matter. Hence have arisen difficulties, no less useless than odious; when it is inquired: whether one and the same body can be in several places at the same time. Whether a body can be somewhere and not occupy a place, not be visible, not be palpable; In which (and similar difficulties) the Reformed have primarily founded themselves, and from which they have most subtly disputed against Catholics, teaching that we communicate in the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, who in the institution of the Holy Eucharist truly and with effect changed bread and wine into His body and blood, making them Sacraments of grace. Although all the Holy Fathers have most clearly held this, whose opinion the Catholics follow up to now, they raised no question about the aforesaid difficulties as having any importance, no doubt arose in any of them; as they well knew that in the Holy Eucharist it is a matter of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to the reason of His mystery, according to which the faithful communicate in them.

In no way, therefore, should it be inquired how the same body can be in several places at the same time; or whether it can be present somewhere, and not occupy a

place, nor be palpable, nor be seen: since all these and similar difficulties concern the conditions and circumstances of corporeal matter and conjoined accidents, which have no place in the reason of the mystery, according to which we communicate in the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This erroneous hypothesis turned Wyclif away from Catholic doctrine, as we have shown in the preceding: and this same hypothesis moved the Reformed to reject the corporal communion of the faithful with the body and blood of the Lord, and to defend only Spiritual communion, as well as Sacramental, insofar as it adds to the elements the condition of signifying the body and blood of Jesus Christ; however much they frequently speak of an incomprehensible mystery, and an ineffable arcane, lest they seem to have receded from the Orthodox consensus of the primitive Church; whereas nevertheless their opinion comprises no arcane, no mystery.

If, therefore, the Reformed ask us: How can it happen that the same body is in many places at the same time? We respond that this proposition, being indefinite, does not contain an assertion of the Catholic faith. The Church does not teach, nor has it ever taught indefinitely and universally that one body can be in several places at the same time: indeed, Catholic doctors of no small name are found who openly and constantly deny it.

The Catholic Church teaches that the body of Christ is in several places at the same time, according to its Sacramental existence, and according to the mode of existing Sacramentally; not, however, according to its natural mode of existing, or according to the mode of existing naturally, according to which it is in one place only, namely in heaven and at the right hand of God the Father.

Therefore, those who propose that question, and object such difficulties against the presence of Christ in several places, in which the Holy Sacrament is; it is for them to explain what is the Sacramental existence of the body of Christ, and the mode of existing Sacramentally: and by that very thing they will perceive that their difficulties do not apply to the matter, and that being in several places at the same time in no way conflicts with the reason of the sacramental existence of the body of Christ.

But they neither understand nor can explain the Sacramental mode of existing of the body of Christ; as they candidly confess, treating of the magnitude of the mystery, and the sublimity of this arcane; will they not judge themselves rash and ridiculous, who propose difficulties against the Sacramental existence, which they do not understand, and the Sacramental mode of existing, which they cannot explain?

But that the Sacramental existence is spiritual existence, or in the manner of a Spirit, 1 Cor. 15, is entirely indubitable. "If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual one." Whence also Christ is said to have been "made into a life-giving spirit, and the heavenly man." Clement of Alexandria says: "The blood of the Lord is twofold: one is

carnal, by which we have been redeemed from destruction: the other indeed spiritual, by which we have been anointed." Taking this concerning the Holy Eucharist. Book 2, Pædagog. p. 151 B.

The foundation of all difficulties, which are raised by the Reformed, does not concern, except the natural existence of Christ, to which it is repugnant to be in several places. But the Catholic Church does not teach that the body of Jesus Christ is in the Holy Eucharist according to the natural mode of existing; which expressly teaches the contrary. Thus whatever the Reformed propose against the truth of the real presence of the body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, proceeds from a hallucination, and does not impugn Catholic doctrine: Consequently no Catholic Doctor is bound to respond to such objections, as proceeding from a hypothesis that is neither Catholic, nor admitted.

This, therefore, must be held: that the Catholic Church has never taught indefinitely and universally: One and the same body can be simultaneously in several places: It has never handed down anything other than that the body of Christ, and only it, can have a Sacramental existence, or be a Sacrament.

Although the reason, the mode of existing Sacramentally, cannot be expressed in words; nevertheless the intellect illuminated by faith can comprehend that it must be firmly believed that this mode of existing is not impossible to God, according to the open profession of all antiquity speaking about this Most Holy Sacrament in the true Church: For they considered that our Redeemer in clear and explicit words, after the blessing of bread and wine, gave His own body, and His own blood, as the Evangelists and St. Paul testify.

Therefore, the rashness of those who want this truth explained in another way than it has been consistently and perpetually proposed by the Holy Fathers in the Church from the Apostles until now, must be stopped. For it is certain that the Sacramental mode of existing of the body of Christ, which cannot be explained in words, is a point of divine Wisdom operating in mystery, which eye has not seen, which ear has not heard, and which has not entered into the heart of man: and therefore with such reverence has all Orthodox antiquity spoken about this mystery.

But although we cannot comprehend the reason of the wonders of God: nevertheless, that they are wonders, and exceeding the capacity of our intellect, is permitted to understand from the end and effect, which they work in us: So that we understand the mode is wonderful, by which the body of Christ is given to us in the Holy Sacrament, and according to which it is sacramentally present, after the blessing of bread and wine, that we might worthily receive it for salvation, it is necessary to consider the end and effect, because of which our Redeemer instituted this Sacrament. For our Redeemer, about to depart from this world to the Father, instituted this Holy Sacrament, in which He accumulated the riches of His love toward men, making a memorial of His wonders, and commanding it to be celebrated in His memory, and His death to be announced by those receiving it, until

He comes to judge the world. But He wanted this Sacrament to be received as the spiritual food of souls, by which they might be nourished and strengthened, whoever lives the life of Him, who said: He who eats me, lives because of me, He wanted it to be an antidote against daily sins, and by which we might be preserved against mortal sins: He wanted it to be a pledge of our glory and eternal happiness: He wanted it to be a symbol of that body, of which He Himself is the Head, and to which He wanted us to be joined as members, through faith, hope, and charity, that we all might say the same thing, and there might not be a schism in the body.

According to the end and effect declared in the institution of this divine Sacrament, it is given to understand how we should think and speak of this presence and sacramental existence of the body of Christ. For as the first Nicene Council says: "Also here at the divine table let us not be humbly intent on the bread set forth, and the cup, but raising the mind by faith, let us understand situated on that sacred table that Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world, bloodlessly immolated by priests, and truly taking His precious body and blood, let us believe these to be the Symbols of our resurrection: for on this account we do not receive much, but little, that we may know, it is taken not for satiety, but for sanctification." You know, Reformed Lords, these are the words of the first general Council, which you admit; according to whose opinion the Helvetic Confession seems to say: "We do not have the supper without Christ, while nevertheless we have a bloodless and mystical supper, as all antiquity has called it." And therefore considering the sacramental existence of the body of Christ, we do not call our senses as witnesses, but we establish our faith as judge. For if Christ were present in the Holy Sacrament, according to the natural mode of existing, our senses could judge: and it would rightly be said that Christ is not present, because He is not seen. But because He is there present, according to the Sacramental mode of existing; in no way should He be said to be absent, because He is not seen: but the human mind is to be raised by faith, that we may understand situated on the sacred table that Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world, bloodlessly immolated by priests: and the symbol of our resurrection.

CHAPTER XXXI. The Reason of the Mystery in the Holy Sacrament is Examined.

Let us begin with St. Dionysius the Areopagite, or another ancient author of his book, and say: "O most divine and sacred Sacrament, graciously open the coverings of the signifying signs, and make yourself appear clearly to us, and fill our spiritual eyes with the singular open splendor of your light."

From the magnitude of this mystery, St. Irenaeus proves that Jesus Christ is the son of the Creator of the universe: "How will it be established for them that the bread over which thanks have been given is the body of their Lord, and the cup His blood, if they do not say that He is the Son of the maker of the world, that is, His Word, through whom wood bears fruit, springs flow, first indeed producing grass, then the ear, then the full wheat in the ear?"

Origen commends a singular circumspection in guarding the Holy Sacrament: "I want to admonish you by examples of your religion; you know, who are accustomed to be present at the divine mysteries, how when you receive the body of the Lord, you keep it with all caution and veneration, lest any small part fall from it, lest any of the consecrated gift be lost; for you believe yourselves guilty, and rightly believe, if anything falls through negligence."

St. Cyprian, or another ancient author, testifies that the presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist is ineffable: "This bread, which the Lord handed to His disciples, not changed in appearance, but in nature: made flesh by the omnipotence of the Word: and just as in the person of Christ humanity appeared and divinity was hidden, so in the visible Sacrament the divine essence ineffably infuses itself."

For St. Hilary, the mystery of the Eucharist is such that it might seem a most foolish paradox, if it were not proposed by Christ: "One should not speak in God's matters with a human or worldly sense, nor should perversity of alien and impious understanding be extorted through violence or impudent preaching from the soundness of heavenly sayings. Let us read what is written, and let us understand what we read, and then we shall fulfill the office of perfect faith. For concerning the natural truth of Christ in us, unless we learn it from Him, we speak FOOLISHLY AND IMPIOUSLY: for He Himself says, My flesh is true food."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem refers the institution of the Holy Eucharist to the omnipotence of Christ: "He once changed water into wine, which is akin to blood, in Cana of Galilee by His will alone: and shall He not be worthy to be believed when He changed wine into blood? Therefore with all certainty let us take the body and blood of Christ: for under the appearance of bread you are given the body, and under the appearance of wine you are given the blood."

In the same way, St. Ambrose proves the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist from various miracles: "Perhaps you say: I see something else, how do you assert to me that I receive the body of Christ? And this still remains for us to prove. How many examples, therefore, do we use to prove that this is not what nature has formed, but what blessing has consecrated? And that the power of blessing is greater than that of nature, because nature itself is changed by blessing? Moses held a rod, he cast it down, and it became a serpent." And after relating other miracles, he concludes: "If human blessing had such power that it converted nature, what shall we say of the divine consecration itself, where the very words of the Lord and Savior operate? For this Sacrament which you receive is made by the word of Christ. And if the word of Elias had such power that it brought down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ have power to change the elements? Concerning the works of the whole world you have read, 'For He spoke, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created.' Therefore, the word of Christ, which could make from nothing what was not, cannot change those things which are into what they were not? For it is not less to give new things to things than to change natures."

St. Basil considers the magnitude of the mystery: "If such threats are placed against those who rashly approach those sacred things which are sanctified by men, what is to be said of him who rashly approaches so great and such a mystery? For as much as something greater is in the temple, according to the voice of the Lord, so much more grave and terrible is it to touch the body of Christ in impurity of soul, than it is to approach rams or bulls, etc."

St. Ephrem says excellently: "Why do you scrutinize the inscrutable? If you curiously examine these things, you will no longer be called faithful, but curious. Be faithful and innocent, partake of the immaculate body of your Lord with most full faith, certain that you eat the Lamb Himself whole. The mysteries of Christ are immortal fire; do not rashly scrutinize them, lest in their scrutiny you be burned." And below: "This indeed exceeds all admiration, all mind, and all speech, what the only-begotten Son Christ our Savior has done for us. He has given us fire and spirit to eat and drink, namely, His body and blood."

Blessed Gaudentius: "The Creator and Lord of natures Himself, who produces bread from the earth, again makes from bread (because He can and has promised) His own body. And afterward: O depth of the riches of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God! It is the Passover of the Lord, that is, the passage of the Lord. Do not think it earthly, which has been made heavenly through Him, who passes into it, and has made it His body and blood."

St. Chrysostom also exclaims: "O miracle! O the benignity of God, who, sitting above with the Father, at that moment of time is handled by the hands of all, and gives Himself to those willing to receive and embrace Him."

And St. Augustine, explaining the title of the Psalm: "And he was carried in his own hands," says: "How could this happen in a man, who understands? For who is carried in his own hands? A man can be carried in the hands of others, no one is carried in his own hands. How it is understood in David himself according to the letter, we do not find, but in Christ we find it. For Christ was carried in His own hands, when commending His own body, He said: 'This is my body.' For He was carrying that body in His own hands."

And these indeed suffice that we may understand that the ancient Doctors of the Church perceived, weighed, and taught the magnitude of this mystery; who nevertheless never hesitated about those difficulties which are raised by the Reformed, as to whom it was well known that they could have no place, unless it were a matter of the presence of Christ according to the natural mode of existing, but in no way where it is a matter of the presence of Christ according to the Sacramental reason of existing, which the Council of Trent proposed and handed down with the whole ancient Church.

Let us therefore ask God to open the spiritual eyes of all, that they may recognize the most divine and sacred Sacrament, and venerate in it the power of the Creator, considering with what caution, with what reverence the body of Christ was once

received. For what is more ineffable than that the divine essence infuses itself into a visible Sacrament, where bread, not changed in appearance but in nature, is made flesh by the omnipotence of the Word; which would indeed be a foolish and impious paradox, were it not instituted by Christ? But He is worthy to be believed, whether changing water into wine, or wine into blood: Nor should it in any way be said, "I see something else," when it is a matter of the wonderful and nature-exceeding works of Jesus Christ. Therefore, we must approach with great reverence, nor rashly scrutinize the inscrutable, which exceed all admiration, all mind, and all speech: For the Creator and Lord of natures Himself, who produces bread from the earth, again made from bread His own body, because He can and has promised. O depth of the riches of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God! Let us not think it earthly, which has been made heavenly through Him, who passes into it and has made it His body and blood. O miracle, O the benignity of God! Who, sitting above with the Father, at that moment of time is handled by the hands of all; who, in the institution of this Holy Sacrament, carried Himself in His own hands.

Let the Reformed consider, whose Confessions and Doctors acknowledge the ineffable mystery, if indeed they acknowledge it with the whole ancient Church, whether it is not necessary to believe with the same Church that which it unanimously and constantly believed about the Venerable Sacrament, and which the Catholic Church still believes.

CHAPTER XXXII. Catholic Truth from the Words of Institution.

Let us not seek the sense of the words of Christ from our own industry, or private opinion, but from the words themselves, as they were understood by the Holy Fathers, of whose fidelity no one doubts.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who was present at the second general Council: "When Christ says concerning the bread, 'This is my body,' who thereafter would dare to doubt? And when He confirms and says, 'This is my blood,' who doubts, saying that it is not His blood?" And afterward: "Becoming by taking the body and blood, of the same body and the same blood with Him: For thus we are Christ-bearers, His body and blood being received into our members."

Origen subtly said: "Do not cling to the blood of the flesh, but rather learn the blood of the Word, and hear Him saying to you, 'This is my blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins.'" For it is not necessary to cling to the blood of the flesh, according to the natural mode of existing, but it is necessary to learn the blood of the Word, according to the Sacramental mode of existing: for in the institution He said, "This is my blood."

St. Cyprian: "The doctrine of this Sacrament is new, and the schools of the Gospel first brought forth this teaching, and with Christ as Teacher, this discipline first became known to the world, that Christians should drink the blood, whose eating the authority of the ancient law most strictly forbids: for the law indeed prohibits the eating of blood; the Gospel commands that it be drunk."

St. Hilary: "There is no place left for doubting about the truth of the flesh and blood: for now, both by the Lord's own profession, and by our faith, it is truly flesh and truly blood."

St. Ambrose: "This bread is bread before the words of the Sacraments; when consecration has taken place, from bread it becomes the flesh of Christ." And below: "The Lord testifies to us that we receive His body and blood; should we doubt His fidelity and testimony?"

St. Gaudentius: "What has been announced, believe, because what you receive is the body of that heavenly bread, and the blood of that sacred vine. For when He handed the consecrated bread and wine to His disciples, He said thus: 'This is my body: This is my blood.' Let us believe Him whom we have believed: truth knows no falsehood." And below: "Let us not break that most solid bone: 'This is my body, This is my blood.' But if anything should remain in anyone's mind that has not been understood by this exposition, let it be burned by the ardor of faith."

St. Chrysostom: "Let us believe God everywhere, and not contradict Him, even if what He says seems absurd to our sense and thought. Let His word, I ask, surpass both our sense and our reason: which we should do in all things, but especially in mysteries, not looking only at those things which lie before us, but also holding His words: for we cannot be defrauded by His words, but our sense is most easily deceived: Since, therefore, He said: 'This is my body,' let us be held by no doubt, but let us believe." And in the manner of a beautiful exhortation: "He who placed the greater, that is, His soul, for you, why would He disdain to give you His body? Let us hear, therefore, both Priests and others, how great, how wonderful a thing has been granted to us, let us hear, I pray, and let us shudder: He gave us His flesh, He proposed Himself immolated." Again: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? He makes faith and horror for himself especially by these words. For the meaning of such words is that what is in the cup is that which flowed from His side, and we are partakers of that."

St. Augustine: "Also, those clouds or fires, how the Angels made or assumed them to signify what they were announcing, even if the Lord or the Holy Spirit was shown in those forms, who among men knows? Just as infants do not know what is placed on the altar, and after the celebration of piety is consumed, from where or how it is made, from where it is taken into the use of religion: And if they never learn by experience, either their own or that of others, and never see that form of things except during the celebration of the Sacraments, when it is offered and given, and it is said to them on the most grave authority whose body and blood it is, they will believe nothing else, except that the Lord absolutely appeared to the eyes of mortals in that form, and that liquid absolutely flowed from such a pierced side." Again, explaining that: "The bread which I will give is my flesh," he says: "How could flesh comprehend this, that He called bread flesh; which flesh does not comprehend."

St. Cyril of Alexandria: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" Explaining this: "Applying firm faith to the mysteries, let us never in such sublime things either think or utter that (how)." Again: "We do not deny that we are joined to Christ spiritually by right faith and sincere charity, but that we have no manner of conjunction with Him according to the flesh, that we absolutely deny, and we say this is entirely alien from the divine Scriptures."

CHAPTER XXXIII. The Holy Fathers on the Real Presence.

Justin Martyr: "For we do not take these as common bread or common drink; but just as Jesus Christ our Savior, incarnate through the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation; so also we have been taught that the food made Eucharist through the prayer of the word, from which our blood and flesh are nourished through change, is the flesh and blood of that incarnated Jesus."

St. Gregory of Nyssa: "The bread is without seed, prepared for us without any human work. It is found on earth, having flowed down from above. For the bread which descended from heaven, which is true food, which is signified enigmatically by this history, is not some bodily thing: for how will an incorporeal thing become food for the body? But a thing which is not incorporeal is altogether a body. Again: It is joined to the bodies of the faithful, so that by this conjunction with the immortal, man may also be made a participant of immortality, etc."

St. Optatus of Milevis: "For what is so sacrilegious as to break, scrape, remove the altars of God, on which you also once offered, on which the vows of the people and the members of Christ have been carried, on which Almighty God has been invoked, on which the Holy Spirit has been asked to descend, from which many have received the pledge of eternal salvation, and the protection of faith, and the hope of resurrection." And below: "What is an altar, if not the seat of the body and blood of Christ." And below: "What had Christ offended you, whose body and blood dwelt there at certain moments?" Below: "Yet this huge crime was doubled, when you also broke the chalices, bearers of the blood of Christ."

St. Augustine: "We receive with faithful heart and mouth the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, giving us His flesh to eat and His blood to drink: although it seems more horrible to eat human flesh than to destroy it, and to drink human blood than to shed it."

St. Cyril of Alexandria: "Or perhaps you think that the power of the mystical blessing is unknown to us? Which, when it is in us, does it not also make Christ dwell in us corporally through communication of the flesh of Christ?" And below: "Whence it is to be considered that Christ is in us not by habit alone, which is understood through charity, but also by natural participation." And below: "For this corruptible nature of the body could not otherwise be brought to incorruptibility and life, if the natural body of life were not congruently joined to it. Do you not believe me saying these things? I implore you, prove your faith in Christ."

St. Leo: "Truly therefore they were conjoined to the body, and the truth of the image was presented beneath what is perceived by the senses, joined to the more noble Sacrament, which, when it is changed to be consumed, is fulfilled." Again: "If manifestly all and the whole substance was necessary, unless for the noble prize and the truth of the body of Christ, and divinely offering: there is nothing at all that faith might believe." And: "In vain does one dispute what is contained in the sacrament, which indeed is spiritually in the Church of God, in a union as much of consanguinity as of the body: for by the bond of flesh and the spirit of Christ, among common Sacraments, it is sufficiently clear."

Eusebius of Emesa, or the author of the sermon on the body of the Lord: "Let all ambiguity of infidelity depart, since He who is the author of the gift is Himself the witness of the truth." And below: "For knowing and perceiving the sacrifice of the true body, may the very power of the consecrator strengthen you." Again: "The unique and perfect host is to be estimated by faith, not by appearance, nor to be judged by external sight, but by interior affection." Again: "The invisible priest changes visible creatures into the substance of His body and blood by His secret power through His word." Again: "Which body, being dispensed by the priest, is as much in a small amount as it is established to be in the whole, which when the Church of the faithful takes, just as it is full in all, so it is proven to be whole in individuals." See Proclus Constantinople... on the Tradition of the Liturgy, Library of the Fathers, Vol. 5, p. 542 D.

Therefore, not understanding the words of Christ according to the private judgment of each, but from the sense of purer antiquity, near to the Apostles, and eminent in sanctity, let us say that there is no room for doubt about the words of Christ, and that we receive His body and blood into our members: Let us not cling to the flesh, according to its natural existence, but let us consider the sacramental: For although the Law prohibits the eating of blood, the Gospel commands that it be drunk: Therefore, concerning the truth of the flesh and blood there is no place left for doubt: For bread exists before the words of the Sacraments; when consecration has approached, from bread becomes the flesh of Christ: Whence, if any difficulty remains, let it be burned by the ardor of faith, believing God everywhere, and not opposing Him, even if it seems absurd to our sense and thought, because our sense is most easily deceived: Therefore, we must always adhere to the most serious authority, however much the flesh may not comprehend it, nor thinking how that can happen, that we are also joined to Christ according to the flesh, and our flesh is nourished through change: For flowing down from above, He is found on earth, and is joined to the bodies of the faithful, so that they may be partakers of immortality: and altars carry the members of Christ, as being seats of His body and blood, and in which He dwells at certain moments: Whence we receive the flesh and blood of Christ with faithful heart and mouth, so that He may also dwell in us corporally by natural participation; and joined to His body we may be brought to incorruptibility, tasting Him in Spirit and flesh, since that is taken by mouth which is believed by

faith. Therefore, let all ambiguity of infidelity depart, when the author of the gift is the witness of the truth.

CHAPTER XXXIV. On Transubstantiation.

We will say a few things about transubstantiation from the Holy Fathers; we will give a fuller treatment as the occasion arises, if it pleases God.

St. Cyprian: "This bread, which the Lord handed to His disciples, changed not in appearance, but in nature."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem: "He transformed wine into blood." Again: "Under the appearance of bread the body is given to you, and under the appearance of wine the blood is given." Again: "Therefore do not consider it as merely bread and merely wine, for it is the body and blood of Christ, according to the Lord's own words. Although the senses suggest this to you, let faith confirm you, do not judge by taste." Again: "Know this for certain, considering that the bread which is seen by us is not bread, although taste perceives it to be bread; but it is the body of Christ: and the wine which is perceived by us, although some sense perceives it to be wine, is nevertheless not wine, but the blood of Christ."

St. Ambrose: "How many examples we use to prove that this is not what nature has formed, but what blessing has consecrated? And that the power of blessing is greater than that of nature, because by blessing even nature itself is changed?"

St. Gregory of Nyssa: "The bread that has been sanctified by the divine word is truly changed into the body of God the Word." And elsewhere: "This is in divine conversion besides blessing that (the body of the Lord) contributes nothing, but blessing that (the body of the Lord) transmutes, and changing (to God), changing the nature of visible things."

St. Gaudentius: "Who made wine from water, and from wine His own blood."

St. Chrysostom: "The things set forth are not of human power, but divine mysteries are to be held: for He who said 'this is my body,' also made it true. Just as He changed water into wine, which was not similar indeed to sight, but it was added to taste, and similarly there, under the appearance of bread there is one thing visible, and another intelligible. So also here do not think of the mysteries only as corporeal substance."

St. Cyril of Alexandria: "We do not shrink from flesh and blood set on the sacred altars, considering our fragility, but if it was offered changing its power into truth properly of flesh, as a body of life as if certain seeds are appointed in us."

Eusebius of Emesa: "When sacred creatures are placed on the altar to be blessed by heavenly words, before the blessing of the Name is invoked, the substance of it is bread and wine; but after the words of Christ, it is the body and blood of Christ. What wonder is it, moreover, if He who created could convert those things which He created with power."

St. Remigius of Reims: "The flesh, which the Word of God the Father assumed in the virgin's womb, in unity is the person of Christ, the bread, which is consecrated on the altar, in unity is the person of Christ: just as that flesh is the body of Christ, so this bread is truly the body of Christ; nor are they two bodies, but one body."

CHAPTER XXXV. The Doctrine of the Greek Church on the Holy Eucharist.

Because the Protestants are accustomed to persuade those who are little practiced that the doctrine of their Church agrees in most things with the opinion of the Greek Church, we have thought it worthwhile to briefly relate the mind of that Church concerning the Holy Eucharist.

The Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah, says: "In the sacred Supper after consecration and blessing, bread passes and is changed into that very body of Jesus Christ; wine indeed into that blood by the power of the Holy Spirit. Nor indeed as if that body transferred from above descends again from heaven (for this is blasphemous) but with the species transformed and transmuted, by grace and invocation of the Holy Spirit, who perfects and consummates this whole Sacrament, through divine and sacred prayers and the Lord's words, the bread itself passing and being changed into the true body of the Lord, and the wine into the true blood. Therefore no longer is that bread of the Lord's body, which is consecrated by the Priest, and handled in a holy manner, either a figure, or unleavened bread, but that very true body of Christ, contained under the species of bread."

After Jeremiah, Neophytus was Patriarch, a Catholic man, and agreeing with the Roman Bishop. Neophytus was expelled by Cyril, who, nurtured among the Reformed, most foully bought the Patriarchate from the Turk, and afterward, by his order, for various crimes, was beheaded; Cyril being extinguished, by legitimate election Parthenius, a Catholic man, succeeded, who in the year 1643 held the Patriarchate.

But because Cyril had published his confession from the opinion of the Reformed, the Bishops of Greece and the Orientals opposed him. And among them (as reported by Isaac Habert, Doctor of the Sorbonne, in the Pontifical of the Greek Church) Caryophilus, the Archbishop of Iconium, who speaks thus: "To delete transubstantiation is the crown of blasphemies; it is to openly show oneself a Traitor of the Oriental Church, an Apostate from Apostolic preaching, etc. This is among Orientals the solid, immutable, and Apostolic faith, that the mystery is accomplished through conversion."

The same Caryophilus reports various arguments against Cyril, which are not to be neglected at this place, so that everyone may understand how much the opinion of the Greek Church differs from the opinion of the Protestants.

I. "A Sacrament consists of word and element, therefore the element of the Eucharist will be bread and wine: what then will the word be? For if the word in the Sacraments signifies the action which is done, as is clear in baptism, the word of the Eucharist

to signify the operation which is done, will indeed be such: I take the body of Christ; But not even Satan has ever dared to say this."

II. "Baptism exhibits the real and substantial presence, both of the baptizer and of the baptized, and of the matter of baptism, water through which ablution is done, and of that, which is continuously signified through baptism, namely regeneration: In a diverse manner, therefore, and not synonymously: Therefore these words 'Take, this is my body,' signify in the tradition the real and substantial presence of that, which is continuously signified through the tradition, namely the body of the Lord."

III. "The Oriental Holy Fathers with one voice teach, all after the sanctification of the venerable gifts, that under the species and symbols which are seen, Christ Himself is present truly, really, substantially."

IV. "It is evident that by the common consensus of the Holy Fathers, the mystery of the Liturgy is called an unbloody sacrifice. But sacrifice is the offering of a living thing: But it is not living, unless what is contained under the species, otherwise to call mere bread a sacrifice is both false and unworthy of the right manner of speaking of the Fathers: The Eucharist would assume only the reason of Communion, but by no means of an unbloody sacrifice." And he proves this extensively from the Liturgy of Basil and Chrysostom, about which he says: "It is manifest that the mystery of the Liturgy was handed down to Christians by the Apostles."

V. "But what will the Calvinists say to the Liturgy of the presanctified, in which it is held that Christ rests upon the altar?"

VI. "To teach presence, but such as faith exhibits to them, is to teach the presence of the absent: it is entirely the same as if someone were to say: to sup is no different from imagining supping."

VII. "Why would the Greeks impart Communion to newborn children from the East? For faith cannot provide the presence of Christ to newly born children; otherwise what they offer to the lips of the newly born would indeed be a drop of wine: but if you want that to be communion, call milk from the breast Communion also."

VIII. "From where does it seem impossible to the Calvinists that the fountain of miracles, the Savior Himself, both sits at the right hand of the Father, and at the same time is contained in the sacred signs?"

IX. "The transubstantiation of bread does not teach such a presence: Which transubstantiation to delete, he proves to be the crown of blasphemies."

X. "Neither Nestorius, nor the Monothelites, nor the Iconoclasts, nor any of the heresies arisen in the East, denied Transubstantiation and substantial presence."

XI. "Among Orientals, not only the Orthodox, but also heretics, 'This is my body,' has always been understood simply, according to its most proper signification." Which he proves with the testimonies of Basil, Chrysostom, etc.

XII. "If those words were understood according to translation explained through faith, how would He not have explained it to the scandalized Jews? Although this also would be unworthy of the wisdom of God, if the Calvinists spoke the truth. For how would it have been fitting for our Savior, casting the seeds of right faith, not to hand down the most congruent explanation of so great a mystery in a bare and clear manner, but to give occasion gratuitously for useless scandal, because of which many of the disciples went back?"

XIII. "The rightness of grammatical construction will compel this very meaning: For there figurative sense has a place, where two substantive nouns are used, as 'The Rock was Christ,' for by such nouns is expressed the concurrence of things differing in nature. Therefore they are to be taken tropically, just as also 'the seed is the word of God; riches are solitudes and pleasures of life.' etc. But where the proposition is expressed through a demonstrative pronoun, since not the concurrence of two things, but the demonstration of one thing is signified, it is not necessary to gather the sense tropically, as here: 'This is my beloved Son: this is the Disciple who bears testimony': and in similar cases. If, therefore, the Savior had said, 'This bread is my body,' there would perhaps be some excuse for the Calvinist Mystics for thinking badly in appearance. But since He said, 'This is my body,' He cut off all excuse." And it is clear that the Emphasis of property, and the tradition of the Apostles, and the genuine faith of the Catholic Church, and the perpetual use of the sacred Liturgy, and the unanimous determination of the Doctors, forces us to believe that no other sense is in the Lord's words, it is clear, besides that which is designated according to the letter." And he confirms this with the testimony of Chrysostom.

XIV. "What great thing would it be to eat common bread, and imagine Christ? The Hebrews when they received manna more precious than bread, had that indeed in the mouth, but Christ in the mind, whom they then expected, so that Manna was the Eucharist for the Jews; for what difference is there between thinking of Christ who was to come, or who has already come, if thought according to faith constitutes the Sacrament of Christ?"

XV. "If to believe is to communicate, and the action of faith is the action of communion, so that with faith established Christ is present, but with it removed He is absent, how does Judas, says Chrysostom, oration on the traitor, being an unfaithful traitor, communicate in the holy sacrifice?"

Caryophilus adds two things by way of objection and solution: "1. Nor indeed let a thought arise in anyone that the divine body is torn and mangled in communion. It is not necessary from the fact that it is substantially received, that it be ground by the teeth and divided: for this is to understand the mystery carnally, sensibly, perversely; but again from the fact that it is not ground by the teeth, it is not licit to conclude that it is not substantially present, but is understood only by the sense of the mind; for the body is present in the manner of substance neither natural nor sensible: for just as on the cross the body of Christ was indeed fixed, but the divinity

of Christ was not; so in the Eucharist the symbols are ground by the teeth, but what is contained by the symbols remains impassible."

"2. But it is not seen, as Aristotle says, 2 de anima, c. 6, a man is seen accidentally, because he is seen through accidents: thus through coverings, that is, accidents, not in existence, but surrounding, Christ is seen, and the most divine mystery is veiled by surrounding coverings."

Here let the Reformed consider whether their Masters are consistent with themselves, when they say that the doctrine of transubstantiation is a fundamental error; when they say that the Greek Church does not err in fundamentals, which nevertheless teaches transubstantiation. Or perhaps it contains a fundamental error, when they dispute against Catholics; and does not contain a fundamental error, so that they may seem to glory deservedly in their consensus with the Greeks? Thus John Hus held and taught transubstantiation; and yet among the Reformed he is a witness of truth.

CHAPTER XXXVI. On the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The Reformed in England establish in many things the same order of the Mass which is observed among Catholics, according to the book of public prayers or ecclesiastical ministry. But they call all that office Liturgy, a Greek word, which we call Mass in Latin.

The Augsburg Confession, treating of the Mass, says that it is not abolished among Lutherans, but retained and celebrated with the utmost reverence, almost all the customary ceremonies being preserved.

John Hus held the Sacrifice of the Mass, and indeed propitiatory, for the living and the dead. Treatise on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, ch. 1, fol. 39, ch. 4, fol. 40.

The Oriental Church, as always, so now holds the same doctrine of the Mass, which they call the Liturgy. For this was unanimously acknowledged by Orientals and Occidentals, as is evident from the definition of the Council of Florence.

It pleases to add the opinion of the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah treating of the Sacred Liturgy: "We explain this whole matter thus. The Christian sacred Liturgy and what sacred mysteries it contains are left to us. How tremendous these arcana are, and how sacrifices to placate God for our sins have value. God Himself has shown, etc., how much more Christ offered us sacrifice and oblation and reconciled us with His Parent, so entirely more with hope and confidence, to recognize the mysteries. Bread is changed into the very body of Christ, and indeed this wonderful bread descended from heaven: but bread which is pure and simple is given for mystical use. This matter is not brief for us. As it descended from Heaven it is dispersed, the word in truth itself truly and really in the body of Christ. Therefore as in the heavens visibly Christ sacred to God prayers confect on the altar is offered for us. But that for us in the sacred Liturgy likewise the memory of Saints, for their

intercession of Saints communication, sacrifice and immolation donating and giving. He who is a calumniator of mystical sacred things. How great this solemnity of mysteries is, that it looks to itself in the soul as it would convert the body and made participant to us, impious people are inhibited from suspecting such holy things. These are the fountains, and the root of these mysteries. These fountains are set, and transmutation in the Holy Spirit, bread and wine, comes to us, and what immediately follows, the same perspiration and ministries of the Holy Apostles."

"Therefore the collation of all Ceremonies of the Sacred Liturgy was made by the Divine James the apostle Bishop of Jerusalem, abbreviated by St. Basil, then by St. Chrysostom: from whose books to this day we offer the mystical sacrifice; so that indeed in the great Lent, of sacred Easter; on Sundays, and certain other days, we read the Liturgy of the great Basil, and from it we examine the sacred mysteries of oblation, but on other days we follow the Divine Chrysostom. In two ways this divine Liturgy and this sacred mystery sanctifies us, in one way, by the very meditation, for which gifts are offered, or by the very oblation of the act, they sanctify the heart of those who offer, and the things for which they are offered. Finally they render those things for fathers: but in another way, by the sacred participation and communion itself, because to us verbatim and body they are. From which ways, the first inasmuch as it is common, happens and defends. But the second way is proper only to the truly, since the dead who are participants can neither eat nor drink more."

The Protestants see that the Liturgy is acknowledged by the Reformed of England, the Mass by the Lutherans; so that whatever is customarily raised about the word "Mass" is in vain. They see that John Hus, whom they want to be their predecessor, and a witness of truth, taught the same about the Mass that the Catholic Church now teaches. They see that the Oriental Church, not deviating from necessary truth, as it pleases them, in the present matter, does not dissent from the Western Church. And therefore we have related these things, so that with their animosity somewhat put aside, they may approach the understanding of the rest in a more settled frame of mind.

CHAPTER XXXVII. On the Antiquity of the Mass, Received by Authority.

That the Mass is the same thing as what the Greeks call Liturgy, is evident from the most approved authors; nor do we think this is to be denied by the Protestants.

Even as to the word, it is found that the Apostles celebrated the Mass, with St. Luke testifying about them, λειτουργουντες τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ νηστεύοντες, which is best translated: They themselves were celebrating the Liturgy to the Lord, or as Erasmus: they were sacrificing, or as the Vulgate version: But as they were ministering to the Lord, namely the ministry instituted by Christ Jesus, which is the sacrifice and celebration of the Liturgy.

In the Council of Chalcedon, which is the fourth general Council, and in which there were Greek and Latin Fathers, it is expressly read that they celebrated Liturgies, or Masses. Indeed, it is reported: "Stephen Presbyter in the morning, also celebrated

four Masses at night, communicated with me, and communicated to me as to a Bishop." Likewise: "In the petition of Ischyron, read in the Synod against Dioscorus Archbishop of Alexandria: He has been so daring, that even the grain which was proceeding to the Emperor, and the Churches of Libya, that province's radiation, and because that lord could not produce not except sides, he desecrated. Likewise: in a certain incantation themselves separated for this, not bearing most Christian Bishops, that them this time so libidiously incursion sacrifices and superstitions and letters diligently very much prosecuted ignorant of nothing. For when that probation in his Testament had laid open, that no quantity of money be furnished to the Monasteries and poor of the Egyptian Province, Dioscorus dispersed Theatrical persons, as from where that the good odor of sacrifice might ascend to God, etc. Behold the unbloody sacrifice customarily offered in the Church, and indeed for the dead."

Similarly in the second Council of Carthage, under the Pontificate of Celestine, in which St. Augustine also was present, it is said: "Christian confession, concerning elevation when celebration is not made by Presbyters, or whatever reconciliation in public Mass, let them know this is not lawful for Presbyters."

In the Ephesian Council, Cyril speaking on behalf of Pope Celestine says: "Holy in life, the body which is proposed, the sacrifice will suffice for the dead, and for the salvation of those who live well. And not only from communion, but rather as though for all saints to God proper oblation of all is offered and made."

In the third Carthaginian Council, in which St. Augustine was also present, it is said: "That Sacraments be celebrated only by those men who have legitimately received holy orders. After the example of the Lord, whether of Bishops, or of Clerics of sacred office, without the license of the Bishop or his superior, let them not presume to perform the sacrifice."

Behold again in another general Council; and two Provincial ones, both sacrifice, and commendation of the dead, and the name of Mass. Similar things can be seen in St. Leo, Epistle 81, ch. 2, p. 416, Justinian, Novel 7, ch. 11, and Novel 59, and the Reformed Godefroy on the said places.

CHAPTER XXXVIII. The Catholic Opinion Concerning the Mass Is Proposed.

We hold with the Council of Trent, and the whole Catholic Church, 1. That the Mass is truly and properly a sacrifice. 2. That it is propitiatory for the living and the dead. That this may be rightly understood, it will be worthwhile to explain the same from Vasquez; so that the Protestants, who in the preceding have seen the opinion of the ancient Church, may more clearly perceive that the difficulty is not what they persuade themselves.

A sacrifice is a note existing in a thing, by which we profess God to be the author of life and death. There is a twofold kind of sacrifice: for some is absolute, namely that

which is not a commemoration of another sacrifice, such as the slaughter of cattle or the consumption of some other thing: but another can be called relative, or commemorative. Such is the sacrifice of the altar, which can be called commemorative; although in this no change is made of the thing, which is offered in this way, nevertheless a true signification and note of divine omnipotence is found as in the absolute sacrifice, and thus the true nature of sacrifice befits it no less than the bloody and absolute sacrifice.

I say that the action of consecration is a sacrifice, or an action of immolating, only insofar as through it, it is effected that by the very consecrated body and blood of Christ and really contained there, His bloody sacrifice, which was offered on the cross, is represented.

Although an absolute sacrifice, that is, not commemorative of another, requires a change of the thing offered, nevertheless change is not the formal reason of sacrifice, but what is necessarily required on the part of its matter; but the reason of sacrifice is formally placed in the signification of the Omnipotence of God, the author of life and death; and therefore if there is any oblation, through which, without a true and real change of the thing offered, God the author of life and death can be denoted and worshipped, it ought to be called truly and properly a sacrifice: but of such a kind is the consecration of the body and blood of Christ, without a real change of Christ Himself, for the sake of the representation alone of His death; therefore it will be truly and properly a sacrifice.

But it is manifest that through the representation alone of the death of Christ in consecration, God the author of life and death is signified just as through the bloody death of Christ itself; For the commemoration of the future death of Christ, such as was made in consecration by Christ Himself in the Last Supper, or of past death, such as is made by any Priest consecrating after the death of Christ, by the very fact that it represents the death of Christ and makes it as if present, denotes God the author of life and death, as if then Christ were killed in reality in honor of God; and for this reason for the essence of sacrifice universally the change of the thing offered is not required, because commemorative sacrifice can be without it, although for the essence of absolute sacrifice it is necessary, because the formal reason of sacrifice, which is signification not in words, but in things, by which God the author of life and death is denoted, is found without such a change in commemorative sacrifice. Nevertheless it is very much to be observed for commemorative sacrifice, which is called truly and properly a sacrifice, that it is not enough if it is only a naked sign of the death of some thing in no way containing in itself the thing itself, whose death is represented; for thus the thing whose death is represented would not be said to be offered in sacrifice, nor truly a commemorative sacrifice, but rather only a sign and a mask of sacrifice, but it is necessarily required that the thing itself whose death is represented be a sign of the death of itself: for example: If the opinion were true which denies that under the species of bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, and the substance of bread and wine were there, the death of Christ could

indeed be represented, but Christ would be offered in sacrifice not truly and in reality, but only in figure, and thus would be said not only to die in figure and similitude alone, but also to be immolated; for in what way can that be said to be offered in sacrifice truly and in reality, around which the action of the offering priest is engaged not in reality, but only in a certain similitude and in figure? But since Christ Himself is under the species of bread and wine, and around Him the action itself of the offering priest is so engaged, that He Himself through the species of bread and wine from the particular way in which He is consecrated by the Priest, represents the bloody and real death of Himself, and by that representation denotes God the author of life and death, although He is not said to be killed and to die in reality and truly, but in figure and similitude alone, nevertheless He is said to be immolated and offered in sacrifice truly and in reality. These are the words of Vasquez.

But what is more easily believed than such a commemorative sacrifice, after the real presence of Christ under the species of bread and wine is believed? For the Priest, as often as he consecrates, offers such a commemorative sacrifice; since it is said separately in Scripture, "This is my body," "This is my blood"; and separately, "Do this in memory of me," namely of the passion and death.

As for the Doctrine of propitiation; we note from the same Vasquez, The Merit of the sacrifice of the cross and the passion of Christ was of infinite value, and that was more than sufficient for our redemption, and therefore there is no need of another immolation and sacrifice, nor of its repetition, either in the same or another way, that Christ may merit for us the grace of our redemption. And in this sense Paul in Hebrews 10, opposing Christ to the Levitical Priests, who repeated the same hosts and sacrifices more often, v. 11, because the merit and universal cause of our Redemption was not in them, said of Him, "For by one offering he has perfected for ever those who are sanctified." v. 14, that is, He has sufficiently merited their redemption. But that Christ is immolated daily in another way, namely the unbloody, on the altar, derogates nothing from the dignity of the death of Christ Himself; for by that kind of sacrifice Christ does not merit, and thus it is not the universal cause of our Redemption, but a particular one, through which, as through the sacraments, Christ wanted the fruit of His universal merit to be applied to us. For what Calvin says, that for applying the fruit of the cross this sacrifice is superfluous, since there are also other means by which it can be applied, is frivolous. For by the same reasoning it would be proved that Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, as celebrated by them, are superfluous, because there are other means by which the merit of Christ's passion can be applied, and faith, which Christ merited for us, can be excited by the preaching of the word. And what, I ask, can several means in the Church, by which the merit of Christ is variously applied to us, harm? Add that it pertained maximally to the worship of Religion, to worship God by some kind of oblation, which would properly be a sacrifice; but among the rest this was most fitting in memory of the bloody sacrifice, by which Christ merited our redemption.

The same Vasquez says, this sacrifice does not have power like a Sacrament, not only of remitting mortal sins, but not even venial ones, or of conferring grace or an increase of justification, but only of obtaining the help of grace, by which one may be protected both from mortal and venial sins, and man may be able to grow in his justification, or of obtaining the spirit of penance and contrition, through which sins are remitted to us; or other holy motions of the soul, through which man may be able to grow in justification.

Thus the Sacrifice of the Mass is somewhat less propitiatory than the sacraments, or even contrition; since although by these immediately and directly sins are remitted to us, and thus God becomes propitious to us: not so through the sacrifice of the Mass. And in this way, namely through impetration, faith and prayer are propitiatory, because these impetrate contrition.

This sacrifice impetrates the remission of temporal punishment due to sins for the living and the dead. For since this sacrifice, according to the Apostolic tradition, can be offered for the dead, and it can profit them in no way except by remitting temporal punishment, it is to be granted that it profits the living also in the same way.

In the same work of sacrifice, as also in the Sacraments, we ought diligently to observe by reason of merit, or the dignity which the work receives from the operator himself, because he is just, and it is done rightly by him, that is according to the norm of virtue, and the work itself in itself, insofar as it is according to divine institution, and because in this way it does not receive dignity and power from the operator himself, but from the institution, therefore it is called the performed work, and as the performed work, to have so much virtue. In the first way, because then the work of the one offering is meritorious, and for this reason it is also impetratory for another. But when it is said to be propitiatory as a work performed, we understand it to have power also performed of dignity, notwithstanding the act of the propitiatory person and the good of the offerer himself, but as it is instituted by Christ, that from the effect of oblation, God would confer these or other gifts, not expecting the dignity of the offerer of the sacrifice, the sanctity and moral goodness of his action, but the institution of Christ, which He wanted to accompany the thing itself of oblation, because of its exceptional excellence.

CHAPTER XXXIX. Proofs from the Holy Fathers for the Mass through Scripture.

St. Irenaeus proves the sacrifice of the Mass through various places of Holy Scripture: "Christ then taking that which of the creation is bread, gave thanks, saying: this is my body: Similarly the cup which is of that creation which is according to us, He confessed to be His blood: And He taught the new oblation of the New testament." Luke 22:19-20, Matthew 16:26, Mark 14:21, and 1 Cor. 11:24.

There follows another proof: "Which (oblation) the Church, receiving from the apostles, offers to God in the whole world." Thus the Church received the understanding of Holy Scripture, as to oblation, from the Apostles.

A third is added: "Concerning which in the twelve Prophets Malachi says: 'I have no pleasure in you, says the Lord Almighty, and I will not accept sacrifice from your hands, because from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is glorified among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure sacrifice, because my name is great among the Gentiles, says the Lord Almighty': most manifestly signifying by these, that indeed the former people ceased to offer to God, but in every place sacrifice is offered to God, and this a pure one, and His name is glorified among the Gentiles."

Fifth proof: "Which the Lord, willing us to offer with all simplicity and innocence, preached, saying: When therefore you offer your gift at the altar and you remember that your brother has anything against you, leave your gift at the altar, and go first to be reconciled to your brother, and then returning you shall offer your gift at the altar."

Nor let the Protestants say that St. Irenaeus indeed teaches Sacrifice, but he does not add that it is true and proper: For words are to be taken in their proper and customary signification, unless the contrary is proved: St. Irenaeus also compares the sacrifice of the New law with the sacrifices of the old Testament, to which the nature of true and proper sacrifice indubitably belongs. Indeed, treating of the same matter of prophecy, he distinguishes between incense and sacrifice, that in every place incense is offered, and a pure sacrifice: But John says that incense is the prayers of the Saints, which nevertheless are sacrifice improperly. Consequently, when Malachi adds, and a pure sacrifice, both the Prophet and Irenaeus understand a true and proper sacrifice.

St. Cyprian proves the same truth by various places of Holy Scripture: "It is not lawful to break or to change by human tradition into something other than what has been divinely instituted. For if Jesus Christ our Lord and God, Himself is the high Priest of God the Father, and Himself first offered sacrifice to God the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of Him, certainly that Priest truly functions in the place of Christ, who imitates what Christ did; and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, if he begins to offer thus, according to what he sees that Christ Himself offered." This proof is taken from the institution of Christ, Luke 22:19, and 1 Cor. 11:24, etc.

There follows another proof: "In the Priest Melchisedech we see the Sacrament of the Lord's sacrifice prefigured, according to what divine Scripture testifies and says: 'Melchisedech King of Salem brought forth bread and wine; for he was a Priest of the most high God' and he blessed Abraham. The Holy Spirit declares that Melchisedech carried the type of Christ, in the Psalms from the person of the Father saying to the Son, 'Before the daystar I begot you: The Lord has sworn and will not

repent, You are a Priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech.' What is the order of Melchisedech, whom the Lord shows to have blessed between himself and Abraham? For who is a greater Priest of the most high God than the Lord, who offered this sacrifice to God the Father? By this order any priest will remain, and will offer a clean oblation before him: For the first true offering through Melchisedech, and therefore through him he blessed Abraham, through whom a greater sacrifice than bread and wine, which Scripture testifies was brought forth by the same Melchisedech, remains prefigured in the type of the future sacrifice of the Lord? The same oblation fulfilled the prefiguration of our blood."

Here is the third proof: "But also through Solomon the Holy Spirit shows beforehand the type of the Lord's sacrifice, with the host immolated, of bread and wine, but also of the Altar, and of apostolic ministers: 'Wisdom,' he says, 'has built herself a house, and has placed under it seven columns, she has immolated her hosts, she has mixed wine in her bowl, and has prepared her table': he declares mixed wine, and that is the cup of the Lord mixed with water and wine to be announced by the voice of prophecy."

The fourth establishes propitiation for the dead from the practice of the whole Church: "Our bishops healthfully preaching before them a certain but not contemptible, for the protection or care of Clerics, offering for the same their sacrificial hosts, and memories for sleep which are celebrated. Nor would it suffice for them to have read this name here and there, but as often as he has come to the Altar, let the Priest remember his Masses and readings obligated from the Lord's day. Let this be confirmed to the Presbyter then by his Guardian, for the dead from public offices memory to be openly demonstrated in one and to be frequented in the Church. Nothing can be said more manifestly."

St. Optatus: "What is so sacrilegious as to break, scrape, remove the Altars of God (on which you also offered), on which the vows of the people and the members of Christ have been carried? Altars, I say, on which the Savior did not command the gifts of brotherhood to be placed, unless they were of peace: 'Put down,' he says, 'your gift before the altar, and first be reconciled with your brother' that the Priest may be able to offer for them. For what is an Altar, if not the seat of the body and blood of Christ?"

A similar proof is had from St. Paul: "We have an Altar, from which those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat." where according to St. Chrysostom Hom. 33, page 1964. Theodoret Vol. 3, page 460. "This," he says, "is the mode of the old prefiguration. That expresses rational hosts; this rational hosts and divine. Therefore there is no rumor of heretical Priests participation, unless he has first received faith in the Lord."

Note, however, how the Altar in the Epistle to the Hebrews is called in Greek θυσιαστήριον, just as in the Dictionary of Henry Stephen himself testifies, it signifies

sacrifice made to God, come and return thanks and laughter, in this way the word, Altar, is accustomed to be taken in Holy Scripture.

Thus also it is said in the Council of Chalcedon: "The Council now coming together from the number of the sun in the Church of the Holy Martyr Euphemia, and with Stephen referring in the middle before the candles of the Most Holy Altar, δυσιασίριον."

In the same way speaks the second Council of Carthage: "If perchance any Presbyter, corrected or excommunicated by his Bishop, puffed up with pride, has thought that sacrifices are to be offered separately to God, or that another Altar is to be erected, against Ecclesiastical Faith and Discipline, let him not go unpunished." The word Altar, the Greeks in the Code of Canons translated as δυσασίειον. And everywhere in Councils and Latin Fathers mention is made of an Altar, and in Greek δυστασίριον, for the place, or seat, where a true and proper external sacrifice is offered. Therefore since in Matthew 5 and Hebrews 13 mention is made of an Altar, it is to be understood as the place in which a proper and true sacrifice is offered, according to the ordinary signification of the word: And if an explanation is offered, the Councils and Fathers will determine the same with us, whose opinions are deservedly to be preferred to novel glosses.

St. Chrysostom, treating of the word of the Apostle, "You cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of demons," says thus: "You have spoken very faithfully and terribly; for what he says is this, That which is in the Chalice, is that which flowed from the side, and that we receive. Therefore if you desire blood, he says, do not redden the altar of idols with the slaughter of brute animals, but let my Altar be reddened with my blood. And in the old indeed, because what they offered was more imperfect, the blood which they offered to idols, he himself endured so that he might distinguish them from those; but here in that which is far more honorable and most magnificent, he established sacrifice, and changing life itself, and offers them participation of his body. And, You see what kind of flesh they make: Are not those who eat sacrifices partakers of the Altar, but he does not say that they are partakers of God, but are reserved at the Altar. But in the body of Christ it is not so. But how? It is the communion of the body of Christ, for we are partakers not of the Altar, but of Christ himself. The purpose of those who sacrifice, and the person of those who receive, renders impure those things which are set forth. That terrible and formidable sacrifice calls us to unity with our brothers, commanding that we approach it with the greatest concord; You do not see the body of Christ in a manger, but on an Altar, not a woman holding him, but a Priest standing by, and the spirit with great abundance bestowing itself on what is set forth. Not only do you see this body itself, etc." Similar things St. Chrysostom has in many places, whose books on the Priesthood should be seen.

Before, however, we depart from him, one thing must be added, from which it may be made manifest what he thinks about propitiatory sacrifice: "Let the sinner have

departed, it is fitting, he says, that he be helped by Prayer, Alms, Oblations. This is not rashly devised, nor do we in vain celebrate the memory of the Dead during the sacred Mysteries, or approach on their behalf that Lamb lying there, who takes away the sins of the world, beseeching, but that some consolation may be for them from this. Nor does he who stands at the Altar rashly cry out, during the dreadful mysteries: For all those sleeping in Christ, and for those who celebrate their memory, we pray. For if Job purged his free children with the father's sacrifice, why should you doubt that when we make supplication for the dead, some comfort will come to others? It can gratify God, let him approach the dead first both by bringing help to those below, and by offering prayers for them, for a common satisfaction of the world lies there. Why, therefore, do you grieve, when so many reasons exist for obtaining pardon for the dead?"

St. Augustine: "In the books of the Maccabees we read that sacrifice was offered for the dead. But even if it were nowhere at all read in the old Scriptures; the authority of this custom is not small, where in the prayers of the Priest which are poured out to the Lord God at his Altar, the commendation of the dead also has its place." Again: "Nor is it to be denied that the souls of the dead are relieved by the piety of their living ones, when the Sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them."

CHAPTER XL. On the Order and Ceremonies of the Mass.

The complete order can be seen in the Liturgies of Saints Chrysostom and Basil. We do not want to relate much about the Mass of the Catechumens, which was the first part of the ordinary Mass, after which the Catechumens were dismissed from the Church; containing certain prayers, the reading of the Epistle, the recitation of the Gospel and the Symbol; which was followed by the Homily or Sermon; because about these there is no or slight difficulty with the Protestants.

The Mass of the faithful, which St. Cyril of Jerusalem reports and explains, we will briefly add: "You have seen the Deacon offering water for washing hands to the Priest, and to those Presbyters who were standing around the Altar of God. Washing hands is a symbol of not being subject to sins."

"Then the Deacon cries out, 'Be completed and kiss one another': this kiss is a sign of the reconciliation of souls: therefore Christ, Matthew 5:21, 'When you offer your gift at the Altar, etc.,' concerning which 1 Peter 5:14, 'In the kiss of love.'"

"After this, the Sacrificer cries out 'Lift up your hearts'; You respond: 'We have them to the Lord'; then the Sacrificer says; 'Let us give thanks to the Lord'; to this you add, 'It is worthy and just.' Then we make mention of the Angels, Archangels, Powers, Dominions, etc. We also remember those Cherubim of Isaiah 6:2. 'Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of Sabaoth.' After these spiritual hymns, we invoke God to send the Holy Spirit upon the things set forth, to make the bread indeed the body of Christ; but the wine the blood of Christ, for entirely whatever the Holy Spirit touches, this is sanctified and transmuted."

"Then, with this spiritual host having been accomplished (or elevated), this unbloody worship, we beseech God over that victim of propitiation, for the common peace of the Churches, for the good state of the world, for Kings, for soldiers, for the sick and afflicted, in sum for all those who need help."

"We ask you all, and we offer this host to you, that we may also remember those who have fallen asleep before us, first of Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that God may receive our supplication through their prayers and intercessions."

"Afterward we pray for the deceased Bishops and all who have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great help to the souls, for whom the supplication of this holy and most tremendous sacrifice is offered; which helps much, because we offering prayers for the dead to it, although they are sinners, we offer Christ slain for our sins, propitiating for them and us the lover of men."

"Then we say that Prayer, which the Savior gave to His Disciples: Our Father who art in heaven, etc. When the Prayer is completed, you say, Amen." He reports and explains the whole Lord's Prayer.

"After this the Sacrificer says, 'Holy things to the holy'; holy are the things which are set forth, which have received the coming of the Holy Spirit. etc. You have heard then the one exhorting you to communion of the sacred mysteries, 'Taste and see that the Lord is sweet.' Psalm 33:9. Is it with the bodily palate that you judge this? By no means, but with faith free of all doubt: for those who taste are commanded to taste, not bread and wine, but the antitype body and blood of Christ. But coming, do not approach with the palms of the hands expanded, nor with separated fingers, but making the left hand a Throne for the right, as it will receive the King, and with a hollow hand receive the body of Christ, saying, Amen. With security therefore, sanctifying your eyes by the contact of the holy body, communicate. Coming, do not lose anything of this; for if you let something fall, this you would lose as it were from your own member. For tell me: If someone gave you gold filings, would you not hold them with all diligence, taking care lest you lose anything of them? Will you not therefore much more with the greatest diligence provide about this which is more precious than gold and precious stones, lest a crumb of it fall from you? Then indeed after the Communion of the body of Christ approach also to the Cup of the blood, not extending your hands, but prone and in the manner of adoration, saying, Amen."

"Lastly, when the prayer is completed, give thanks to God, who has made you worthy of such great mysteries."

"Retain these immaculate traditions, and preserve yourselves without offense."

In St. Ambrose indeed there is not found such a distinct order of the entire Mass, as he professedly only proves the real presence and the transformation of the symbols of bread and wine; nevertheless the principal part of the Canon, against which the Protestants are accustomed to clamor, is found.

He therefore says: "Do you want to know that it is consecrated by heavenly words? Receive what the words are. The Priest says; make this oblation for us ascribed, reasonable, acceptable, which is in the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, (for it becomes bread before consecration) who the day before He suffered, in His holy hands He took bread, looked up to heaven to you holy Father Almighty eternal God, giving thanks, He blessed, He broke, and gave the broken to His Apostles, saying: Take and eat of this all of you: for this is my body, which is given for you: Similarly also the Cup after He had supped, that is, the day before He suffered, He took, He looked up to heaven to you holy Father Almighty eternal God, giving thanks, He blessed, He gave to His Apostles saying: Take and drink of it all of you: for this is my blood. See, all those words are from the Evangelist up to Take, whether body or blood; from there the words are Christ's: Take, drink of it all of you; for this is my blood. See the details. The day before, He says, He suffered, in His holy hands He took bread: Before, therefore, it is consecrated, it is bread: but where the words of Christ have come, it is the body of Christ; finally to the one saying, Take and eat of it all of you, this is my body: And before the words of Christ, the Cup is full of wine and water; where the words of Christ have operated, there the blood is made which redeemed the people. Therefore see in how many ways the word of Christ is powerful to convert all things: Then the Lord Jesus Himself testifies to us that we receive His body and blood; Ought we not to have doubt about His faith and testimony?"

"Again; And the Priest says: Therefore mindful of His most glorious Passion, and Resurrection from the dead, and Ascension into heaven, we offer you this immaculate host, this holy bread, and the Cup of eternal life: and we request and pray, that you receive this Oblation on your sublime Altar by the hands of your Angels, as you have deigned to receive the gifts of your boy Abel, and the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and what the High Priest Melchizedek offered to you."

CHAPTER XLI. On the Adoration of Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist.

The Council of Trent teaches: "If anyone says that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist Christ is not to be adored with the worship of latria, including external worship, etc., let him be anathema." Nor has it said in another sense: "The worship of latria, which is due to the true God, should be given to this Most Holy Sacrament." For it speaks of absolute adoration, which cannot be feigned as twofold; and therefore it is added: "For we believe that same God to be present, whom the eternal Father, bringing into the world, says: 'And let all the angels of God adore Him,' whom the Magi, prostrating themselves, adored." Catholics frequently understand Christ present in the Most Holy Eucharist by the name of Sacrament, because He is the cause.

Some Reformed pretend that Catholics adore the Sacramental species with adoration not due to God, and in this they do a great injury to men, since this is a completely invented fiction. The Council of Trent has nothing about the relative adoration of the Symbols. Scholastics differ variously about the difference, certain

ones through their opinions are not to be held as articles of faith. Moreover, that honor of the King is true; if they say that Christ is covered with Symbols. Certainly it is impossible for the King to be honored, and his garments to be stripped off: here frivolous thoughts seem to be applied, and the Symbols sufficiently truly, that no reverence of faith should ever be called.

That Christ is to be adored in the Holy Eucharist, as in Baptism, the Reformed concede: who also teach that honor may lawfully be given to the words of Holy Scripture. To dispute much about the mode and names of this honor is useless here; since no one attributes or can attribute absolute adoration to the Sacramental species; and all confess that they, as certain coverings or signs of Jesus Christ, are to be treated with honor. The Lutherans teach that Christ existing in the bread may lawfully be adored there as God. Scheibler, in *fid. Antig. Cath. de Euchar. cap. 7, art. 7, §3, n. 67, p. 438; and 69, 548, 439. The Theologians of Wittenberg, Refutation of Orthodox Confession, p. 670. The Greeks elevate and adore the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, Florimond de Ramond lib. 5, ch. 12, p. 587. But if Christ is lawfully adored there, as must be said entirely, what, I ask, do they reproach in Catholics?*

CHAPTER XLIII. On Communion Under One Species.

The Protestants hold that Christ ordered that both species be offered to the people approaching communion. But those who teach that for those absent only the species of bread is lawful, how will they maintain that there is a divine precept, concerning Communion under both species? Those who teach that the Church does not have the power to dispense in a divine precept; do not dispense in it themselves, when they permit communion under one species to their absent members: but rather they say that there is no divine precept of Communicating under both species. Those who teach that it is necessary to exclude from the observance of the precept, but not to give license to transgress the precept: how is it permitted to permit, that they deny license to the absent to prohibit, who exhibit precedents to us in needy ways. Those who teach that in necessity for wine, it is lawful to use either, they need no excuse, why the communion of their absent ones under one species, not seeing any precept. The Greeks themselves frequently communicate under one species. Florimond de Remond, book 4, chapter 5, page 422.

Let the Protestants also consider how they themselves hold that under one species the whole Christ is received. The Reformed say that Christ nourishes us with the substance of his body and blood. But the substance of the body and blood of Christ is always united; for Christ now does not die. And therefore we are nourished by both; which the Reformed also establish, when they want us to lift up our hearts to heaven, to have the truth of the Sacrament, where Jesus Christ is in the glory of his Father. But there Christ is entirely, who may entirely nourish us, and the elevation of the heart would be blasphemous, if it were directed to the body of Christ, as if dead. The Lutherans also teach: that under one species the whole Christ is present, the whole Christ is received, with body and blood. Therefore all the complaint of the

Protestants is about one drop of wine alone, not difficult to put to rest, with the Church indulging, if they would approach in the rest.

CHAPTER LXIII. On Extreme Unction.

The Council of Trent teaches: "If anyone says that Extreme Unction is not truly and properly a Sacrament, instituted by Christ and promulgated by the Blessed Apostle James, let him be anathema."

And it uses this proof: "This holy Unction of the sick was instituted as a true and proper Sacrament of the New Testament by Christ; in Mark indeed chapter 6, and by the Apostle James in the place cited, commended and promulgated to the faithful. 'Is anyone sick among you? Let him bring in the Presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith will save the sick person,' and elsewhere receiving from tradition by hand, the Church says, the oil of Unction, which is sanctified in Christ, that it may be the sealing of the Sacrament."

What can be desired in this proof, we do not see. For a sensible thing, the matter, is found. A promise is found and the remission of sin is attached, which is not except through grace. Why therefore would it not be a Sacrament; when authority, matter, and promise have instituted the Sacrament? And how will the Protestants prove either Baptism or the Eucharist to be a Sacrament, if this proof is not manifest and efficacious?

CHAPTER LXIV. On the Sacrament of Orders.

The Council of Trent teaches, that Sacred Ordination is truly and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord.

Calvin says: "The imposition of hands, by which the introduction as it were of presbyters and Ministers of the Church into their state is made, I do not object that it may be held by us as a Sacrament, for it is very near to the institution through the sacred Scripture, to a certain imposition of hands, and of St. Paul, that is, a sign of the Spiritual grace of God. That I have not counted it among the doubtful, from where if it is I have not noticed, from where if it is I have not noticed, from where if it is I have not noticed, from where if it is I have not noticed, from where if it is I have not noticed, from where if it is I have not noticed, from where if it is I have not noticed, from where if it is I have not noticed."

Whence it is said in the Gallican Confession: "We confess only two Sacraments" and it is added: "For the whole Church in communion."

Calvin's proof from St. Paul is good: "Do not neglect the grace that is in you, which was given to you through the imposition of hands of the presbytery." Behold the imposition of hands he imagines to be and grace with a clasp to calumniate.

Again Calvin proves: Christ breathed on the apostles, John 20:22, and through breathing gave them the Spirit, which at that time he retained: for having given to the Apostles the power of remitting sins. Why should the remission of sins not be?

Christ breathed, which breathing is a ceremony, is a sensible sign: And he said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," who is not given without sanctifying grace. Behold therefore grace annexed to the sign and a true Sacrament.

If this does not suffice for the Protestants; how will they prove either Baptism or the Eucharist to be a Sacrament? St. Augustine rightly says: "Let them explain how the Sacrament of the baptized cannot be lost, and the Sacrament of the ordained can be lost. For if each is a Sacrament, which no one doubts, why is the one not lost and the other lost? No injury is to be done to either Sacrament." Calovius: "The ordination of ministers is of Divine right, although some things have been added in the Papacy: nevertheless the essence of ordination has not been changed or removed." Synop. contr. disp. 33, th. 7, p. 183.

CHAPTER LXV. On the Sacrament of Matrimony.

The Council of Trent teaches that Matrimony is truly and properly a Sacrament. Baptism and the Eucharist are named Sacraments in Holy Scripture; where, however, Matrimony is thus called: "For this a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall be one flesh. This Sacrament is great, but I speak in Christ and in the Church."

The Geneva Bible and others have "Mystery." But Calvin rightly says: "The translator of the Latin Vulgate of the New Testament expounded with a sacred understanding, from where Greek, Mysterion, the Priest said to be called in Greek, Mysteria, that is, sacraments in the Church of God. Certainly therefore those who receive Baptism and the Supper as Sacraments, why do they reject Matrimony from that number?"

But let us hear St. Augustine: "In our marriages the holiness of the Sacrament is worth more than the fruitfulness of the womb." Again: "The Good of Marriage through all Nations and all men, in the cause of generating, etc., and in the faith of chastity, which extends to the people of God, also in the holiness of the Sacrament, through which it happens that even departing by divorce from another man, while the other lives, not even for the sake of a parent. Since it is only, which marriages are, of which neither in subsequent offspring which they become, is the Nuptial bond had, unless the custom of morals. Therefore while the bond of faith is made for the congregation to be gathered, as it is satisfied by abstinence itself, nevertheless it remains in some holiness of the Sacrament. It is a Sacrament. The Lord imposed Sacraments of the age to the extent that one allows another. To Sacraments it belongs that other: 'A wife not to depart from a man, but if she departs, to remain unmarried.' All these things are good, because of which Marriages are good, offspring, faith, Sacrament, etc."

CHAPTER XLVI. On Mortal and Venial Sin.

The Protestants teach with us that not all sins are equal: they also teach with us that the Predestined, after obtaining faith and justification, sometimes fall into mortal sins: they teach with us that all sins with which the reprobate die are punished with eternal punishment.

It is agreed that the remission of venial sin is a gratuitous and supernatural benefit of God: and no sin, from its own nature, is in that sense venial, as if its pardon and remission could be obtained by the powers of nature alone, without the mercy of God pardoning; since the guilt of no sin is so light that it can be washed away by the powers of nature; none, considered in itself, has anything that would merit remission.

The Catholics want venial sin to be subject only to temporal punishment, provided that the guilt is also washed away, or grace is present, by which it can be washed away and expiated: for unless it were committed by a just man, endowed with the grace and charity of God, it would be punished perpetually. But because those sins from their nature do not destroy charity; nor did God will that they should destroy it; they are called venial: although also because of the mercy of God, not willing charity to be destroyed by those sins, they are rightly called venial.

When, therefore, the Protestants say that venial sins are not imputed to the faithful, they do not mean by this that they are not constituted truly sinners by them, or that they do not need their remission, but that God does not impute all the punishment that He could justly impute, namely because He does not decree to remove inherent sanctity because of venial sins, nor consequently to ordain man to eternal punishment.

When the Protestants say that in the reprobate all sins are mortal, they mean that all those sins are punished eternally, with which they die, whether they are more serious or lighter.

When the Protestants say that sins are consistent with faith, they do not understand by faith the bare assent which is given to revealed truths, but by faith they accept the confidence of mercy, which confidence they so explain as to comprehend whatever the Catholics require for justification. And thus they rightly say that mortal sins are not consistent with such faith, which is accepted for confidence: they also rightly say that venial sins are consistent with such faith.

From what has been said, it is clear that the opinion of the Protestants in this matter can thus be taken not inconveniently, that it does not differ from Catholic doctrine; which will suffice for moderate minds. The punishment of all sin is temporal, spiritual, and eternal death. Cocceius, disp. 5, Corol. n. 2.

CHAPTER XLVII. God Is Not the Cause of Sin.

For many years a grave question was agitated: Whether the Protestants established God as the author of sin? And indeed in their public Confessions scarcely anything is found which leans to the affirmative side. The Protestants of this time most openly profess the negative, and the Reformed declare that they do not dissent from the Thomists. Whether the Protestants of earlier times established God as the author of sin, there is no need to inquire here. It suffices now that we know that none remain with whom that question may be agitated.

CHAPTER XLVIII. On the Sin of the First Man.

Here it is customary to ask: Why did God permit man to be tempted, whom He knew would fall? And the Protestants with the Catholics say, but probably (for who was the Counsellor of God?), that the mercy and justice of God required it, to be silent now about other reasons.

If it is asked: Whether the sin of Adam was necessary? the modern Protestants so explain themselves that they follow the opinion of the Thomists entirely. Nothing, therefore, remains in this place, from which they may bring a lawsuit against the Catholic Church, or why they should be reproached by Catholics for the harsher opinions or errors of certain individuals.

CHAPTER XLIX. On Original Sin.

The Protestants teach with the Catholics that sin worthy of the name is derived from the sin of Adam to his posterity. The Protestants teach with the Catholics 2. that Original sin comes to his posterity through generation. The Protestants teach with the Catholics 3. that Original sin pertains not only to the children of unbelievers, but also to the children of believers: although they want that sin not to be imputed to the children of believers, about which it was treated in the preceding. Consequently in the aforesaid three things there is no reason why the Protestants should abstain from Catholic communion.

CHAPTER L. Whether Concupiscence in the Renewed Is Truly Sin?

The Catholics teach that the corruption of nature, or concupiscence, such as remains in men after justification, is not sin from its nature truly and properly: since in Baptism is taken away all that which has the true and proper nature of sin. The Protestants hold the contrary.

But the same Protestants at this time so explain their opinion that scarcely any difficulty can remain. For they teach with the Catholics: 1. Original sin means the privation of justice that should be present. 2. Concupiscence resides not only in the flesh, that is in the inferior part of man, which is called sensual; but also in the superior part: and thus a similar vice is found in the soul. 3. Under the name of concupiscence is contained the depravation of human nature, to be overcome all of the powers, and propensity to evil, and thus concupiscence is not a simple privation, but a corrupt habit. See Calovius Synop. contr. disp. 7, thesis 1, p. 86.

The Protestants hold that the guilt and offense against God is pardoned in Baptism, while the matter of original sin, which is the corruption of nature inclining to evil, remains. Hence they teach that through Baptism original sin is not completely extinguished and uprooted, because indeed the guilt and offense is extinguished, uprooted, and taken away, while the material of the same sin remains, which sin is therefore said to be broken, weakened, and partly removed. Calixtus, however, says in his Dissertation on Purgatory, Thesis 32, Original sin after baptism remains both as to the formal and the material. But Crocius, Anti-Bec. contr. 8, sect. 3, n. 5, vol. 2, p. 11: The material remains, the formal is removed. The same pleased Bucer and

Melanchthon in the formula of Concord in Cassander on art. 2 of the Aug. Conf. in Consultation. Cocceius disp. 1, on power, script. corol. n. 20. Original sin is given, both imputed and inherent, which we say also has a place in the regenerate. And disp. 17, loc. n. 1. Original sin as to the stain also remains in the regenerate after baptism.

Therefore, if the Protestants teach with us that in baptism the formal of original sin is removed, constituting the mind turned away from God; the guilt and offense against God is abolished: they assent to the definition of the Council of Trent, that in Baptism all that is removed which has the true and proper nature of sin: for where there is not the formal of sin, there is nothing which is truly and properly sin. See St. Augustine, Enchiridion to Laurentius, ch. 48, Vol. 3, p. 74 c.

CHAPTER LI. On the Evils Consequent to Original Sin.

The evils which follow Original sin in this life either raise no difficulty between Catholics and Protestants, or pertain to other Controversies. It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that man, through the guilt of Original sin, not remitted in this life, is subject to damnation: and that to infants, not baptized, nor regenerated, eternal life is not to be attributed, or natural beatitude, as Bellarmine rightly proves in many places, book 6, on grace. See also St. Augustine, heresies 88, Vol. 6, p. 14 D. Enchiridion to Laurentius, ch. 93, Vol. 3, p. 9 D.

CHAPTER LII. On Grace and Its Division.

Grace is first taken for the love of someone: and thus we say that a soldier has the grace of the King, who is loved by the King. Secondly it is taken for a gift freely given; and thus we say, I do this grace to you. Thirdly it is taken for giving thanks for a benefit received. The second depends on the first; the third on the second.

In this place we are treating of grace, not insofar as by that word comes any benefit of God, but insofar as it signifies a supernatural gift, which is conferred on the unworthy from the merit of Christ.

The first division of grace is into eternal and temporal. Eternal grace consists in the love and dilection of God, by which from eternity He loved the predestined. Temporal consists in the benefits of Vocation and justification, derived as effects from a cause, making grace pleasing.

The second division is of temporary grace into grace freely given; and grace making pleasing: the former is conferred principally for the salvation of others; the latter for the spiritual salvation of each one. The Protestants want grace making pleasing to be said primarily to be the eternal grace of God: but it is a question of name; since eternal grace makes pleasing effectively, but temporal as an inherent form.

The third division is of grace making pleasing, into permanent grace, or habitual, and the grace of special help. The Protestants do not disapprove of the thing itself: but whether habitual grace, or inherent in any way makes pleasing, is not of this place.

The fourth division is of special help, into exciting help, and helping help. Nor do we want exciting grace to consist only in the illumination and inspiration of the mind, but also in a certain supernatural power, received in the will. But each of these graces is prevenient.

The fifth division both of exciting and of helping: is into sufficient and efficacious.

The sixth division of grace is of efficacious into operating and cooperating: although it may not be said inconveniently that operating and cooperating grace are the same, which is distinguished according to different effects.

Difficulty is accustomed to be raised about the fifth division of grace, by which it is divided into sufficient and efficacious. But since some of the Protestants follow the opinion of the Thomists, others the opinion of Suarez and Vasquez, there is not much work to be done here.

CHAPTER LIII. On the Communication of Grace.

What is truly and properly to be called sufficient grace, is felt in different ways both by Catholics and Protestants: and hence it happens that they speak in different ways about the communication of grace. We for the ordering of instruction will proceed through more certain and common things.

After Bellarmine we say first: The help of the grace of God is not so offered to all men, that God waits for men who desire it, or ask for it; but He comes before all desires, and all invocation.

Second, the help of the grace of God is not equally present to all.

Third, there is no iniquity in God, if not only to some, but even to all men, He has denied sufficient help for salvation.

Fourth, whether sufficient help is given to all, or only to some, nevertheless we ought not to despair of the salvation of anyone, who was in this life, nor should correction, exhortation, and other offices of charity be withdrawn from anyone.

For the rest, where there is no difficulty concerning the preceding, the question which lacks certainty would vary. And sufficient help for salvation is said to be that, from whose knowledge there is no doubt, concerning man who will come to obtain the end, not looking at supernatural and intrinsic sufficient help for producing immediately supernatural acts of faith and hope. But what kind of help is it, of which all are participants? To the Gentiles is given help, by which through several occasions of works they are excited to operate well, and that they may not consent to sin, with thoughts mutually accusing and defending; to which something of divine grace has been imparted, while they see the universe machine preaching God, who is to be invoked. And if the gentiles use that grace well, we do not doubt but that more abundant would be given to them, by which they could reach to faith. We do not say that the helps of grace are conferred on man operating well from free choice; as if God had made a law of giving helps of prevenient grace to those doing all that

is in them from the faculty of nature: but if man from special help would operate rightly, even concerning natural objects, we think it congruous to divine goodness, that He further illuminate such people. We concede therefore that the Gentiles do not receive the kind of graces which are proximately sufficient; but because they are not lacking in all help, even special, this grace is such, that God is rightly and truly thought not to deny what is sufficient, if they use this well. Whence it is not badly said that God gives sufficient grace to the Gentiles; not because it is immediately sufficient, but because by prior good cooperation, and divine further liberal conferral of grace they can arrive at conversion. See Arnobius book 2, Library of the Fathers, Vol. 3, p. 170 B. And the cited Bullinger in Necessary Responses, part 1, p. 120, 122. Overall *ibid.*, p. 146. Calovius Synopsis of Controversies, disp. 17, th. 4, p. 123.

CHAPTER LIV. On Predestination and Reprobation.

The Reformed in the Point of Predestination and Reprobation at this time commonly follow the Thomists and Bellarmine; nor do we scrupulously investigate what they have thought heretofore. From the Lutherans in the point of Predestination, some follow Bellarmine, others other Catholic Doctors: and the same happens to them in the point of Reprobation; because they mostly do not dissent from Catholic Doctors. Why, therefore, do they dispute with us in these times; if they agree with some Catholic Doctors? Perhaps they will say that their opinion is of the necessity of salvation; and that of certain Catholic Doctors is not to be permitted? We do not think so.

CHAPTER LV. On Free Will According to Itself

Free will is the faculty of acting according to counsel. And for liberty, intellect and will are required: intellect, which properly presents the object; will, which chooses one over another, or accepts or rejects one and the same thing. Protestants, along with Catholics, admit that humans are free from coercion. Protestants also acknowledge the freedom of will from the necessity of natural determination to one thing: because it is free from all necessity, so that properly speaking it cannot act necessarily regarding the exercise of its act, although with respect to divine ordination it acts certainly and infallibly, through God's predefinitions and predeterminations, which the intellect cannot penetrate, nor judge their indifference.

Therefore, it is agreed that free will exists formally in the will and radically in the intellect. Free will requires that, given all the prerequisites antecedent to the act, it can operate or not operate; so that with these same prerequisites, there exists simultaneously in free will the faculty and power by which it can operate if it wishes, or not operate if it wishes. If Protestants admit, with the Thomists, God's special and determining influence on the actions of free will, they should not be blamed as if they denied free will; because the Thomists also teach such influence of God, and defend the freedom of will. Whether the first Protestants thought or spoke

differently, we do not investigate here: but it is enough for us that at this time Protestants hold the same view of free will as Catholic Doctors.

CHAPTER LVI. On Free Will in Natural and Civil Matters

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants: 1. That by the powers of nature, some mechanical truth in arts and theoretical truth in sciences can be known. 2. That by the powers of nature, it can be known that God exists, that He is one, and other things of this kind. 3. That unregenerate man has free will in natural and civil works. But at the beginning of the so-called Reformation, there was a serious controversy with Protestants on this matter; which now having ceased, there is no need to refute the errors of the past time, or to dwell on them unnecessarily.

CHAPTER LVII. On the Harmony of Cooperation with Free Will

Concerning the harmony of divine cooperation with free will, there are various opinions among Catholic Doctors. Bellarmine says that divine cooperation concurs with second causes, not only as a source of power, conferring operative virtues, but also by moving and applying them to action. The Thomists hold the same, and understand application to action as efficacious determination. Grotius explains the opinion of modern Reformers according to the Thomists: The inclination of wills is natural, and efficacious by its own power, unless restrained by other causes, but it is voluntary, because it pertains to that nature to be moved by will; God determines it, applying it to action, so that the act is from the will's part, insofar as it is moved, and from the superior cause's part, insofar as it is determined. The first cause is God, who gives being and virtue to agents; the second cause is the will of man, so that man is the author of his own acts. To the first it is moved, so that it is moved by will, only determined. The second cause is the determined will itself. If the will is undetermined, the act is not from the second cause. And this middle way is the most common among the Reformed. Nor at this time do they teach that grace is innate, efficacious, and often efficacious from the excellence of moral motion, which is through counsels and persuasions. Similarly, at this time they do not teach that God so efficaciously moves the will that afterward it is not our choice to either obey or resist His motion; for they hold that the faculty of dissenting is consistent with efficacious grace. And they teach the same here as the Thomists: they also freely confess that God, through grace or efficacious motion, so works in us to will and converts us to Himself, that grace precedes our will, with our will following as an attendant, obeying freely. Therefore, it is not necessary to investigate what Calvin, what others before this thought: it is enough that we think and speak with Catholic Doctors. Other Protestants follow other Catholic Doctors. They find no cause here why they should want to abstain from the communion of the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER LVIII. On the Powers of Free Will in Moral Matters

The first question is about knowing moral truth. But moral truth is not understood in this place as universally considered, as that God is to be worshipped, parents to be honored: but it is understood with all the circumstances that are necessary for

an action of the will, conforming to it, to be an action of virtue: as when someone judges that at this time alms should be given, or that what has been received should be returned at this time, because the reason of justice demands that it be done now. The judgment of cognition is not understood as preceding the command of the will, such as is usually exercised in mere deliberation; but not the ultimate judgment depending on the will, which election necessarily follows. Regarding the aforesaid question, it is asked: Can moral truth in a moral act be known by the powers of nature? There are various opinions among Catholics, variously explained, and affirming, which is common among Catholics, some Protestants follow; rightly explained, hardly any will deny it.

The second question is: Can man, by the powers of nature alone, fulfill all moral commandments, according to the substance of the work? And here Protestants deny with Catholics; both probably teaching that some moral commandments, as to the substance of the work, can be fulfilled by the powers of nature alone: both teaching that by the powers of nature alone, man cannot observe any moral precept if pressed by temptation. Catholics teach that an unregenerate man, if no temptation urges, can with special help accomplish some moral good: because they think those works lack nothing, as they come from a supernatural principle, and can be referred to the ultimate end, God Himself. Protestants also commonly require for a good moral work that it come from God and be referred to God: hence it must be said that such works, proceeding from special help, are not sins. Indeed, such works in this sense proceed from faith, because it is certainly understood that the work which is undertaken is of the kind that God wills and has commanded by His law to be done. And thus the Council of Trent defined that some works which precede justification are not sins; namely those which proceed from special help, and through which God disposes man to the grace of justification. But the Council did not define that there are other works, preceding justification, which are not sins: just as it did not define that the aforementioned works, although good, are meritorious of justification, even of congruity; nor did it define that any works are meritorious, except after justification. Protestants confess that there are certain works through which God leads us to justification; and that the same are certain preparations for salutary conversion: and therefore we do not see how they can dissent from Catholics, unless they also dissent from themselves.

This question is also customarily proposed: Is man in the state of fallen nature of free will in choosing moral good and avoiding evil: or, what is the same, in observing or transgressing moral precepts? But if the question is understood, is man of free will in choosing moral good and avoiding evil, as to the substance of the work, Protestants do not deny that man in the state of fallen nature is of free will. But if the question is understood, is man in the state of nature of free will, that is, does he have the proximate faculty of doing moral good, avoiding moral evil, so that he does not sin, either by reason of the principle from which it flows, or by reason of the end

to which it ought to be referred, thus it coincides with what we have said in this chapter.

CHAPTER LIX. On the Powers of Free Will in Supernatural Matters

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants: that for supernatural mysteries to be perceived by us, divine revelation is required, which is proposed through Scriptures or Preachers sent by God: Something external is required, which makes the revealed doctrine credible: The command of the will is required, bringing the intellect into the obedience of faith. It is also agreed that faith is not required unless divine revelation, which is credible through something external, to be assented to in the obedience of faith; without special divine illumination. It is similarly agreed that human will cannot will anything, except its supernatural goodness perfecting, without the help of God's grace. It is also agreed that man by the powers of nature alone cannot prepare himself in every way for receiving grace; nor that any grace is conferred of condignity, nor even of congruity. It is also agreed that man by the powers of nature alone cannot love God above all things; neither as the author of nature, nor as the giver of grace and glory, whether perfectly or imperfectly.

Because of what has been said so far, Protestants call the faculty of the will's judgment in unregenerate man servile will, an empty title, with respect to supernatural things: They do not absolutely deny free will in unregenerate man, as is clear from what has been said, and when they say servile will, they understand the slavery of sin and corruption, in which the unregenerate freely exist; denying the freedom of grace, which man cannot obtain except through divine mercy. We say that through sin free will is diminished, because it lacks the freedom of grace, with respect to supernatural things: but free will remains, although reduced to servitude, because that natural faculty of the soul remains, knowledge remains, the inclination to universal good remains, and what it does in that servitude, is not moved by nature, as brute animals, but by its own judgment: and thus it is established in the servitude of sin, from which man cannot be freed except through the grace of God. But when grace comes, free will for supernatural good is not conferred on man inasmuch as it is a certain middle power, which can either be directed to faith or inclined to infidelity, which is naturally attributed from the creation of the rational soul: but through grace it is freed from the servitude of sin, and receives the freedom of grace. Pagans, who have heard nothing of Christ, are rightly said to have free will for supernatural good: because through creation it is such that it is capable of supernatural good; although meanwhile, due to the servitude of sin, it cannot exert itself to embrace supernatural good, unless it is freed from servitude through grace. Thus a bound and infirm person is rightly said to have the power of walking; although he cannot actually walk, unless loosed, and with his strength restored by medicines. Therefore, to be able to have faith, just as to be able to have charity, is of the nature of men; but to have faith, just as to have charity, is of the grace of the faithful. Good works are in man's power, and the same man does not have power for good works: but one power is proximate, another remote. Good works are in man's

remote power, with which alone he can do nothing, so that he works good from that remote power alone: for in order to work good, proximate power is required, which power is nothing, unless it is given by God. Hence man has no proximate power for supernatural good, which he does not receive from God through grace; nor any remote power, which he has not received from God through nature. If man did not have this remote power, that power of the soul which is called will would have to be not only prepared by the Lord, but newly created; and thus there would be two wills in man. And thus Calvin says: True Ratio of Church Reform, p. 367. I confess indeed, that there remains will in man, even when he is held captive under the tyranny of sin and Satan. When the will is freed from the servitude of sin, and receives new spiritual powers to operate what it could not by nature, it is rightly said to be created, although not in the sense that a new power of the soul is created, but that the power, which could not come forth into act by itself alone, receives those powers by which it can operate rightly, with impediments also removed. With this matter thus explained, there remains, as far as we know, no difficulty with Protestants, as they teach at this time.

CHAPTER LX. Man Freely Consents to the Grace of God

The question is: Is man after the fall of the first man truly of free will in those things which pertain to salvation, and although he can do nothing without the help of grace, yet when excited by prevenient grace and helped by God, can he so operate that he can also not operate?

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants: 1. That man in his conversion is not inert, or a stone. 2. That man in his conversion behaves willingly and spontaneously. 3. That grace in the order of reason and causality precedes the cooperation of our will. For God first prevents the will of man and contains most efficacious grace, which the will of man itself follows. Calvin agrees, True Ratio of Restored Church, p. 367. Free will is said to increase and prevent, because this potency pertains active, partly passive; because the will behaves passively in order to the previous help of God already receiving everything, as such, it behaves in a small way, in order to judgment, which precludes that prevenient help, if by God alone effectively, and is received in the will of help intentionally its effect. But it is necessary that the will behaves passively with respect to that help. Nor does it follow from this that in the justification of an adult the will behaves merely passively; for although it behaves passively in relation to the previous help, yet with respect to the free act, to elicit which it is moved, it behaves actively. Against Calovius. Synop. Contr. disp. 18. Th.5. p.127.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that man in his conversion cooperates with the grace of God: For at the same moment God causes that through grace we will, and actually will, by moving and bending the will; so that truly and properly we perform good actions, and fully assent to the words and promises of God, hope in Him, and love Him, by which we are justified. However, our cooperation with respect to God is not such as is the cooperation of God with respect to us:

because our entire cooperation is also the operation of God Himself making us do: but God's cooperation is not our operation, as if we make Him operate.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that man in his conversion freely consents to the grace of God. For those whom God converts, He renders participants of their freedom, and they operate freely, with the Spirit of God also operating, who helps the will, does not take away the help of grace, does not bring force to the will, but perfects it, so that it cooperates freely; with God alluring the will in its conversion with invitations and persuasions, instructing it with supernatural powers, by which it can obey these persuasions, and inclining and bending it by His efficacious operation to actually obey: for He makes from one unwilling one freely willing, converting to God, and believing.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that man in his conversion can not cooperate with the grace of God; For Protestants here hold with the Thomists that the power not to operate exists together in the same subject with grace, and the help which is required for operating; but they deny that efficacious grace for a certain act, and the lack of the same act, or a contrary act, can be found in the same subject.

Since, therefore, in this cause Protestants at this time do not dissent from Catholic Doctors, there is no reason why they should seek occasion here to abstain from the union and communion of the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER LXI. On the Name of Justification and Its Causes

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the word justification in Holy Scripture is taken: 1. for the donation or conferring of inherent justice. 2. for the increase of inherent justice. 3. in a forensic manner, to pronounce and declare just.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that inherent justice is given: but Protestants want that we are not sanctified by it; but only, with it being placed, to be demonstrated just, and in justification before God, we are not through the justice of Christ given and imputed to us, of which we will treat in the following.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that the end of justification is the glory of God and the salvation of man, the extrinsic cause is to be sanctified: The primary efficient cause of justification is God; the efficient cause of justification through the mode of merit, or the meritorious cause, is the passion of Christ. The material cause we can judge to be inherent justice, which is infused in the soul, or informing the whole man, the habit of infused grace.

The formal cause of justification, insofar as we are called just from inherent justice, is inherent justice itself; but insofar as we can be called just from justice given to us, it is that justice given to us, which for it to be communicated to the subject, application from the part of God toward us is required as a condition of the formal cause.

I'll translate the provided Latin text into English, maintaining the chapter numbering (Roman numerals) as in the original text.

CHAPTER LXII. On the Object of Justifying Faith

The question is: Is the object of justifying faith only the promise of mercy, or does it extend as broadly as the word of God extends? The question is understood about special mercy, not as if it preceded or was something revealed individually about the salvation of this or that believer, which revelation each believer must apprehend; but about mercy, which through faith itself becomes special, that is, which this and that faithful person applies to themselves through faith.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants: 1. that the object of faith, which justifies, extends as broadly as the word of God extends. 2. That the object of faith, which justifies, includes the promise of mercy; for the promise of mercy is some word of God, or something revealed by God. 3. That the object of attribution, or the principal object of justifying faith, is the promise of mercy: for we must believe whatever God has revealed and promised; and especially that the impious is justified by God through His grace, which is in Christ Jesus. For faith, to which Holy Scripture ascribes justification, is certain and firm assent, elicited on account of the authority of God speaking and revealing, by which those things are believed true which are divinely revealed and promised, and especially that the impious is justified by God, through the grace of Christ Jesus, and His redemption.

And here it must be observed that through justification man attains inherent justice, by which we begin to be just, and are made partakers of the divine nature, and have charity diffused in our hearts. We also attain justice given to us with Christ, or the justice of Christ, with all His merit: for God has given us Christ, and all things with Him; when the son was born to us, and the son was given to us, whom we also offer to God in sacrifice, from His gifts and donations; to those baptized themselves, baptized into the death of Christ and buried with Him, as if they themselves, bearing the person of Christ, had died, suffered, and been buried with Christ, and had risen with Christ to new life.

Therefore, if we consider justifying faith, insofar as through it we attain inherent justice, it is rightly said to have for its object whatever God has revealed, among which the promise of mercy stands out. But if we consider justifying faith, insofar as through it we attain justice given to us, it is rightly said that its object is only the promise of mercy, since by virtue of that promise that justice is given to us.

Regarding special mercy, Protestants teach with Catholics that people, understanding themselves to be sinners, from the fear of divine justice, by which they are shaken, by turning to consider God's mercy, are raised to hope, trusting that God will be propitious to them because of Christ. For the beginning and necessary foundation is both the Catholic faith of dogmas, history, and promises; for the Catholic and universal faith embraces these three: and also the private faith of promise, by which each believes that God will not fail them, nor deny efficacious

help, and that they will eventually be justified by God: For if anyone thought that God would deny them efficacious help for salvation, all progress to justification, and disposition would be impeded, as is clearly evident. For among other things necessary for first justification, there must be hope of pardon; but this cannot be without particular faith. For although someone might believe those things which are promised to all, namely, that sins are remitted to those truly penitent: and that by penitence and other good works, pardon and justification are obtained from God: yet unless they also believe that by those works which they perform, they will obtain pardon from God, which is indeed the particular faith of promise, they cannot now hope for pardon from God, and consequently will not attain justification: since hope is no less necessary a disposition for justification than faith. See St. Augustine, book 1 of Christian Doctrine, ch. 18, p. 6. A. Vol. 3.

This special faith of promise has for its object the promise of mercy; and is nothing other than firm confidence; for when in the gospel salvation is attributed to faith, by faith is understood assent given to revealed truths, and confidence conceived from the omnipotent goodness of God. This special faith is received through the grace of the Holy Spirit, and is a gift of God through Christ; but because it does not rely on an object that is revealed by God; nor does it exclude all fear; and therefore the faithful need confirmation, which they should also seek through God's institutions.

With the whole matter explained in this way, we do not see why Protestants should dissent from Catholics in this cause.

CHAPTER LXIII. On the Subject of Justifying Faith

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that faith requires motion, and a certain pious affection of the will, inclining the intellect to assent to this testimony, on account of the truth of God testifying: and thus faith, insofar as it signifies assent, is formally indeed in the intellect; but nevertheless requires the concurring motion of the will.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that from faith arises confidence; and this is an effect of faith: for faith is the origin and root of confidence. Just as, therefore, to obey faith requires the command of the will: so from the certainty of faith is born confidence, which pertains to the will, so that by a certain circle this faith begins from the will, and ends in the will.

These being established; confidence of obtaining pardon, such as should be in a person doing penance, precedes justification; and this confidence is the special faith of mercy, necessary for obtaining justification. There is also another confidence; by which one trusts that their sins are remitted, that they are pleasing to God, and heir to the kingdom, which depends on good conscience, and perseverance in the love of God, and good works, and therefore presupposes justification; it does not effect it, and through this it is not justifying faith, but something posterior to justifying faith. With this double confidence observed, it should also be noted that Protestants frequently describe justifying faith by certainty about obtained remission of sins,

about the mercy of God in Christ specially applied; although that certainty is something posterior to justifying faith, and follows justification. This is done, however, because the perfection and consolation of justifying faith appears more in that certainty, when justifying faith is described by an illustrious effect of the same faith. And hence it has happened that Protestants commonly describe faith popularly, as if it were partly in the intellect, partly in the will: understanding by justifying faith also the private faith of promise, which we think does not differ from confidence of obtaining pardon and justification, which is prerequisite to justification; and describing the same faith by subsequent confidence; both of which pertain to the will. Cocceius says, Disp. 18 Corr. n. 10, that the subject of faith is equally properly the will as the intellect.

CHAPTER LXIV. Is Faith Knowledge or Assent?

Faith, insofar as it is in the intellect, is properly assent; it supposes some knowledge; and improperly it is knowledge; and it produces some knowledge. We have said, insofar as it is in the intellect, lest in a broader signification it be understood as confidence, which is in the will; and which does not pertain here. We have said, it is properly assent; and in this there is no difficulty. We have said, some knowledge is prerequisite, or supposed; because the object of faith must be credible to us, and known as such, before we assent. We have said, it is improperly knowledge, because it can be so called from the knowledge which it supposes, and which it produces. We have said, faith seeks some knowledge, because it is a way and step to understanding. We do not think Protestants will find anything here to dissent from Catholics.

CHAPTER LXV. Does Faith Alone Justify?

As justification is diversely understood, either tending to inherent justice, or to given and imputed justice; so we must speak diversely of faith, as it concurs to obtaining this or that justice.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants: 1. that no works, no love, no merit proceeding from the powers of nature, by which man either obtains justification, or prepares himself to receive it. 2. That the sinner, who is justified, in no way merits remission of sins, or reconciliation with God, neither of condignity, nor of congruity; but all justification happens entirely freely, on account of the merit of Christ Jesus.

If it is asked: Does faith alone justify by way of disposition? Protestants teach with Catholics that for faith to actually justify, it is required that it be living; for faith, unless hope and charity accede to it, neither unites perfectly with Christ, nor makes one a living member of His body: but it is rightly said of living faith, that it alone justifies. Therefore faith, insofar as it is in the intellect, does not alone justify, by way of disposition; but the presence of other virtues is required: for no remission of sins is obtained, except to sinners disposed by contrition of heart; when by recognition of sin, and by sorrow they are prepared to receive grace, and are brought to the

benefit of justification: although meanwhile such prerequisite dispositions do not acquire for the sinner any right to receive justification.

If it is asked again: Does faith alone justify by way of instrument? Protestants will say with Catholics that faith is not the only instrument by which God applies justice to men, whether inherent, or given and imputed: for since the Sacraments are also divinely instituted instruments, by which God bestows justice; faith cannot be said to be the only instrument applying justice.

But because in the justification of an adult, special faith of promise is required, which applies general promises in particular: and those promises contain the merit of Christ, and the justice of Christ given to us; that faith or confidence is rightly said to alone justify, that is to apprehend on the part of the one being justified the merit and justice of Christ promised to believers, and to apply that merit and justice in particular; whence the other helps of grace are derived; by which one attains internal renovation and inherent justice. That confidence, which is the apprehension of justification, as our present possession, by which after we have received remission of sins, we state that we are in grace with God, is something consequent to justification, and a fruit of the same. With the question explained in this way, there will be nothing for Protestants to contradict Catholics about.

CHAPTER LXVI. Can Faith Be Alone?

The question is: Can faith be alone, and separated from love and other virtues?

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that faith, insofar as it signifies the assent of the intellect, which is given to revealed truth, can be found in man without charity and other virtues: for nothing prohibits that man can assent to historical, miraculous, dogmatic, and general promises. It is also agreed that faith alone, which is in the intellect, separated from hope and charity, does not justify. For faith that actually justifies always has joined to it hope and charity, by which it is distinguished from infidels.

However, if faith is taken for special faith, which applies general promises to a person in particular, with true confidence attached, and internal religion, if thus it necessarily has joined to it hope and charity, it cannot be found in man as solitary and separate, and would cease to be such faith.

Therefore, if by true faith is understood that which has a true object; there is no doubt that such faith can be separated from charity. If by true faith is understood that which is a habit infused by God, inclining to assent to revealed truth; there is no doubt that such faith is found without charity. If by true faith is understood assent given to revealed truth; that too can be without charity. If by true faith is understood special faith, of which we have treated; it can no more be without charity, than the ultimate disposition to form without form; because that special faith, having joined other necessary things, is the ultimate disposition to charity.

CHAPTER LXVII. On the Perfection of Inherent Justice

Protestants at this time do not deny that inherent justice is given. They say, however, that inherent justice is inchoate, in respect to the justice which the Blessed possess in heaven; which, as more perfect, protects them from all sin, ours not preventing us from being bound to say, "Forgive us our debts"; and therefore it is necessary that we be sustained daily by God's mercy. Inherent justice can also be called imperfect in respect to the justice of Christ; as that which undoubtedly infinitely exceeds our justice, and by virtue of which, inherent justice is attributed to man by God.

None, as far as we know, say that inherent justice is rather a vice than a virtue, rather injustice than justice; for all teach that inherent justice consists in virtues infused by God, which to call vices, or injustice, would be extreme insanity. Some Protestants teach that even habitual justice is contaminated with many stains of sins; but how this is true in baptized and regenerated infants, they themselves will see; for if inherent justice there is contaminated with the stains of sins, how will that contamination not be from God? How also in adults will habitual justice be contaminated, which is infused by God alone? Other Protestants resort to the imperfection of works, which proceed from inherent justice: but besides that this question does not pertain here, and if contamination adheres to those works, it is not, according to them, from inherent justice but is from the root of concupiscence: nor is it necessary that all and each of the works of the justified, which proceed from inherent justice, also proceed from a vicious beginning, as they gratuitously assert. It is sufficient for us, if such inherent justice is acknowledged, from which the faithful are rightly called just.

CHAPTER LXVIII. On Justice Both Inherent, and Given or Imputed

No one doubts that inherent justice is given. And because in the preceding chapters it has been said several times about given or imputed justice; it will be necessary to deal briefly with it in this place.

To impute something to someone is the same as to count and reckon it among those things which are his, and pertain to him. Bellarmine says: "If Protestants only wanted the merits of Christ, which have been given to us, to be imputed to us, and we could offer them to God the Father for our sins, since Christ took upon Himself the burden of satisfaction for us, and of reconciling us to God the Father, their opinion would be correct." This opinion is that of Protestants; as Gerhard holds, Conf. lib. 2, part 3, art. 23, ch. 4, p. 700. Amesius, lib. 6, ch. 1, Thes. 19.

Bellarmino says: "Christ is called our justice, because He satisfied the Father for us, and gives and communicates that justice to us in such a way, when He justifies us, that our satisfaction and justice is imputed." For even through inherent justice we are truly justified before God; however not so much through satisfaction to God for our fault, and eternal punishment: but that we might have justice with remission of fault, and the satisfaction of Christ, which (as the Council of Trent teaches, Sess. 6, ch. 7) is conferred on us in justification. "When it is said that we are in this way not

absurd, because to say that Christ is our justice, while He is imputed and applied to us, as we ourselves satisfy God, through Him, and in Him, as we are absolved from the obligation of sin, and are justified by God, and glory in the judgment of God. So also Bernard speaks in Epistle 190. We should not be ashamed of what we have from gift, but glory; because from ourselves we are nothing. As it would seem revealed, if we remain in the same grace, and will possess it, as our own." Cardinal Hosius has similar things. And Gerhard testifies that this is his opinion about the justice of Christ given or imputed to us, in the place cited. And Amesius, in Jud. Theol. in probat.

Bellarmino says: "Your justice (Christ's) is imputed to us as to the satisfaction, which He provided for us. Also, the justice of God through special justice, which is in Christ. But that we are called just, not by our own, but by His, whose members we are head. And what is fitting for the head, is fitting also for the members, not that measure should be given from the head, but that the members should do, and be one head with the head." Gerhard says this is his opinion, in the place cited, and Amesius, *ibid.* Theol. 7, in probat.

And hence it is clear that Protestants understand by relative justice, and they do not want to confess it in idle thought, but to result from the application of one to another: they do not want it to be a mere fiction of law, but actual absolution, and donation of the justice of Christ. And because it must be explained, how that justice can happen to someone, and not to all; they rightly say this happens from communication, "which we have with Him through the bond of the Holy Spirit," who is our head, so that the same Spirit in our hearts always effects through relation is understood, difficult: and therefore this relation is understood, not to be conferred except through true, vital, and spiritual union, so that what is attributed to Christ as head, is also attributed to the faithful as His members.

It is to be observed, that just as to justify, taken in the forensic manner, does not immediately import, except the sole action of God justifying; so it comprehends in its breadth, that the justice of Christ is given to us, in view of which inherent justice is also communicated, which is the term and proper effect of justification thus accepted: for the imputation or communication of the merits of Christ is the cause for some gift and benefit to be given to us, by this very fact that such are the merits of our head Christ that He has wanted to be of His members, so that by reason of them God would also bestow His gifts on the members.

With the opinion of Protestants thus proposed and explained, perhaps it will find nothing uncomfortable with Catholic Doctors.

CHAPTER LXIX. On the Formal Cause of Justification

Protestants acknowledge with Catholics that the word justification in Holy Scripture and the Holy Fathers is taken for the conferring of inherent justice, which they commonly call sanctification: they acknowledge that its form is inherent justice; that it is virtue not vice: they acknowledge that by absolute denomination man is

denominated just from inherent justice: "They are truly made just," says Calvin. True Ratio of Church Reform, p. 368. "We do not deny that the sons of God are named just, either from the holiness of life, or from pure conscience" Ibid. The infusion of inherent justice is always conjoined with forensic justification, or an infallible consequent.

In turn, Catholics concede to Protestants that forensic and judicial justification is true, and is rightly called justification with Holy Scripture: They concede that where Scripture deals only with liberation from punishment and concession of pardon, the infusion of inherent justice is not included as a means of liberation; because through that means we are not liberated from punishment, nor is pardon granted. And although where abstractively only liberation from punishment and concession of pardon is dealt with, the infusion of inherent justice is not included, as a means of liberation; nevertheless the infusion of inherent justice is not therefore excluded, as a means of inwardly renovating and making just. They concede that because of the merit of Christ we are pronounced free from punishment and guilt when we are absolved, because not only is the debt of punishment remitted, but also the guilt itself is considered as not committed, and thus is removed demeritorious. Therefore, if justification is not treated of all and in general; but only of that which is the way and means, on account of which we are transferred from wrath to grace, favor, and friendship of God, and are accepted to eternal life, we concede that it is the justice of Christ alone; for in first justification no merit of ours concurs, whether it concerns given and imputed justice, or inherent; and inherent justice does not concur to imputation or donation of justice; because the latter precedes the former. For through the extrinsic justice of Christ to us we are not only judged and reputed not unjust, but also we are judged and reputed partakers of the justice of Christ, and in divine judgment exactly conforming: moreover positively just, if this is understood, that by positive justice we are extrinsically just; for a sinner is not received into grace on account of his own and inherent justice, but on account of the justice of Christ; nor is he accepted to glory on account of his own and inherent justice but from grace giving to man the justice of Christ, infusing inherent justice, leading in good works, and faithfully and mercifully giving eternal life.

These things now incidentally; from which it is clear, if in the justified both given or imputed justice, and inherent justice are to be acknowledged; man by absolute denomination should be called just from inherent or intrinsic justice alone; as in due time through the grace of God we will more fully show.

CHAPTER LXX. In What Confidence Should Be Placed

It is admitted by all that fundamental and thoroughly solid confidence is to be placed by a Christian person in the goodness of God willing our salvation: in the mercy of God, conferring gifts of grace because of Christ; in the liberality of God promising eternal life. Nor does anyone deny that the exercise of good works is necessary for adults if they desire salvation, as they ought. Therefore, one should not so acquiesce in God's mercy alone, as if the exercise of good works were not necessary; but it

must be believed that eternal life and glory will be conferred on the just, as adopted sons of God, from grace and mercy; yet in such a way that the same life and eternal glory is given to the just, as those who work well, from the fidelity of divine promise, originating from the liberality of God. The mercy of God justifying because of Christ, and the fidelity of God promising salvation to those who work well, are true foundations of solid confidence. For just as we rightly trust in the mercy of God justifying sinners, giving us the justice and merit of Christ, freely infusing inherent justice; so we rightly trust that the liberal and gratuitous promise of God, about eternal life to be bestowed on those who work well, will be faithfully fulfilled. And since eternal life is not to be adjudged to those who work evil, and persevere in evil, for whom the law is set that they should work well, if they wish to be saved, it is necessary that without good works they should not hope for life, but exercise themselves in good works. Whence those who work well experience that their adversities work hope, and abundant confidence; not doubting at all about remuneration, when through good works they make their calling certain, where patience is necessary, so that doing the will of God they may obtain the promise. But because the just rightly fear all their works, and know that God is not bound from His own justice to give eternal life to the faithful, it is safest to place all hope in the goodness and mercy of God alone: since not without cause we see it always observed in the Catholic Church, that those who are now near to death are diligently admonished, that distrusting their own justice, they have all their hope and confidence placed in the justice of Christ alone, represent that to the heavenly Father, rely on that alone.

CHAPTER LXXI. On the Certainty of Justice

The question is: Whether someone should, or can, without special revelation, be certain, with the certainty of divine faith, to which falsehood can in no way be subject, that their sins are remitted.

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that even holy men hesitate about the favor of God, when they are pressed by more serious temptations. Nor is there any doubt that the grace of justification generates joy, peace, and confidence in the faithful. But Protestants are accustomed to call this confidence faith (which indeed does not rely on special revelation) but coming from justifying faith and the virtues conjoined to it; which excludes hesitation and fluctuation, does not avert solicitude and caution. And in this there is no difficulty. Calvin, *Antid. Synodi. Trid. ref. c. p. 131*, expressly speaks "of perseverance, and 327, of patient study." p. 86. He similarly speaks in his *Response to Sadoletto p. 151*, "of certain hope."

CHAPTER LXXII. On the Certainty of Predestination

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that it cannot be known a priori, or through the cause, whether we are predestined; nor does the just have evident knowledge of his predestination: Any faithful person, exercising himself in good works, should with firm and certain hope expect eternal life. For having known the goodness of God, it is proper to conceive hope and confidence thence of obtaining

eternal salvation not indeed rejecting the fear and trembling commended in the Holy Scriptures, but doubt, hesitation, and diffidence. For God wanted us to have His mercy before our eyes, and our infirmity; so that being cast down we might be raised by the former, being elevated we might be humbled by the latter: so that if anyone says in his abundance, "I shall not be moved forever," he may have consideration of his infirmity, recalling him in fear: but if anyone is troubled by his humility, he may have consoling mercy. But because the Protestants of this time especially urge the certainty of confidence, which we acknowledge, there is no need to dwell longer on this matter.

CHAPTER LXXIII. On Good Works

It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants that not all the just are equally just, if it concerns inherent justice; as it receives increase through good works: It is also agreed that good works are necessary, and through them the faithful are disposed to attaining salvation. For they are necessary, by the necessity of divine precept; by the necessity of a means ordained to God's glory and our salvation: because the promise of eternal life is conditional, and requires good works. Whence Protestants also hold with us that good works are means administering salvation, and tending to that; the just efficiently work their salvation; good works are conditions for life, the way to life: and every way has the character of a cause, at least sine qua non. But what kind of causality is theirs, can be seen in Vasquez 1.2, disp. 220, ch. 7, 1.64, 66.

Catholics teach that there are good works of the just, which are not sins. For although it is true of many works of the just that they are not free from venial sins; and the just offend in many things; nevertheless it should not be said that sin is joined to every action proceeding from the just. For why? Is it because all is avoided by innate concupiscence? But whence is it proved that a vicious motion of concupiscence concurs with all and each of the works of the just, which is not always moved, and which is frequently resisted by the just? Is it because the just do not operate with so much fervor and perfection of love, with which they will operate in heaven? But whence is it proved that he, e.g., does not love the Lord God with his whole heart, who constantly undergoes martyrdom for Him? It can happen that perfect observance of the commandment is found; where nevertheless in a similar case a more perfect action is found. Thus all the Apostles preached by command, some not therefore imperfectly, because they lived from the Gospel; although more perfectly saint Paul, who preached at no expense to his hearers. How it is possible to observe all precepts; and yet impossible not to offend venially, see Vasquez 1.2, Tom. 2, disp. 212, ch. 1, ch. 2, n. 14, p. 700.

CONCLUSION

Here you have, Protestant Lords, in this Fourth Motive most of the controversies of faith, which for a whole century have been agitated between Catholics and Protestants, briefly deduced; and that according to the concepts and mind of the Most Serene Prince often explained; adding here and there certain things, which either by reason of Order, or by reason of fullness seemed to be required, from the

faculty specially conceded by the Most Serene Prince. We ask God, that those who are to respond, (whom we easily conjecture will not be lacking) may bring modesty and moderation: if they bring modesty, they will do a thing pleasing to the Most Serene Prince, and fitting to their function, pleasant to readers, and useful to all: if they show moderation, they will not attribute to the Catholic Church either alien, or particular Doctors' opinions; but will approach the matter itself, and will freely examine things which are universally defined and received: both disapproving what displeases, and producing more solid things, if they can. For thus fewer controversies will be reached, and those which remain will suffer less difficulty, if indeed we proceed by the aforesaid method. But if contrary to hope it should happen, that some clamorous, injurious, and caviling persons oppose themselves to these Motives; although we will not bear their detonation with displeasure; the Most Serene Prince's such great suavity and affability will not want to burden us with the onus of responding, which consists in not caring what such people say; but what those who are led by love of truth, put forward their reasons and foundations.