Adrian and Peter Walenburch

TREATISE V. ON PURGATORY.

WARNING TO THE READER.

This Treatise in the edition of the Year 1656 on the unity of the Church and schism followed the earlier one on the Saints; nor has anything of any importance been added here, because adversaries have brought no objections against it. It should be noted that in both Treatises, on the Saints and on Purgatory, the controversies are treated both as necessary and as true: necessity establishing a relation to the general Treatise on the unity of the Church, when it is shown from these controversies that Protestants cannot derive a cause for separation; whether the Catholic doctrine be true or false; truth providing satisfaction to the reader, while they are presented according to the Augustinian method.

Translated by: **@WesternCatholik @ScholasticsFan @JohnXI35 @Dogmaticist**

Table of Contents

Note: We did not skip Chapter V. the original Latin text omits it probably due to an error

CHAPTER I. The Catholic Doctrine of Purgatory Is Not a Just Cause for Separation.

I. Eilbracht presents the Catholic position in these words: “That there is a purgatory in which the souls of some of the faithful undergo temporal punishment to be fully purified before they are admitted to the enjoyment of heavenly bliss.” The Reformers respond thus: “That purgatory is a blasphemous and deadly fabrication of Satan, which insults the mercy of God and overthrows our faith.”

II. Eilbracht considers this controversy “fundamental,” and in this he does not seem to disagree with Calvin, who states: "We must cry out, not only with our voice, but with all the effort of our lungs and sides, that purgatory is a deadly invention of Satan, which nullifies the cross of Christ, inflicts an intolerable insult on the mercy of God, and undermines and destroys our faith."

Perkins included purgatory among those controversies by which he sought to prove that the Reformers and Catholics do not agree on the foundation of salvation, as can be seen in Catholic Reformed Controversy XVII, page 347.

III. We do not believe that the question of purgatory, according to the doctrine of either the Lutheran or the Reformed Church, is fundamental. The reason is evident: if Protestants count among their orthodox doctors—those even raised by divine privilege—men who believed and taught that purgatory exists, then the controversy over purgatory cannot be fundamental. Otherwise, those orthodox doctors would not have been orthodox but heretics in fundamental error.

However, Protestants do count among their orthodox doctors John Wycliffe and John Hus, to whom they commonly appeal as their predecessors, as has been demonstrated earlier. They even commend the former as having the spirit of prophecy and attribute great privileges to the latter. Let us now see what they taught.

IV. Wycliffe speaks as follows: "The Church is truly said to be the mixed body of Christ, which by the words of eternal predestination is united to Christ, the Bridegroom. And this Church is threefold: the Militant, the Dormant, and the Triumphant. The Militant Church consists of the predestined, as they journey in this life toward their homeland. The Dormant Church consists of the predestined suffering in purgatory. And the Triumphant Church consists of the blessed at rest in the homeland."

Likewise, he says: "Since many souls must in the meantime be purified in purgatory, and since it is unfitting for the universal Lord to multiply His judgments in such a way, it is evident that there must be a final judgment."

V. Hus, among the reasons for receiving the venerable Sacrament, includes the following: "To be purified from sins, to advance in virtues, and to be freed from the punishment of purgatory, which a man ought to suffer."

He also states: "The Universal Church is principally divided into three: the Triumphant Church, the Militant Church, and the Dormant Church."

And again: "It is called Dormant because those within it are already awaiting the beatitude they are to enter by the grace and assistance of the Militant Church." He further explains: "The Dormant Church consists of the number of the predestined suffering in purgatory. It is called Dormant because those within it do not merit beatitude anew but will be rewarded after satisfying the pains of purgatory, having merited beforehand through God's grace in this life."

He also states: "The cause of laudable funeral rites consists in devoutly praying for the dead and providing aid to the Dormant Church, that is, the Saints in purgatory."

VI. Thus, those whom Protestants judge to be orthodox doctors of the Church held, believed, and taught that purgatory exists. Consequently, it cannot be that the controversy over purgatory is, from the Protestant Church's standpoint, a fundamental issue—unless they claim it is fundamental for Catholics but not for their own predecessors, which is absurd. Therefore, those who assert that this controversy is fundamental cannot put forward the position of their own Church without contradicting themselves. Consequently, the controversy over purgatory is not a just cause for the Protestants' separation from Catholic unity.

VII. Let Protestants declare whether the doctrine of purgatory is, by its very nature, such a fundamental error that all who believe and teach in purgatory must be excluded from heaven and condemned to eternal damnation.

If they affirm this, let the reader consider what follows, even according to Protestant testimony.

Peter Martyr states: "As for what the Fathers thought on this matter, I can only report that most of them inclined to the view that purgatory exists. But I do not remember reading

among them that it was considered an article of faith, such that those who thought otherwise could not attain salvation."

Therefore, the majority of the Fathers inclined toward granting purgatory's existence. But if such a belief necessarily excluded one from heaven and consigned one to hell, then these Protestant censors must admit a contradiction. Who, indeed, would believe that the Fathers only probably handed down the doctrine of purgatory? If they had agreed with Calvin, they would have regarded purgatory as a deadly invention of Satan, nullifying the cross of Christ, insulting God's mercy, and overthrowing faith.

VIII. Pareus writes: "The Apostle refers to 'wood and stubble' as erroneous, vain, curious, and unnecessary doctrines mixed with fundamental teaching, rather than as outright heretical, impious, and blasphemous doctrines in opposition to the foundation of faith."

Among these, he includes the doctrine of purgatory and many other matters. Pareus further states: "The principal Fathers, both Greek and Latin—Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Chrysostom—absorbed certain errors and mixed them with apostolic doctrine, such as those concerning marriage and celibacy, grace and free will, intercession and invocation of the dead, prayers and sacrifices for the dead, fasting, dietary laws, and purgatory." Thus, according to Pareus, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Chrysostom mixed the doctrine of purgatory with apostolic teaching. Even Arminians testify that Augustine believed in purgatory and prayers for the dead. Moreover, according to Pareus, purgatory is to be counted among those doctrines that were added to Christian teaching shortly after the apostolic era and are widely found in the writings of the ancients.

IX. Sadeel states: "I acknowledge that the ancients sometimes spoke of a future purifying fire, but I affirm that they discussed it not as a doctrine of faith but as a probable opinion." Would they have regarded as probable that which, according to Calvin, is an intolerable insult to God's mercy?

X. Therefore, let Protestants consider where they are heading if they declare the question of purgatory to be fundamental, both according to their Church's teaching and the nature of the issue itself. Besides entangling themselves in contradictions, they would have to condemn their own predecessors, the holy Fathers, to eternal flames.

Thus, if Eilbracht and Calvin’s opinion is merely private and rightly to be rejected, then the doctrine of purgatory is not a just cause for the Protestants' separation from Catholic unity.

CHAPTER II. On the Punishments Remaining After the Guilt of Sin Has Been Remitted

I. Becanus, as Crocius reports and praises, holds that three things remain after a mortal sin has been committed and then passed away:

1. Guilt,
2. Liability, or the worthiness of punishment,
3. The punishment itself.

Crocius does not deny that, after the guilt of mortal sin has been remitted and the liability to eternal punishment removed, the liability to temporal punishment sometimes remains, which a person already justified is still obliged to undergo. Just as the liability to temporal punishment remains, so too is the temporal punishment itself inflicted because of sin, as even Crocius admits. This punishment refers to past sins and transgressions, as Calixtus states in his Dissertation on Purgatory, Thesis 39.

II. Protestants deny that punishments inflicted after the remission of sin's guilt are properly called "punishments." Instead, they call them "corrective measures," meant as a reminder of the sin committed and the stain remaining from it, as well as a testimony to the eternal misery contracted, unless one is freed through Christ, and a restraint upon the indulgence of the flesh. They distinguish between punishments and chastisements, stating that while both cause affliction, sorrow, and distress, they differ greatly in purpose. The goal of chastisements is correction, whereas the goal of punishments is vengeance and compensation for injury. Properly speaking, punishment is related to the vindication of a crime, while chastisement is related to the correction of the sinner. They also differ in their efficient cause: punishment stems from justice, which demands satisfaction, while chastisement arises from paternal care and providence.

III. Catholics do not claim that all afflictions sent by God are properly called punishments, for many suffer afflictions as a means of exercising patience, aside from other specific reasons. However, they do teach, in accordance with Sacred Scripture, that after the remission of guilt and eternal punishment, the liability to temporal punishment remains—both the worthiness and obligation to undergo it.

This is proven from the punishment of Moses and Aaron, of whom it is written: "And the

Lord said to Moses and Aaron: Because you did not believe in me, to sanctify me before the children of Israel, you shall not bring these people into the land which I will give them."

And later: "Let Aaron go to his people; for he shall not enter the land which I have given to the children of Israel, because he was disobedient to my words at the Waters of Contradiction."

Likewise: "And the Lord spoke to Moses on that very day, saying: Go up into this mountain of Abarim, that is, of crossings, into Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab opposite Jericho, and see the land of Canaan, which I am giving to the children of Israel as a possession, and die on the mountain that you ascend, and be gathered to your people, just as Aaron your brother died on Mount Hor and was gathered to his people. Because you transgressed against me among the children of Israel at the Waters of Contradiction in Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin, and did not sanctify me among the children of Israel. You shall see the land, but you shall not enter it, which I am giving to the children of Israel."

Here we see affliction, chastisement, and punishment inflicted by God because they did not believe in Him and transgressed.

IV. Crocius responds that it is clear from Scripture that Moses and Aaron were chastised for their sin; if one wishes to call this punishment in a broad sense, he does not object. However, it is not certain that they were punished with proper punishment in strict justice. The argument does not follow: "They were punished because they transgressed. Therefore, they were subjected to a proper punishment, inflicted with wrath and condemnation."

There is a difference between chastising punishment and satisfactory punishment. The former is that of a father without condemnation, while the latter is that of a severe judge, accompanied by wrath and condemnation.

Yet, Scripture attests to the affliction imposed upon Moses and Aaron. That this affliction should be properly called "chastisement" and not "punishment" is not testified by Sacred Scripture. Why, then, should we not conclude that it was both proper punishment and chastisement? What prevents the same affliction from serving different purposes? Indeed, why should we not rather call it proper punishment than chastisement, since the purpose of punishment is vengeance and compensation for injury, and God, as evidenced by the cited Scriptural passages, expressed this injury, announcing that punishment was being inflicted on account of it?

Nevertheless, it must not be said that they were punished from the rigor of justice, for they had experienced the mercy of a God who forgives guilt and eternal punishment. Yet, to suffer a proper punishment and to be punished with wrath and condemnation are not

the same. Although a severe judge punishes with wrath and condemnation, a merciful judge can still punish without condemnation. It suffices to say that punishment properly concerns a crime as something to be avenged, and in this sense, it is properly called punishment. The punishment of Moses and Aaron was indeed aimed at avenging their offense because it was inflicted solely on account of guilt, without any mention of correction. Consequently, it is a proper punishment, although in another sense, it may also be called chastisement.

V. Another proof is taken from the example of the children of Israel, who worshipped the golden calf in the desert. Concerning them, the following facts are certain, as even Crocius admits:

God wanted to destroy the entire people because of this sin. He was appeased by Moses' intercession and did not destroy them.

Nevertheless, thirty-three thousand from the entire population were slain because of this sin. Moses interceded for the remaining survivors that this sin might be forgiven. Despite this, God declared: "On the day of vengeance, I will visit this sin upon them." From this, we derive both a probable and a certain argument. The probable argument is that, among the multitude that perished, some were likely repentant. Yet, their death was not for their correction or amendment but as vengeance and a proper punishment.

Crocius distinguishes between vengeance properly and improperly called: proper vengeance, he says, is when God's judgment is accompanied by wrath and condemnation, whereas improper vengeance is when He does not seek to destroy but rather to correct. However, by what authority or reasoning is it denied that there is proper vengeance even when one is not condemned to destruction? Why should God not sometimes punish sinners in this life with proper punishments, using the same affliction both to chastise and to punish? Certainly, He does not always punish to destroy, yet He does properly punish and inflict real punishments.

VI. We also have a certain argument from the same passage: for although God, at Moses' intercession, forgave the sin of the Israelites, He nevertheless added, "Yet on the day of vengeance, I will visit this sin upon them."

Thus, after the guilt was remitted, the temporal punishment remained—not as a mere precaution, but as an act of vengeance, as is evident from the phrase "on the day of vengeance." Against this argument of Becanus, Crocius replies: "I do not find in Scripture that God punishes those whose guilt He has forgiven." However, neither does Scripture state that the guilt was not forgiven. Rather, its remission can be inferred from what Moses

later said: "For how shall it be known that I and Your people have found grace in Your sight, unless You go with us, so that we may be glorified above all the nations that dwell on the earth?"

And the Lord answered Moses: "I will do this very thing that you have spoken, for you have found grace in my sight."

Therefore, if, after the remission of guilt, there is still a visitation on the day of vengeance, then this visitation is not merely for caution but primarily for vengeance.

VII. Crocius responds again: "Note that the discussion here concerns the whole body of the people, not individual persons. Among the people, there were both penitents and impenitents. For the impenitent, guilt was not forgiven, and they suffered punitive vengeance in strict justice at its proper time. For the repentant, guilt was forgiven, and proper punishment was not retained." We reply: We acknowledge that the discussion pertains to the entire body of the people. However, the text does not explicitly state whether it concerns individuals. Likewise, the text does not specify whether the people included both penitents and impenitents. Yet, assuming there were both, God's warning of visitation on the day of vengeance applies to all of them. There is no reason to restrict this visitation only to the impenitent.

VIII. A third proof comes from the example of the entire Israelite people, who later murmured against God: "You shall not enter the land over which I lifted My hand to make you dwell in it, except for Caleb the son of Jephunneh and Joshua the son of Nun. But your children, whom you said would become prey for the enemy, I will bring in, so that they may see the land you rejected. But your corpses shall lie in the wilderness."

It is unlikely that all of these Israelites died in a state of mortal sin. Some of them must have obtained remission of their sin, yet still endured temporal punishment even after that remission.

IX. Against this argument of Becanus, Crocius replies: "For the unbelievers, their death was formally a punishment; for the believers, it was not formally a punishment but only materially so. For they did not thereby satisfy God for their sin; rather, their death was a benefit to them, for through it they were transferred to the heavenly city not made by hands." We respond: Sacred Scripture, and Becanus as well, are not speaking of death in itself but specifically of the death in the wilderness with the deprivation of seeing the Promised Land. Such a death, inflicted equally on both unbelievers and believers, must be considered, for both groups, a formal punishment since there is no basis for making a distinction. Dying in the desert and not seeing the Promised Land cannot be regarded as a

benefit, as is evident in itself. However, death itself may be both a proper punishment and incidentally a benefit—just as corrective chastisement can be both properly called correction and incidentally bring about a benefit.

X. A fourth proof comes from two examples concerning David. After receiving forgiveness for his murder and adultery, David was first punished by the death of the child he had conceived through adultery, as an act of vengeance for his sin. Nathan the prophet said to him: "The Lord has taken away your sin; you shall not die. But because you have caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme by this deed, the child that is born to you shall surely die." Second, David was punished with the disgraceful violation of his wives.

Later, when he presumptuously numbered the people, even after his sin had been forgiven, he was presented with three possible punishments:

Seven years of famine,

Three months of fleeing from his enemies,

Three days of pestilence.

David chose the last, and in three days, seventy thousand men perished by the plague.

XI. In response to this argument of Becanus, Crocius acknowledges that the punishment was a chastising one and indeed severe, but he denies that it was vengeful. We, however, recognize both aspects. For those words, "because you have caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme," indicate both the gravity of the sin—its lingering liability being punished by the child's death—and the severity of the scandal, which required to be redressed by that very death. There is no reason why this punishment should be understood in one sense and not the other.

XII. From all these preceding considerations, we conclude with Becanus: It often happens that a person who has committed a mortal sin is justified, being freed from mortal guilt and consequently from the liability to eternal punishment, yet remains subject to some temporal punishment.

Therefore, if such a person dies before expiating this temporal penalty, he must do so after this life. Since this cannot be done in Heaven, where there is no punishment, nor in Hell, where all punishment is eternal, it must necessarily take place in Purgatory.

XIII. Crocius objects: "It must first be proven that anyone departs from this life before

expiating temporal punishment."

We respond: On the contrary, it would first have to be proven that no one departs from this life unless their temporal punishment has been fully expiated. There is nothing preventing some from leaving this world still liable to temporal punishment. Crocius argues: "Whoever God decrees to punish here will not depart before suffering that punishment. God's judgment is not uncertain or conditional—'Either you will suffer here, or after death'—but definite and determined: 'He will suffer here.' Therefore, he will not suffer elsewhere."

But how can it be certain that in every divine decree this rule holds—"He will suffer here"—when it is sufficient that God has simply determined "He will suffer"? Indeed, sometimes temporal punishments can be remitted or mitigated through other means, such as works of charity performed in the grace of God.

CONTROVERSY I . On Purgatory

I. The question between Catholics and Protestants is: Whether Purgatory exists?

II. The Gallican Confession states: "We consider Purgatory to be a fabrication, originating from the same workshop (of Satan)." Confession of Helvetia: "What some teach concerning the fire of Purgatory is contrary to the Christian faith, to the complete purification through Christ, and to the very words of our Lord." The First Anglican Confession declares: "What they are accustomed to boast about their Purgatory, although we know it is not a new invention, is nonetheless nothing more than a foolish and old wives' tale." The Later Anglican Confession adds: "The doctrine of the Romans concerning Purgatory is vain, frivolously invented, and supported by no scriptural testimonies; indeed, it contradicts the Word of God."

III. The Catholic Profession of Faith, on the other hand, states: "I firmly hold that Purgatory exists."

IV. There is agreement between Catholics and Protestants on the following points:

1. Not all souls after this life undergo the pains of Purgatory. Some ascend directly to heaven, while others go straight to hell.
2. After the Day of Judgment, Purgatory will no longer exist; there will be only two eternal places, namely Heaven and Hell. As St. Augustine affirms: "No one should believe that purgatorial punishments will exist after that final and dreadful

judgment."

3. In the next life, souls cannot be reconciled with God through grace if they depart this world in mortal sin without reconciliation.

4. Christ is the purification for our sins, as it is written: "Making purification for sins."

However, this refers to the person purifying, not to a place of purification. The tribulations of this life, as well as death itself, may be considered a purification of sins. From this, it is evident that the term Purgatory has various meanings, and the question concerns its proper meaning in this context.

V. There is no dispute of faith between Catholics and Protestants regarding:

1. Where Purgatory is located.

2. How long souls remain there.

3. The nature of the purgatorial fire—whether it is corporeal or of a different kind than earthly fire.

4. Whether the fire of Purgatory is as intense, consuming, and afflicting as the fire of Hell. 5. How fire acts upon an incorporeal soul.

6. Whether the only difference between the pains of Purgatory and Hell is their duration.

7. How severe the pains of Purgatory are.

Such questions, though they may be useful and fruitful in theological discussions, and can be debated among Scholastic Doctors—such as Bellarmine and others—the Council of Trent (Session 25) cautions against discussing them in detail among the unlearned and common people. Instead, it recommends focusing on what is most certain and free from any appearance of falsehood.

VI. Hence, most of what Chemnitz reports about the structure of Purgatory (Examination of the Council of Trent, Part 3, p. 140) is vain and irrelevant to the controversy with Protestants. Similarly, such arguments are rightly ignored in the Synopsis of Pure Theology from Leiden (Disputation 39 on Purgatory, Thesis 4, p. 537).

Most absurd, however, is Scheibler's claim that "Souls in Purgatory suffer the same infernal punishments as the damned and are only freed from them by the intercessions of the living" (Examination of the Faith, Book 2, Part 2, Chapter 9, Section

1, Paragraph 1).

VII. Thus, the real question of faith is: Does Purgatory exist? That is, is there a place where souls, after this life, undergo temporal punishments for their sins?

FIRST PART

1. The Protestant Argument from Sacred Scripture

VIII. Objection 1 of Calixtus:The Scriptures and the power of the Church's keys describe the forgiveness of sins in such a way that the foundation of Purgatory cannot possibly exist alongside it. The Scriptures testify that God forgives sins in this manner:

He no longer remembers them (Ezekiel 18:22).

He casts them behind His back (Isaiah 38:17).

He plunges them into the depths of the sea (Micah 7:19).

He wipes them away like a cloud (Jeremiah 44:22).

He removes them as far as the east is from the west (Psalm 103:12).

He does not impute transgression (Romans 4:8).

He forgives all debt (Matthew 18:33).

His wrath no longer remains upon sinners (John 3:36).

There is no condemnation for them (Romans 8:1).

However, defenders of Purgatory claim that God forgives sins while still reserving punishments.

IX. Reply 1: In the passages cited, we do not read that Purgatory is a fabrication of Satan, or that it is a foolish and old wives' tale, or a vain invention, or any other such thing as is found in Protestant confessions. Thus, these passages do not contradict our doctrine—either explicitly or even by equivalence. The logical consequence that Protestants draw from these verses is flawed due to a common logical deficiency.

X. Reply 2: If Calixtus's argument is valid against the foundation of Purgatory, then it is

also valid against Scripture itself, which testifies that even after the guilt of sin has been forgiven, some temporal punishment remains to be paid.

For instance, Scripture teaches that God forgives sins and no longer remembers them. But then why did He still remember the sins of Moses and Aaron? Would you say that He did not remember them, even though He declared that He would inflict punishment upon them for it? Scripture says God casts sins behind His back—so how could He still look upon them and choose to punish Moses and Aaron?

Scripture says God plunges sins into the depths of the sea—so were they then dragged back up to be punished in Moses and Aaron?

Scripture says God wipes away sins like a cloud—so what cloud appeared when He still saw the sins of Moses and Aaron?

Scripture says God removes sins as far as the east is from the west—so how could those sins still have been set before Moses and Aaron after they were forgiven?

Scripture says God does not impute transgression—so what, then, did He impute to Moses and Aaron?

Scripture says God forgives all debts—yet He punished Moses and Aaron, who no longer owed anything.

Scripture says God's wrath no longer remains upon sinners—and yet He still punishes after His wrath has subsided.

Scripture says there is no condemnation for those reconciled—so either Moses and Aaron were not condemned, or there is a different meaning of condemnation.

You see, I think, that this argument does not hold against the Catholic position unless it also holds against Scripture itself.

XI. Reply 3: Why do Protestants not learn from these passages that God forgives sins in such a way that He truly removes their stain? Why do they not conclude that He casts them behind His back in such a way that their filth is no longer seen? Why do they not believe that He plunges them into the sea so that man is completely purified? Why do they not affirm that He removes them like a cloud so that man is truly no longer a sinner?

Why do they not say that God removes sins so completely that they no longer exist? That He does not impute transgressions because there is nothing left to impute? That He sets aside His wrath because there is no reason for anger? That there is no condemnation

because there is nothing left to condemn? If Protestants truly followed Scripture, they would come to this understanding, and Calixtus would abandon his error. Even Crocius, a Protestant, states more correctly and in accordance with Catholic teaching: “The material of sin remains, but the formal aspect is removed.” (Anti-Becanus, Contra F. Sect. 3, 1.5, Vol. 2, p. 111).

XII. Reply 4: If the formal aspect of sin is removed by forgiveness, then it is rightly said that:

God no longer remembers sins.

He casts them behind His back.

He plunges them into the sea.

He wipes them away like a cloud.

He removes them far away.

He does not impute them.

He fully forgives them.

He sets aside His wrath.

He does not wish to condemn.

If Crocius rightly follows Sacred Scripture in saying that God does not remember sins, yet acknowledges that after guilt is forgiven, God still visits the sinner for correction—which cannot happen without some form of remembrance—then why should we not also attribute a remembrance for temporal punishment? We do not doubt that sometimes God chooses to forget even temporal punishments. However, Scripture does not teach that He does so for all who repent, and this would contradict what we have already proven from Scripture.

XIII. Reply 5: Condemnation can be understood as damnation to eternal punishment—and in this sense, there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. Where there is no punishment, there is no condemnation. However, it does not follow that there is no condemnation in any sense for those who are in Christ if they still suffer some punishment. Why should temporal punishment be called condemnation, when that word implies God turning away from the condemned person in rejection of their guilt—which temporal punishment does not signify? Temporal punishment concerns satisfaction for divine justice after reconciliation. Furthermore, the Apostle states: "There is no condemnation for those

who are in Christ Jesus—who do not walk according to the flesh." If someone does not walk according to the flesh, but remains in Christ Jesus, then not only does eternal condemnation not threaten him, but no punishment of any kind from divine retribution.

XIV. Objection 2 of Calixtus: Sacred Scripture attributes full satisfaction for our sins solely to the passion of our Savior:

"Surely He has borne our pains" (Isaiah 53:4).

"He was wounded and crushed for our sins; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him" (Isaiah 53:5).

"He has redeemed us from the curse of the Law" (Galatians 3:13).

"He is the propitiation for our sins" (Romans 3:25).

"His blood cleanses and purifies us from all sin" (1 John 1:7).

The clear meaning of these and similar passages has even compelled Catholic theologians to admit that Christ has fully satisfied for all the penalties of sin.

Thus, Bellarmine states (De Indulgentiis, Book 2, Chapter 10): "Christ has most fully satisfied God the Father for the guilt and both the temporal and eternal punishment of all sins." If Christ has so abundantly satisfied for all sin, then why do Catholics require human satisfaction to appease divine justice? Why does God accept the merit of Christ for eternal punishment, but not for temporal punishment? Why must human beings also make satisfaction for temporal punishments, as if Christ's sacrifice were not sufficient?

XV. Reply 1: This objection proves nothing because, in proving too much, it also contradicts Scripture itself—not just Purgatory.For Scripture says: "Christ bore our pains." But then, why did God still visit the sins of the Israelites on the day of vengeance? If Christ removed all suffering, then why did the Israelites still suffer punishment?

"Christ was wounded for our sins." Then why, on the day of vengeance, were the Israelites still wounded for their own sins?

"Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law." Will you then say that the Israelites were still under the curse of the Law when they were punished on the day of vengeance?

"Christ is the propitiation for our sins." Will you claim, then, that Christ was not the propitiation for the Israelites' sins, since God still punished them?

"The blood of Christ cleanses us from all sin." Yet even after being cleansed, the Israelites

did not escape punishment on the day of vengeance. Catholics and Protestants agree that Christ has abundantly satisfied for all the penalties of sin. However, Christ's satisfaction does not benefit us unless it is applied to us, as even Crocius admits.

So let Calixtus answer this question:

Why does God accept Christ's satisfaction for eternal punishment, but not automatically for temporal punishment?

The answer is that Christ's satisfaction must be applied to us in different ways, and God accepts it in different manners—something that no one can fully explain, since no one is God's counselor. Calixtus asks why Christ's merit is sufficient for eternal punishment, but not for temporal punishment. But who denies that Christ's satisfaction removes temporal punishments? It is clear that without Christ's satisfaction, temporal punishments could not be removed, and in fact, they are frequently removed through the application of His satisfaction. Yet this does not mean that God always removes all temporal punishments immediately. This is not the place to dispute about our own human satisfactions, since the discussion here concerns the temporal punishments that God still reserves for us.

XVI. Reply 2: The Scriptures teach:

Christ bore our pains.

He was wounded for our sins.

He redeemed us from the curse of the Law.

He is the propitiation for our sins.

His blood cleanses us from all sin.

Calixtus uses these passages to argue against temporal punishments, but a wicked man could just as easily use them to reject faith, baptism, and obedience to God's commandments. For instance, why do Protestants still pray "Forgive us our debts" if they claim to believe by divine faith that their sins—both guilt and punishment—have already been remitted through Christ's satisfaction?

In the same way, Protestants believe: "The blood of Christ cleanses us from all sin." "He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world."

Yet, Protestants do not claim that all people in the whole world are automatically freed from guilt and punishment because of Christ's propitiation. Otherwise, no one would go to Hell, and eternal damnation would not exist. Thus, it does not follow that: "Christ has fully

satisfied for our sins; Therefore, whoever receives His satisfaction for the forgiveness of guilt must also receive it for the forgiveness of all punishment." As has already been said, similar faulty logic could be used to prove anything from anything.

XVII. Reply 3: We become partakers of Christ's satisfaction through various means: Faith: The Apostle Peter states:

"Purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts 15:9)

Here, purification is attributed to faith. Baptism: Scripture also states: "Cleansing her by the washing of water in the word of life." (Ephesians 5:26) Here, purification is attributed to water and the word of life. Yet neither faith nor baptismal water are the Blood of Christ itself—which alone purges us from all sin. Rather, they are means by which Christ's satisfaction is applied to us. Similarly, prayer is a means of grace, which is why we do not pray in vain: "Thy kingdom come."

Just as we have a commandment to believe, to receive baptism, and to pray, we also have a commandment to endure afflictions sent by God—whether these afflictions: serve as a correction, act as a safeguard against future sins, or atone for past sins.

This commandment is given to Moses and David, as previously cited, and is also found in the general teaching of the Apostle Paul: "We are heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ, provided that we suffer with Him, so that we may also be glorified with Him." (Romans 8:17)

XVIII. Reply 4: Against the false security of Protestants, St. Augustine rightly says: "If you do not confess to God what you are, God will condemn what He finds in you. Do you not want Him to condemn you? Then condemn yourself. Do you want Him to forgive you? Then acknowledge your sins, so that you may say to God: 'Turn Your face away from my sins.'"

Likewise, Scripture says:

"For I acknowledge my iniquity." (Psalm 51:3)

And also: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all iniquity." (1 John 1:9)

St. Augustine further warns: "Lest it seem that God gives impunity to sins, He says: 'He is faithful and just to cleanse us from all iniquity.' Otherwise, people might say: 'Let us sin, let us do whatever we wish; Christ will cleanse us, for He is faithful and just, and He will purify us

from all iniquity.'" But Scripture removes this false security and instead instills useful fear:

"You wish to be secure? Be vigilant instead! For God is faithful and just to forgive our sins—but only if you always repent and change, until you are made perfect."

XIX. Objection 3 of Calixtus: Sacred Scripture defines only two states for the dead—salvation and damnation. Nowhere does it mention an intermediate place or a prison-like state from which one might be freed.

If such a state existed, people would have been warned about it so that they might avoid it, especially since it would be feared by so many souls, including God's adopted children, whom He loves so dearly. Instead, Scripture teaches: "Whoever believes will be saved, but whoever does not believe will be condemned." (Mark 16:16)

"There is one gate that leads to destruction, and one gate that leads to life." (Matthew 7:13–14) "The wheat is gathered into the barn, while the chaff is burned with unquenchable fire." (Matthew 3:12)

"Lazarus is carried by angels into Abraham's bosom, while the rich man is cast into Hell." (Luke 16:22–23)

Because only eternal rewards or eternal punishments remain after death, Scripture constantly reminds us:

"Time is short." (1 Corinthians 7:29)

"Redeem the time, for the days are evil." (Ephesians 5:16)

"We must work while it is day." (John 9:4)

"Run while you are still in the race." (1 Corinthians 9:24)

However, according to the Roman doctrine of Purgatory, some sinners may still obtain deliverance after death— either by securing many suffrages and indulgences while alive, or by having prayers and indulgences offered for them by the living after their death.

XX. Reply 1: Calixtus rightly says that, according to Catholic teaching, some sinners may obtain deliverance after death.

But if he claims that this contradicts Sacred Scripture, what will Protestants say about

their own doctrine?

Many Protestants believe that all sins are only covered in this life, not fully removed—and that they are only taken away completely after death. Calixtus also states that deliverance after death is conditional—that is, it requires either: prayers and indulgences obtained during life, or prayers and indulgences offered for the deceased by the living. Yet, according to Catholic teaching, he will never be able to prove that these conditions are absolutely necessary for a soul to obtain deliverance from Purgatory. Even though the suffrages of the living are helpful to the faithful departed, as will be proven in a later discussion, the Catholic Church does not teach that they are absolutely necessary. Moreover, the claim that one can procure indulgences after one's own death has never been heard of among us, and we attribute such a statement to excess in speech. Similarly, the assertion that indulgences are obtained for the dead by the living is nothing beyond the regular practice of suffrages, which will be addressed in Controversy II, Section 7.

XXI. Reply 2: Sacred Scripture indeed defines two states of the dead, which are always placed before the eyes of all: Salvation, and Damnation.

Beyond these two eternal states, we do not know of a third, since Purgatory is not eternal. Since the eternal state of each soul—whether in eternal happiness or eternal misery—must be well known to all, it is not surprising that these two states are frequently mentioned in Sacred Scripture. However, knowledge of Purgatory is not of the same necessity as knowledge of the eternal states. Thus, it is no wonder that Purgatory is not mentioned as frequently as Heaven and Hell. Nevertheless, Sacred Scripture does not remain silent on Purgatory, as will be demonstrated in the following sections.

Therefore, the argument does not hold:

Scripture frequently mentions Heaven and Hell; therefore, it defines only two states of the dead.

XXII. Reply 3 It is not incorrect to say that, because either eternal rewards or eternal and inescapable punishments await us after death,

Scripture so frequently urges us to make good use of time, since: Time is short. The opportune moment must be redeemed. We must work while we can. We must run while we are still in the race. But how does any of this prove that Purgatory does not exist after this life? There is no logical connection between these two claims.

XXIII. Objection 4 of Calixtus: Scripture clearly states that those who die in the Lord are

immediately blessed and at rest after death:

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; they shall rest from their labors." (Revelation 14:13) "The souls of the just are in the hand of God, and no torment shall touch them." (Wisdom 3:1) "The righteous enter into peace and rest in their chambers." (Isaiah 57:1–2) "Those in Christ know that when their earthly dwelling is destroyed, they have a building from God, an eternal dwelling in the heavens." (2 Corinthians 5:1)

He proves this further with the example of:

The Good Thief on the cross and Lazarus, who was immediately carried into Abraham's bosom. Calixtus also argues that because Christians desire death without fear, and because death is described as sleep, the doctrine of Purgatory contradicts this certainty—for it teaches that even the most just must endure terrible sufferings before reaching Heaven.

XXIV. Reply 1: Regarding Revelation 14:13, Beza translates:

"Blessed are the dead who die for the Lord", and explains that this refers to martyrs. The Heidelberg Gloss agrees, interpreting this passage as referring to the holy martyrs, which aligns with St. Augustine's explanation.

In fact, St. Augustine found nothing contrary to Purgatory in this passage. On the contrary, he also mentions prayers for the dead, writing:

"The souls of the martyrs, of course, have not yet been reunited with their bodies. For even the souls of the pious dead are not separated from the Church, which even now is the Kingdom of Christ. Otherwise, there would be no commemoration of them at the altar of God in the communion of Christ's body."

And shortly after, he adds:

"That is why only the souls of martyrs are mentioned."

Therefore, we teach that those who die for the Lord's sake, imitating Christ and the martyrs, immediately enter into the beatific vision.

XXV. Reply 2: For all others, the situation is not the same.

Those who depart this life fully purified do not experience the pains of Purgatory. Are these many, or are they few? That is uncertain. What is certain is that the doctrine of Purgatory encourages all to:

Make worthy fruits of repentance. Constantly seek divine mercy for the remission of debts.

Believers have confidence that when their earthly dwelling is destroyed, they will have an eternal home in Heaven. For this reason, they unceasingly pray to God to receive the dying into the peace of the just and that they may rest in their chambers. However, they do not believe that Purgatorial punishments await all the faithful, since from the examples of the Good Thief and Lazarus, we know that some enter directly into rest. Thus, although everyone has good reason to fear the punishments of Purgatory, they also know that whatever sufferings may come are only temporary— and that eternal and unending happiness will follow. This hope of eternal joy gives the righteous courage to face death fearlessly, desiring it as a means of union with Christ. At the same time, however, the thought of Purgatorial punishments motivates them to persevere in works of repentance until the very end.

XXVI. Reply: 3 Calixtus cites Wisdom 3:1, saying:

"The souls of the just are in the hand of God, where no torment touches them."

We congratulate him for counting the Book of Wisdom among the Sacred Scriptures. However, we read in that passage:

"The souls of the just are in the hand of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them."

It is clear, then, that Calixtus has changed the meaning of the text. He alters the phrase "the torment of death" to mean simply "no torment at all," modifying both the words and the sense of the passage to fit his own interpretation.

XXVII. Objection 5 (from the Helvetic Confession and Scheibler): Purgatory contradicts the doctrine of faith, because Scripture states:

"Whoever hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life." (John 5:24)

Reply: Whoever fully satisfies the demands of faith by living righteously does not enter Purgatory. However, those who do not fully satisfy must undergo purification. If we do not make satisfaction for temporal punishment in this life, then it must be cleansed in Purgatory.

XXVIII. Objection 6 (from the Helvetic Confession): Purgatory contradicts this text: "He who has bathed has no need except to wash his feet; he is entirely clean. And you are clean." (John 13:10)

Reply: In Catholic doctrine, those who have been bathed by justifying and sanctifying grace are entirely clean, for the filth of sin has been removed. But in Protestant doctrine, they are

not entirely clean, since sin remains in the justified, merely covered, not removed. Where, then, do Protestants find in this passage any argument against Purgatory?

XXIX. Objection 7 (from Scheibler): Purgatory contradicts the doctrine of penance, because: The Heavenly Father receives the prodigal son out of love, He forgives his sins, And He remembers them no more (Luke 15; Ezekiel 18; Isaiah 43; Micah 7). How then could God hand over His own children to the Devil in Hell for punishment?

Reply: Purgatory does not contradict the doctrine of penance, any more than the temporal punishments which God often imposes on the faithful even after their sins have been forgiven. Furthermore, the Catholic Church does not teach that God hands over His children to the Devil in Hell.

XXX. Objection 8 (from Scheibler): The doctrine of Purgatory contradicts the doctrine of the Cross and prayer, because: On the Cross, we are directed to prayer, Prayer is promised to be heard, But in the great Cross of Purgatory, the cries of the suffering are in vain.

Reply: On the Cross, we are indeed directed to prayer, and prayer is promised to be heard. However, nowhere does Scripture state, nor does the Catholic Church teach, that the prayers of those in Purgatory are in vain.

XXXI. Objection 9 (from Scheibler): Purgatory contradicts the role of angels, who carry the souls of the faithful into the bosom of Abraham— a place of consolation (Luke 16).

Reply: Scripture does not say that all the souls of the faithful are immediately carried by angels into a place of consolation after death.

XXXII. Objection 10 (from Scheibler):

Purgatory contradicts the Final Judgment, because: At that time, some will still have venial sins Or unpaid temporal punishment for mortal sins. Yet, Scripture teaches that: All those on Christ's right hand are immediately saved (Matthew 25).

Reply: We agree that there will be no Purgatory after the Last Judgment. However, we deny that anyone will be found at that time still bearing the debt of temporal punishment, whether for venial or mortal sins. Since we know that after the Last Judgment: Purgatory will no longer exist, Nothing unclean will enter Heaven,

It is certain that before then, God will purify the faithful through certain means. Now let Protestants answer this:

When are the faithful purified from their mortal sins? We are not asking when they are

covered by Christ's righteousness through faith— but when they are actually cleansed of their sins. If they say this happens in this life, they contradict Protestant doctrine, which teaches that sinfulness remains in the justified.

If they say it is remitted after this life, then why should temporal punishment not also be required after this life? If, however, they say that the faithful are never purified in this life or the next, then it follows that they enter Heaven in their filth—yet nothing unclean shall enter (Revelation 21:27). Perhaps they will say that sinfulness is removed at the moment of death. But then, by what Scriptural authority or foundation do they assert this?

XXXIII. Final Argument: Lacking clear and manifest Scriptural proofs to establish their doctrine or disprove ours, Protestants often resort to a different kind of argument—one that they present to the unlearned, as though it were most in harmony with truth.

They use this argument so frequently because it relieves them of proving their position, and because it is so broad that it covers almost all their negative articles of faith. Calixtus, realizing that his objections do not disprove Purgatory, argues that his Church has no need to dispute this new doctrine, which, according to him, was introduced apart from Scripture. But the Catholic theologians, since they affirm the doctrine of Purgatory and regard it as ancient, certainly cannot avoid the necessity of proving it.

However, whether Calixtus likes it or not, he also bears the burden of proof— for he must give a reason from Scripture why the Lutheran Church departed from the belief that it once held before its separation. Even so, we do not shrink from the burden of proof if the Lutheran Church first fulfills its duty by attempting to prove its own position. For further discussion on this method of argumentation, see the Augustinian Method.

2. Protestant Proofs from the Holy Fathers

XXXIV. Objection from St. Gregory.

Protestants object, citing St. Gregory, who says: "Since we have been redeemed by the grace of our Savior, we now possess this gift from Heaven: that when we depart from the habitation of our flesh, we are immediately led to the heavenly rewards." If, therefore, the pious souls of the departed cannot immediately ascend to Heaven but at the same time must remain in Purgatory, then it clearly follows that Purgatory does not exist.

XXXV. Reply: Where do Protestants find that St. Gregory here is not contrasting the law of the Gospel with the old law? Perhaps after Christ's redemption, the just can now so live that they immediately enter Heaven after death—something that was not granted to the

just under the Old Law. In fact, the very next words of St. Gregory state: "However, those who came into this world before His coming, no matter how much virtue they had in righteousness, could not in any way be immediately received into the bosom of the heavenly homeland after death, because He had not yet come who would break open the gates of Hell by His descent and place the souls of the just in their eternal dwelling." What St. Gregory denies for the just of the Old Testament, he affirms for the just of the New Testament. Thus, his words offer no argument against our position, since we already teach that some do enter Heaven immediately after death. However, for those who do not immediately enter the heavenly homeland, we attribute this to their imperfect satisfaction for sin. For this reason, along with St. Gregory and other Holy Fathers, we affirm the existence of Purgatory, as will be further demonstrated in what follows.

XXXVI. Objection from St. Augustine.

Protestants also cite St. Augustine, who says: "The first place, according to Catholic faith, is believed to be the kingdom of Heaven, from which, as I have said, the unbaptized are excluded. The second is Gehenna, where every apostate and unbeliever in Christ will suffer eternal punishment. The third we completely ignore, indeed we do not find it in Holy Scripture." Therefore, they conclude, Purgatory does not exist.

XXXVII. Reply: Whatever may be said about the authority of the books attributed to St. Augustine, the author in question is writing against the Pelagians, who placed infants dying without baptism in a certain eternal third place, separate from both Heaven and Hell. However, what he denies is a third place that lasts eternally. This is evident from his immediately preceding words: "Give me, apart from this place (he speaks of the kingdom of Heaven), another place where there can be eternal rest."

XXXVIII. Important Distinction

Note: When the Holy Fathers say that after this life, there is no remission of sins, no penance, or satisfaction, they are referring to grave sins, that is, mortal sins that were not forgiven in this life, which cannot be remitted in the next life. However, if Protestants claim that the Fathers are speaking generally about all sins, whether venial sins or the punishment due to sin, let them respond to the testimonies which we will present in the following sections as evidence to the contrary. "See to it that no one deceives you through philosophy and empty deceit." (Colossians 2:8)

XXXIX. Summary of Protestant Errors

1. Their first objection from Scripture misuses a passage by wrongly assuming a

contradiction.

2. Their second objection argues from cause to effect, yet ignores the means of application.

3. Their third objection relies on an authority that is denied and on empty presumption.

4. Their fourth objection falsely invents a contradiction.

5. Their fifth objection repeats the same error as the fourth.

6. Their sixth objection is entirely trivial.

7. Their seventh objection takes a statement in a limited sense but applies it universally.

8. Their eighth objection assumes something that should not be assumed.

9. Their ninth objection draws a universal conclusion from a particular case.

10. Their tenth objection again fabricates a contradiction.

As for their objections from the Holy Fathers, they take statements in a limited sense but treat them as if they were absolute and universal.

SECOND PART:

1. Catholic Proofs from Councils and the Practice of the Church

XL. Definition from the Council of Florence

The Council of Florence defines Purgatory as follows: "We define that if those who have truly repented depart this life in the love of God, yet before they have satisfied for their sins by worthy fruits of penance for what they have committed and omitted, their souls are purified by the punishments of Purgatory after death." This same Council, in another passage, explicitly affirms the existence of Purgatory (Session 25, p. 598D).

XLI. Teaching from the Council of Trent

The Council of Trent likewise declares: "Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, has, from Sacred Scripture and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred Councils—and most recently in this ecumenical Synod— that Purgatory exists…" The

universal practice of the Church is evident to all and cannot be denied.

Why would the faithful be so concerned with offering prayers, sacrifices, and suffrages for the souls of the departed unless they believed that there was indeed a place from which their souls could be freed?

2. Catholic Proof from Sacred Scripture.

XLII. First Proof. "Whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor in the future." Here it is formally presupposed that some sins are forgiven in the future age; for, as we have said elsewhere, every exception formally presupposes the rule. This was observed regarding the matter by St. Gregory in Dialogues, Book 4, Chapter 39, Volume 3, Columns 337–338.

XLIII. Calixtus Objects: "We deny that it follows from this passage that some sins are forgiven in the future age. Rather, the words of Matthew, 'neither in this age nor in the future age,' signify that it shall never be forgiven, but that the sinner will remain subject to judgment and punishment even after death." For this is how the sense is expressed by the Evangelist Mark, etc.

XLIV. Response: "We, in opposition, deny that from the fact that these words mean 'it shall never be forgiven,' it follows that they do not mean that some sins are forgiven in the future age. Why should they not signify both, since both are true if both are contained in these words?"

XLV. Peter Martyr Objects: "In dialectics, two negative propositions do not usually conclude an affirmative one. Therefore, saying 'not forgiven in this age' and 'not forgiven in the other' does not affirm that after this life there is a remission of sins."

XLVI. Response: "We grant that in dialectics, two negative propositions do not conclude an affirmative one; therefore, it is incorrect to infer an affirmative from negatives, as far as they are negative. However, in the proposed case, the affirmative is not inferred from the negative as if it necessarily followed from the negative, which is falsely assumed by Martyr. Rather, the affirmative is inferred from the negative insofar as that negative is also an exception, because every exception formally presupposes the rule. Although it belongs to dialecticians to discuss affirmative and negative propositions, wherever an exceptional proposition occurs, it must be explained according to the rules of that science to which it belongs to discuss exceptional

propositions. That science teaches: 'Every exception presupposes the rule.' Since these terms are exceptional—‘neither in this age nor in the future’—it is necessary that some sins are forgiven even in the future age."

XLVII. Crocius Objects: "Let it be granted that sins are forgiven in another age. That does not mean there is a purgatory. On the contrary, it rather means that there is not. For purgatory is imagined as a place where sins are punished. But here, remission of sins is concluded, which is not a punishment but its opposite, as common sense clearly dictates. Remission of debt is not the same as demanding payment. And who ever heard of a man remitting a debt while simultaneously demanding its payment?"

XLVIII. Response: "We accept the concession that sins are forgiven in another age. But sins are not forgiven to those in heaven, because ‘nothing unclean shall enter there,’ as Scripture testifies. Nor are sins forgiven to those in hell, because there is no remission there, as Protestants themselves admit. It remains, therefore, that remission takes place in another place, which we commonly call purgatory. As for the remaining objections, distinguish between guilt and the penalty due; and no difficulty will remain in the objection. For the remission of guilt is not the same as punishment, nor is it opposed to all punishment, even if he insists that common sense clearly dictates this. For we have already proven that, even when guilt is remitted, a temporal penalty is still required. The remission of punishment and the exaction of punishment are not the same; but the remission of guilt and the exaction of some penalty are not contradictory."

XLIX. Crocius' Second Objection: "The adversaries ought to prove three things. First, that by ‘the other age’ purgatory is meant, or at least precisely the intermediate time between this age and the Last Judgment. Where will they prove this? On the contrary, Scripture designates the Last Day clearly, as in Luke 20:35: ‘But those who are accounted worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage.’ Here, ‘that age’ signifies the time of resurrection, which the Sadducees had spoken about in verse 33. Second, if a certain sin is neither forgiven in this age nor in the future, it does not follow that some sins, which are not forgiven here, will be forgiven in the future age. This does not follow logically—just as from the statement, ‘Some men do not love God in this age nor in the future,’ it does not follow that ‘Some who do not love Him here will love Him there.’ Third, ‘A certain sin is neither forgiven in this age nor in the future age; therefore, some sins are forgiven either in this age or in the future.’ This does not necessarily follow."

L. Response 1: It is universally acknowledged, and the very matter itself proclaims, that by "the next age" is meant the time after this life. Both Calixtus and Crocius, along with Sacred

Scripture, affirm that "the next age" refers to the entirety of time after this life. Sacred Scripture, in the phrase "neither in this age nor in the one to come," designates all of eternity.

Thus, whether the words "in that age" in Luke 20:35 signify the time of the resurrection or the entire period after this life—which is later determined by the following context to refer to the time of the resurrection—makes little difference. If Crocius were to interpret "in that age" in Luke 20 and Matthew 12 strictly as referring to the time of the resurrection, he would contradict himself, for he had previously in Matthew 12 taught that the phrase encompasses all of eternity. If this is true, then the phrase "in that age" does not exclusively signify the time of the resurrection to the exclusion of the rest of time.

Since it is evident that "the future age" means all time after this life, it necessarily follows that there must be some intermediate period between this age and the final judgment in which sins are remitted. For if sins are neither remitted after the final judgment nor within the final judgment itself, it follows that they must be remitted in the intermediate period between this age and the final judgment; otherwise, they would never be remitted at all. Protestants, along with us, teach that after the final judgment, no sins are remitted. Calixtus and Martyr likewise assert that at the time of the final judgment itself, no sins are forgiven, refusing to acknowledge any remission or pardon of sins after this life.

Those who are to be condemned will not partake in the remission of sins, as is universally acknowledged. Nor will those who are to be saved receive remission upon descending from heaven. If the blessed souls in heaven, to which nothing impure can enter, have already attained their beatitude, they will not bear any stain of sin requiring remission or pardon when they come to judgment.

Thus, it remains proven that sins are remitted in the intermediate period between this age and the final judgment. Meanwhile, it is possible that venial sins may be remitted for souls coming from purgatory to judgment, as will be discussed below in section 121 and in Chapter LII.

LII. Response 2: In Christ's words in Matthew 12, as Martyr acknowledges, two negative propositions are stated: "Whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven in this age." "Whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven in the age to come." Each of these negative propositions is exception-based. The first assumes that some sins are forgiven in this age; the second assumes that some sins are forgiven in the age to come. This is sufficient for our proof.

Crocius demands further proof that certain sins not forgiven here are forgiven in the future

age. Yet this is already established when we demonstrate that some sins are indeed remitted in the future age. For who has ever heard of remission occurring after full satisfaction has been rendered, or of something being properly remitted that has already been forgiven once?

Thus, it follows from the exception-based proposition that some sins are remitted in the future age. That these sins were not previously remitted follows from the nature of remission itself. Hence, the objection is baseless. As for Crocius' third objection, the response is evident from what has been said.

LIII. Objection 3 by Crocius. Crocius argues that even their own adversaries sometimes admit that the logical consequence they rely on is not necessary according to formal reasoning. By what rule then is it established? By the rule of prudence.

This is indeed remarkable! What an extraordinary way to argue! When the rules of dialectic fail to support their error, they resort to the rule of prudence. These are the words of Bellarmine in De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapter 4.

I respond that what we infer from the words of the Lord does not follow according to the rules of dialectic but according to the rule of prudence. The opponent sought to conclude an error. Since dialectical rules do not support his argument, he turns to the rule of prudence. But how can we trust this rule, especially given the nature of Jesuitic prudence?

We insist on the truth: negative propositions by their nature imply two affirmative contradictions—one conjunctive and the other disjunctive. Thus, the disjunctive conclusion is not necessarily required; a conjunctive inference is possible.

Therefore, the following argument is not necessary: "This sin will not be forgiven in this age or in the age to come."

"Therefore, some other sin must be forgiven either in this age or in the next." A third option exists: some sins are forgiven in both this age and the next. This conjunctive proposition is what we infer from Christ's words. For Scripture testifies that whatever sins are forgiven here are likewise forgiven in the next age, and whatever sins are forgiven in the next age are also forgiven here.

Sins are forgiven in this age through the ministry of the Gospel; they are forgiven in the next through the declarative sentence of the Judge. Just as Christ has an authoritative sentence in heaven that pronounces forgiveness on earth (Matthew 18:18; John 20:23), so also in the future, He will declare His sentence as binding (Romans 2:16).

This aligns with the Apostle's statement in 2 Timothy 1:18: "May the Lord grant him (Onesiphorus) mercy from the Lord on that day." Likewise, Peter states in Acts 3:19: "So that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshment shall come from the presence of the Lord."

LIV. Response 1. From the words of Christ: "Whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven, neither in this age nor in the one to come," our teachers have correctly inferred that some sins are indeed forgiven in the future age. Protestants, as seen in the writings of Calixtus and Martyr, have generally denied this conclusion, convinced that it cannot be derived through dialectical rules.

Bellarmine, as was his custom, responded solidly, arguing that this inference does not follow from the rules of dialectic but from the rule of prudence. For dialectical rules do not teach that an exception establishes a rule for cases not excepted, whereas the rule of prudence—or rather jurisprudence, founded on natural reason—does.

It is worth noting how Crocius himself, while arguing a different matter, employs the same rule. He states that Becano had established that written law cannot be the judge in faith controversies in three specific cases. Crocius then responds: "If in three cases written law cannot be the judge, then outside of those cases, it can be."

This inference is evident. If written law could never be the judge, then specifying three cases where it cannot be would be absurd. Right reason demonstrates this clearly. But does right reason demonstrate this by the rules of dialectic or by the rule of prudence? One cannot claim it is demonstrated by dialectical rules, for dialectic provides no such principle. Consequently, right reason must demonstrate it through the rule of prudence. Thus, when dialectical rules fail, Crocius himself argues from the rule of prudence. Would it be fair to mock him, saying: "What an extraordinary disputant! Since dialectical rules do not serve to establish his error, he flees to the rule of prudence, which we have every reason to suspect given the nature of Crocian prudence?"

If it would not be just to say this of Crocius, why should it be said of Bellarmine, who employs the same rule of prudence?

Therefore, following Crocius' own reasoning, Bellarmine's proof remains valid: If a sin is specifically determined as one that will not be remitted in the future age, it necessarily follows that there must be some sins that will be remitted in the future age. For if no sins were to be remitted, then excluding one particular sin from remission would be meaningless. This principle is affirmed by St. Chrysostom, who states that the Apostles abrogated the Mosaic Law by making exceptions for the prohibitions against eating food

sacrificed to idols, blood, and things strangled. Accordingly, all Protestants who deny that some sins are forgiven in the future age contradict evident reason. But since Crocius does not deny this alongside his brethren, we must now examine his alternative argument.

LV. Response 2. Crocius correctly states: "If the same sin is forgiven in this age, then it is forgiven in the future age as well. From Christ's words, it does not follow that one sin is forgiven in this age while another sin is forgiven in the future age which was not forgiven here."

However, Crocius is mistaken in asserting that the same sin is forgiven both in this age and in the future age. Thus, it rightly follows from Christ's words that one sin is forgiven in this age, while another sin—one not forgiven here—is forgiven in the future age.

One who has already accepted full satisfaction for a debt cannot remit it again, for there is no debt remaining after payment has been received. Therefore, if God, while a person exists in this age, has accepted Christ's satisfaction for his sin and thus forgiven it, He cannot, properly speaking, remit the same sin again. Who has ever heard of someone properly remitting a debt that has already been paid? Or of properly remitting something that has already been remitted once?

The sentence of remission, which is pronounced on earth by the delegated power from heaven, is ratified by the One who delegates that authority and who exists in heaven, as Christ affirms in Matthew 18:18 and John 20:23. In the day of judgment, Christ will declare that He has ratified that sentence, as stated in Romans 2:16.

Indeed, He will manifest His mercy toward the faithful, as St. Paul prays for Onesiphorus in 2 Timothy 1:16:

"May the Lord grant him mercy from the Lord on that day."

This manifestation of mercy, or the reiteration and declaration of remission already granted, can be loosely termed the remission of sins, and perhaps this is the sense in which Acts 3:19 should be understood:

"That your sins may be blotted out when times of refreshment shall come from the presence of the Lord."

However, it does not follow that in Matthew 12:32, remission is to be taken in its proper sense when referring to this age but in an improper sense when referring to the future age. It is more reasonable that, in such closely connected propositions, the terms should remain consistent. Moreover, there is no necessity for taking remission in the future age in an

improper sense.

LVI. Objection by Calvin and others object that this passage concerns guilt, and specifically the gravest guilt, but not punishment.

Response: Christ, in this passage, speaks specifically about the gravest guilt while also addressing other sins whose severity He does not specify. Furthermore, when Scripture speaks simply of the remission of sin, it is understood to refer to both the punishment and the guilt of sin—unless something else prevents that interpretation. This is so true that even Protestants teach that guilt is never remitted without the remission of punishment.

Thus, although in the future age mortal sins are not remitted—as Protestants teach along with us, since those who depart without repentance are not freed from them and therefore do not merit being aided by the prayers of the faithful, as St. Augustine observes—Catholics teach that mortal sins are remitted with regard to their temporal punishment, and venial sins with regard to both their guilt and punishment, since a complete remission must precede entrance into heaven.

From this, it follows that the fruit of Christ's passion is applied to us not only in this age for the expiation of our sins but also in the future age. This application occurs in a place which cannot be called either heaven or hell and is thus rightly called Purgatory—at least until a more fitting term is commonly adopted.

LVII. Second Passage "If anyone's work is burned up, he will suffer loss, but he himself will be saved—yet as through fire."

Bellarmine's Interpretation: "The meaning of this entire passage," says Bellarmine, "is that the Day of the Lord will be revealed by the fire of conflagration. And just as that day itself will be revealed by fire, so too will the works of each individual be made manifest by fire—namely, the fire of judgment. And just as works will be revealed by fire, so also will the workers who need purification be purified by a certain fire." (De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapter 6, § Refpondeo primo).

LVIII. Objection by Calixtus Calixtus argues that several reasons from the text itself prohibit interpreting Paul's words as referring to the Papist doctrine of purgatory: Paul's fire is metaphorical. Just as gold, silver, and precious stones are metaphorical—likewise wood, hay, and straw—so too the fire that is said to test and partially consume these must also be taken metaphorically. However, purgatorial fire is not metaphorical but infernal.

LIX. Response 1 This objection is irrelevant. Bellarmine, commenting on Paul's

words—"Each one's work will be tested by fire. If someone's work remains, he will receive a reward. If someone's work is burned up, he will suffer loss."—writes: "Although works pass beyond the sight of men and cannot be examined by a material fire, they do not pass beyond the sight of God. As Ecclesiastes says, 'God will bring everything into judgment and examine all that is done.' And if someone's work remains—that is, if his work can endure God's judgment, just as gold withstands fire—he will receive a reward, he will be tested and crowned by God. But if someone's work is burned—that is, if his work cannot endure God's judgment, just as hay and straw cannot withstand fire—he will suffer loss, he will be reproved and rejected."

Thus, Calixtus, you see how Bellarmine understands Paul's words about the fire that tests and consumes works as referring to metaphorical fire. Indeed, Calixtus himself agrees with Bellarmine in interpreting this portion of Paul's text, yet he still claims to have found in it an argument against the doctrine of purgatory.

LX. Response 2: Crocius offers a more precise argument, raising a valid difficulty. He asserts that the Apostle's phrase "as through fire" proves that the fire is metaphorical. He notes that the Greek word ὡς (as) often signifies likeness rather than reality, as in the phrase ὡς σοφός ἀρχιτέκτων ("as a wise architect"). Since the rest of the passage is metaphorical, he argues, the fire must be as well.

However, Bellarmine refutes this difficulty as follows: Some object that the word "as" (quasi) signifies likeness rather than reality. I respond that the word "as" does not signify that the fire itself is unreal or imaginary. Rather, it qualifies the passing through fire. The meaning is thus:

"He who has built with hay will attain salvation, but in the same way as someone who passes through fire."

Just as John 1:14 states: "We have seen His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father," meaning, "We have seen Him as glorious in the way that befits the only-begotten Son of the Father."

Thus, Crocius, you see that the phrase "as through fire" denotes similarity, and on this point, you agree with Bellarmine. However, you erroneously conclude that the resemblance refers to the fire itself, as if the fire were not real, whereas it actually refers to the one passing through the fire.

As for your second argument, Crocius, let us also hear Bellarmine:

Some object that it would be absurd for the Apostle to use the word fire in different senses

within the same passage—once to mean judgment and once to mean the actual fire of purgatory. Response: The text itself compels us to admit not one but two distinct meanings. When Paul states that the day of judgment will be revealed through fire, he seems to be speaking of the fire of final conflagration. But when he adds, "each one's work will be tested by fire," he cannot mean literal fire, for literal fire cannot examine works that have already passed.

Moreover, when the Apostle states that all works will be tested by this second fire, but then specifies that only certain workers—namely, those who build with wood, hay, and straw—will pass through it, this necessarily implies different fires. However, this is not a case of improper equivocation but an elegant play on words in Paul's language.

Furthermore, it is not unusual for St. Paul to use the same word in different senses within a single sentence. For example, in 2 Corinthians 5:21, he writes: "He who knew no sin, for our sake was made sin." Likewise, in Romans 8:3: "For sin, He condemned sin in the flesh."

Finally, even if someone wished to deny any variation in meaning and insisted on taking fire as judgment throughout, the doctrine of purgatory would still stand. In that case, the passage would mean: "If anyone's work is burned up, he will suffer loss, but he himself will be saved—yet as through fire," which would be understood as follows: "If someone's work cannot withstand God's judgment, his work will indeed be rejected, but he himself will be saved—yet in the manner of one who has passed through the fire of divine judgment," implying that this judgment necessarily entails some form of penalty. Thus, Crocius, once again, you see that Bellarmine has sufficiently answered you, and that you have raised an objection while ignoring the solution already provided.

LXI. Response 3: Now, Crocius, with what justification do you claim that this fire is material? Calixtus' assertion that it is infernal is equally frivolous.

The Catholic Church has not defined the nature of purgatorial fire. Therefore, whether it is a material fire, weakly blowing and soon dissipating, or an infernal fire metaphorically transformed, makes no difference to the argument at hand.

LXII. Objection: by Calixtus Calixtus argues that Paul's fire does not punish but tests and examines, and that its entire effect is not to afflict the worker but either to leave him with a reward or to destroy his work, bringing loss to the builder. However, purgatorial fire, according to its proponents, is vindictive and afflicts the very worker, that is, the soul of the builder.

LXIII. Response: Crocius bases this objection on the words of St. Paul: "Each one's work will be tested by fire. If someone's work remains, he will receive a reward. If someone's

work is burned up, he will suffer loss."

Bellarmine, commenting on these words, states that the Apostle speaks of the fire of God's severe and just judgment, which is not a fire that purges or afflicts but one that tests and examines. He confirms this interpretation with references to St. Ambrose and other authorities. Moreover, Bellarmine provides a rational argument: since gold and silver must also be tested by this fire, it cannot be purgatorial, for gold and silver (representing good works) would not require purification.

Thus, Calixtus has learned well under Bellarmine's teaching when he writes: "By fire is meant the examination of the Last Judgment and the scrutiny of that judgment." Crocius likewise follows Bellarmine's reasoning when he and certain Catholics refute those who mistakenly interpret the "testing fire" as purgatorial fire. However, neither Calixtus nor Crocius actually addresses or refutes Bellarmine's own position. Each of them engages with a different matter and diverges in a different direction.

LXIV. Objection: Calixtus further argues that Paul's fire applies to both good and bad works, since it tests all works. This is evident from the Vulgate translation: "Each one's work will be revealed by fire, and the fire will test what sort of work it is." But purgatorial fire does not purge good works—rather, it only purges souls from bad works. Furthermore, Paul's fire operates only on the Day of Judgment, as the entire context shows, and as the Vulgate translation confirms, which does not merely say "the day" but "the Day of the Lord."

Yet purgatorial fire does not purge souls on the Day of Judgment—it purges them before that day and ceases on the Day of Judgment, for by then, its work is finished.

Thus, the Apostle does not mean purgatorial fire.

LXV. Response 1: We congratulate Calixtus for his diligence in using Bellarmine's arguments. For Bellarmine explicitly refutes those who interpret "revealing and testing fire" as purgatorial fire, stating that such an interpretation is impossible because purgatorial fire does not test the works of those who build with gold and silver. Yet this "testing fire" of which we speak does test each one's work.

Calixtus, this is precisely your argument! Crocius, this is your argument as well! And yet it is also Bellarmine's argument, from whom you have learned it. Thus, this argument is only as strong as it is in Bellarmine's reasoning; it carries no greater weight coming from your pen than from his mind.

Bellarmine's argument holds against the particular opinion of certain Catholics who

mistakenly interpreted the fire as purgatorial. But it does not support the general conclusion of Calixtus: "Therefore, the Apostle Paul does not mean purgatorial fire." Nor does it support Crocius' claim: "Therefore, Paul's fire should not be understood as purgatorial fire."

LXVI. Response 2: Paul's revealing and testing fire operates only on the Day of Judgment. Bellarmine extensively proves that the Day of the Lord signifies the Day of Judgment—specifically, the final Judgment.

So here again, we have fresh material to congratulate Calixtus on his progress under the instruction of the learned Cardinal! Nor should Crocius' achievement go unmentioned. Let us hear what he presents and from where. LXVII. Objection by Crocius Crocius argues that everyone will pass through this fire, including the Apostles. He bases this on Paul's words: "Each one's work will be made manifest." And again: "The fire will test what sort of work each one has."

Since Paul says "each one," this must include the Apostles, the Martyrs, and even the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. But according to the Papists, not everyone descends into purgatory—not the Apostles, not the Martyrs, not the Virgin Mary.

Thus, it is false to say that everyone passes through purgatorial fire and is saved through fire. Bellarmine himself states this explicitly in De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapter 5.

LXVIII. Response This objection is entirely borrowed from Bellarmine.

When refuting those who interpret the "manifesting and testing fire" as purgatorial fire, Bellarmine states: "It would follow that all people, even the most holy, pass through purgatorial fire and are saved by fire. For everyone must pass through this fire of which we speak." Crocius, you merely repeat Bellarmine's argument, changing only the wording. But since Bellarmine's argument does not refute his own proof for purgatory, neither does your version of it.

LXIX. Objection: Crocius claims that Paul speaks of the entire work, and therefore, above all, of mortal sin. But the Papists exclude mortal sin from purgatory, since it is remitted in this life.

Response: Once again, Crocius is in agreement with Bellarmine. Bellarmine explicitly teaches that on the Day of Judgment, all works—good and bad, including mortal sins—will be examined and tested. Although Bellarmine interprets wood, straw, and hay as venial sins, he acknowledges that the same principle applies to all other sins. For just as God will judge

doctrine, so too will He judge all works. Thus, the Apostle indeed speaks of the entire work, including mortal sin, and both Bellarmine and Crocius are in agreement.

However, this does not mean that mortal sin should be admitted into purgatory, as will be further explained.

LXX. Objection: Crocius claims that Paul's fire is testing fire, while the Papists claim that purgatorial fire purges rather than tests.

Response: Crocius is still in agreement with Bellarmine.

Bellarmine asks the same question: "What is the fire that, on the Day of the Lord, will test each one's work?" And he answers: "It is the fire of God's severe and just judgment, which does not purge or afflict but tests and examines."

Thus, both Bellarmine and Crocius teach that Paul's testing fire is examining, not purging.

LXXI. Objection: Crocius argues that the builder who constructs with hay, wood, and straw on the foundation suffers loss, according to Paul's words. But what loss, he asks, does a soul suffer in purgatory? Would Papists claim that the loss consists in the destruction of venial sins? I will not object that such things do not exist—if one believes the Apostle—but I will object that this is not loss, but rather gain. Just as purging gold of its dross through fire is considered a gain rather than a loss, so too the removal of venial sins should be regarded as profitable, not detrimental.

LXXII. Response: Crocius is still not entirely separated from Bellarmine. The builder who constructs with hay, wood, and straw on the foundation indeed suffers loss in the Pauline fire—something Bellarmine himself explicitly states.

Liberation from venial sins is not a loss of works, but rather a gain, as Crocius correctly observes—an insight he borrowed from a similar passage in Bellarmine.

For when Bellarmine asks what Paul means by "He himself will be saved, yet as through fire," and considers the interpretation of Calvin and others, who view this fire as the approving or rejecting judgment that takes place at conversion and especially at the hour of death, Bellarmine replies: "That judgment, which rejects errors, does not bring loss but gain, for it is a kind of illumination of the mind, leading to the knowledge of truth. Just as someone who mistakenly believes they possess gold but then discovers it to be base metal does not consider it a loss when the false metal is removed and true gold is given instead, so too, one who holds errors and then learns the truth through divine illumination does not

suffer loss but rather gains." But Paul says, "He will suffer loss," therefore...

Thus, liberation from evil is not a loss but a benefit.

So what does Paul mean by "He will suffer loss," or, as Crocius puts it, "He will suffer the loss of his work?"

This becomes clear from its connection to the preceding word, "burned up." For what does it mean for something to burn if not that it fails the test of divine judgment and is rejected by it? Crocius generally appeals to the force of the verb. But Calixtus, along with Bellarmine, interprets burning to mean an inability to withstand the fire of this test.

Thus, by everyone's interpretation, burning signifies reprobation and rejection. From this rejection follows loss: The loss of the works themselves, insofar as they are rejected with shame, as Bellarmine states (which Crocius follows here).

The loss of an accidental reward, which they otherwise could have attained, as Calixtus asserts (and this is in accordance with the truth). The experience of real and proper punishment, for suffering loss also implies being penalized, as Bellarmine explains.

From this, it is evident: The souls in purgatory suffer loss because they endure punishment. On the Day of Judgment, they suffer loss because they bear the shame of their rejected works. In heaven, they suffer loss because they are deprived of the accidental glory that they could have attained.

Since the Apostolic text accommodates all these explanations, Protestants reject none of them with merit.

LXXIII. Summary: Before Proceeding Further Before continuing, the reader should recall that neither Calixtus nor Crocius has refuted Bellarmine’s explanation of this passage from the Apostle. Rather, both have adopted Bellarmine’s arguments against the less convincing interpretations of some Catholics. This is a clear indication that they lack solid arguments against Bellarmine's own explanation. Now let us examine the Apostle’s context.

LXXIV. Who Are the Builders?

Paul states: "As a wise builder, I laid the foundation, and another builds upon it." The question arises: Who are these builders?

Bellarmine’s Interpretation: The builders are preachers of the Church (De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapters 5-6).

Calixtus’ Interpretation: The builders are pastors, teachers, or ministers of the

Church (De Purgatorio, n. 54).

Crocius' Interpretation: The builders are teachers of the Gospel (Anti-Becanus, Controversy 8, Section 6, Article 22, p. 148).

Here, all three agree.

LXXV. What Do the Materials Represent? Paul continues:"For no one can lay any foundation other than the one already laid, which is Jesus Christ. If anyone builds on this foundation with gold, silver, and precious stones, or with wood, hay, and straw..." The question arises: What do these materials signify?

1. Bellarmine's Interpretation:The foundation is Christ, as announced by the first preachers. Gold, silver, and precious stones represent sound and beneficial doctrine, taught to those who already believe.Wood, hay, and straw represent doctrine that is not heretical or evil, but rather curious, unnecessary, or trivial—preached to Catholic congregations.

2. Calixtus' Interpretation: The foundation consists of articles concerning Christ, His Incarnation, merit, and satisfaction. One builds with gold, silver, and precious stones by correctly explaining Scripture, raising useful questions, and skillfully resolving them for the edification of the listeners. One builds with wood, hay, and straw by offering cold, thorny, and useless interpretations of Scripture and burdening listeners with idle and unnecessary questions.

3. Crocius' Interpretation:Gold, silver, and precious stones represent true and necessary doctrine.Wood, hay, and straw represent erroneous, vain, and unnecessary doctrines—though not impious, blasphemous, or destructive to the foundation.

Here, Crocius makes an imprecise statement by saying that necessary doctrine is symbolized by gold and silver. However, as Bellarmine correctly points out (and Calixtus follows him in this), necessary doctrine belongs to the foundation itself, whereas gold, silver, and precious stones pertain to what is built on the foundation.

LXXVI. What Is the Day of the Lord?

Paul continues:

"Each one's work will be revealed, for the Day of the Lord will disclose it." The question arises: What does "the Day of the Lord" signify?

Bellarmine’s Interpretation: The Day of the Lord is the Last Judgment (De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapter 3).

Calixtus’ Interpretation: The Day of the Lord is the Last Judgment (De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapter 3).

Crocius’ Interpretation: The Day of the Lord refers indefinitely to any moment of divine revelation—whether in this life or the next.

Thus, Calixtus agrees with Bellarmine, while Crocius departs from both.

LXXVII. Bellarmine's Rebuttal of Crocius' Interpretation Bellarmine argues that Crocius’ interpretation does not align with St. Paul’s meaning.

First, in Greek, the phrase "the Day" is written with the article (ἡ ἡμέρα), indicating a definite and specific day, just as seen in 2 Timothy 4:8:

"The Lord will give me my reward on that Day."

Likewise in 2 Timothy 1:12:

"I am convinced that He is able to guard what I have entrusted to Him until that Day." And again in 2 Timothy 1:18:

"May the Lord grant him mercy on that Day."

Second, Scripture never refers to the present time as the Day of the Lord, but rather as our day. Third, in this present life, the works of individuals are not yet fully revealed, a point that even Calixtus acknowledges.

However, despite these arguments, Bellarmine concedes that if someone wished to interpret both the present life and the Last Judgment as being referenced here, he would not object—since neither interpretation contains falsehood, though one aligns more precisely with Paul’s wording.

LXXVIII. Interpretation of the Fire Paul continues: "It will be revealed by fire, and the fire will test each one's work."

The question arises: What is this fire?

Bellarmine’s Interpretation: The Day of the Lord will be revealed by the fire of conflagration, and the works of each person will be tested by the severe and just fire of God's judgment. Calixtus’ Interpretation: The testing fire signifies the examination of the

Last Judgment. Crocius' Interpretation: The fire that reveals represents the efficacy and judgment of the Holy Spirit—manifested through the fire of the Word and sometimes through tribulation.

Bellarmine criticizes Calixtus for not clarifying which fire will reveal the Day of the Lord, since this would force him to admit a second fire distinct from the testing fire, whereas he prefers to maintain a single metaphor.

Crocius, on the other hand, confuses the fire that reveals and the fire that tests, blending them into one.

Nonetheless, Bellarmine has already been heard refuting Crocius' position in previous sections.

LXXIX. Bellarmine's Proof that Fire Represents the Last Judgment

Bellarmine reinforces his position that the testing fire represents the Final Judgment, as previously demonstrated.

Furthermore, he adds that God's judgment is rightly called fire because it is: Purest (purissimum), Swiftest (celerrimum) , Most effective (efficacissimum), Most penetrating (maxime penetrativum)

As seen in Daniel 7:10, where it is said: "A river of fire was coming out from before Him." Since God is entirely justice and judgment, He is also frequently called fire in Scripture, as in: Malachi 3:2: "He is like a refiner's fire." Hebrews 12:29: "For our God is a consuming fire."

LXXX. What Does the Fire Represent in "He will be saved, yet as through fire"? Paul continues: "If anyone's work remains, he will receive a reward. If anyone's work is burned, he will suffer loss, but he himself will be saved—yet as through fire."

The question arises: What does this fire represent?

1. Bellarmine's Interpretation: The fire here refers to some purgatorial and temporal punishment, to which those who have built with wood, hay, or straw are condemned after death in their particular judgment.

2. Calixtus' Interpretation: In eternal life, there are essential rewards and accidental rewards that vary according to each person's labor. Those who built with gold, silver, and precious stones—that is, who taught beneficial doctrine with sincerity—will see their work endure the fire of divine judgment and will receive an accidental reward,

namely, a greater

degree of celestial glory. But those who built with wood, hay, and straw—that is, who taught useless and idle doctrines—will see their work burn up in the fire of divine examination. The teacher will thus suffer the loss of his work, meaning he will be deprived of the accidental reward that he could have received had he taught more sound and beneficial doctrine. However, because he remained in fundamental doctrine, he will still be saved, though as through fire. That is, through the rigorous scrutiny of judgment, he will be deprived of an increase in accidental glory—which he otherwise would have obtained as a special reward. This loss is comparable to a person who escapes a fire unharmed but loses his clothes in the flames.

3. Crocius' Interpretation: Paul describes difficulty and a certain loss, meaning that: The Holy Spirit, through Scripture and the conscience, will judge teachings over time, using the Word and sometimes tribulation to distinguish solid doctrine from vain doctrine.

Those who faithfully taught the truth will receive the promised reward, that is, a higher degree of glory. Those who defended erroneous or frivolous teachings, even while remaining in fundamental doctrine, will eventually recognize that they built with straw. They will endure the test of the Word, feel shame, and be saved only by discarding their errors.

Conclusion

Bellarmine interprets the fire as purgatorial punishment.

Calixtus sees it as a judgment determining levels of heavenly reward.

Crocius understands it as the Holy Spirit purging erroneous doctrine in this life. While Calixtus and Bellarmine broadly agree on the role of divine judgment, Crocius diverges by applying the metaphor primarily to this life rather than the next.

LXXXI. Bellarmine's Response to Calixtus Regarding Calixtus' position, we acknowledge that in eternal life, there is an essential reward and accidental rewards, which are distributed according to the variety of works, ensuring a proportion between labor and recompense. We also concede that this understanding is not a poor way to interpret Paul's words: "If anyone's work remains, he will receive a reward."

Thus, those who build with gold, silver, and precious stones will receive rewards

corresponding to their labor.

However, Calixtus is mistaken in saying: "He will suffer the loss of his work." Since he correctly interprets wood, hay, and straw as useless and idle doctrines, which will be consumed in divine judgment as if by a blazing fire, he cannot rightly describe this as a loss of work any more than a goldsmith could describe the removal of dross from gold as a loss, as we previously heard from Crocius.

Furthermore, when the Apostle says, "If anyone's work is burned," he means nothing other than that it cannot withstand the fire of divine examination, as Calixtus himself affirms. But not being able to withstand this fire means being rejected by the severe and just judgment of God. What is rejected in this way—whether it is the rejection itself or the shame it produces—causes confusion for those builders or teachers of useless and idle doctrines.

This confusion is a form of punishment after this life—a kind of purgatory, which Protestants refuse to admit, as Bellarmine observes. Thus, if Calixtus wishes to maintain that "he suffers loss of his work" insofar as it is shamefully rejected, he is already admitting an element of purgatory. Furthermore, as previously stated, suffering loss can reasonably be understood as privation of accidental glory, and nothing prevents other punishments from being included as well.

LXXXII. Bellarmine's Critique of Calixtus' Interpretation of "He will be saved, yet as through fire." Calixtus' interpretation fails completely in explaining these words. As Bellarmine correctly states, the analogy of passing through fire implies pain and suffering. If someone passed through fire without any harm, it would not be said that they passed "as through fire", but rather "as through flowers", as we read in the account of St. Tiburtius. However, Calixtus' interpretation involves no pain or suffering.

Yet if a builder were in a wooden and straw house, he could not escape except by passing through fire. Though he would not perish, his beard and hair would be singed, unless a miracle occurred—such as with the three young men in the Babylonian furnace.

Calixtus acknowledges the idea of passing "as through fire," while still preserving life, just as we do.

However, he interprets this analogy without any bodily harm or suffering, as if clothing could be burned and consumed without any injury or pain to the body—even in a fire fueled by wood, hay, and straw, which is exactly the metaphor used by Paul.

Moreover, Calixtus' interpretation contradicts the Apostle's words.

Paul states that only those who built with wood, hay, and straw will be saved "as through fire", and not those who built with gold, silver, and precious stones.

But according to Calixtus' interpretation—where fire represents the rigorous judgment of God—it would follow that all who are saved are saved "as through fire."

For even though Paul is discussing the sins of teachers, the same principle applies to all other sins, since all sins will be tested and examined at the Last Judgment, as Calixtus himself admits. Thus, according to Calixtus' reasoning, all martyrs, apostles, and even the Virgin Mary would be saved "as through fire", even though they built only with gold, silver, and precious stones. For if the phrase "as through fire" refers to the Last Judgment, and if all who are saved must pass through this judgment, then all must be saved "as through fire".

Furthermore, following Calixtus' reasoning, it would also mean that all teachers—including the Evangelists and Apostles—built not only with gold, silver, and precious stones but also with wood, hay, and straw.

For he asserts that in the Last Judgment, God will not only examine what doctrine was taught but also the teacher's attitude, sincerity, and intention in their teaching.

Lutherans themselves teach that all human works, no matter how righteous they appear to men, are still sinful in the eyes of God and cannot withstand divine judgment, since no one ever carries out their duty with the perfect sincerity, faithfulness, and intention that they should. Thus, even the Evangelists and Apostles, according to Calixtus' reasoning (contrary to Paul's words), would have built wood, hay, and straw and therefore would be saved "as through fire." Bellarmine refutes this idea, stating that Paul is speaking only about those who retain the foundation of true faith in Christ while building with perishable materials. Thus, Calixtus' interpretation cannot be reconciled with Paul's words.

LXXXIII. Bellarmine's Refutation of Crocius Bellarmine refutes Crocius' interpretation in a similar way.

Crocius argues that "as through fire" refers partly to tribulations sent by God in this life. But this cannot be correct, because tribulations in this life affect both the righteous and the wicked.

If tribulations were what Paul meant, then even those who built with gold and silver would be saved "as through fire," since earthly suffering is common to all.

Thus, why would Paul apply this phrase only to those who built with wood, hay, and straw?

LXXXIV. Bellarmine's Further Refutation of Crocius Crocius also argues that "as

through fire" refers partly to the judgment of the Holy Spirit, speaking in Scripture and the consciences of men.

Bellarmine refutes this as well: Some teachers—whom the Reformers claim built with wood, hay, and straw—die suddenly, as happened in 1653 with Christoph Scheibler. How then are these people saved "as through fire"?

How do they recognize that they built with straw?

How do they endure the test of the Word and feel shame?

How do they suffer the loss of errors they defended as truth until their dying breath? Paul contrasts this passage with receiving a reward:

Paul states: "If anyone's work remains, he will receive a reward."

Then he says: "If anyone's work is burned, he will suffer loss, but he himself will be saved—yet as through fire."

But receiving a reward refers to something beyond simply doing good works—it refers to an extra reward for them.

Crocius himself admits that the promised reward refers to a higher degree of heavenly glory. Thus, suffering loss and passing through fire must also refer to some kind of punishment beyond just the loss of one's work.

Correction of errors is not a loss but a gain.

The correction of theological errors does not constitute suffering loss, but rather a benefit, since one gains truth.

Thus, it cannot be described as passing "as through fire."

If Crocius were correct, then even the martyrs, apostles, and the Virgin Mary would have to be saved "as through fire", which contradicts Paul's teaching.

LXXXV. Third Passage: "What will those do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead do not rise? Why then are they baptized for them?"

Bellarmine states that the true and authentic interpretation of this passage is that the Apostle speaks of the "baptism" of tears and penance, which is undertaken through prayer, fasting, almsgiving, and other acts of mortification.

Thus, the meaning of Paul's words is: "What will those do who are baptized for the dead,

if the dead do not rise?" That is: "What will those do who pray, fast, mourn, and afflict themselves for the dead, if the dead do not rise?"

LXXXVI. Bellarmine's Proofs: Bellarmine supports this interpretation by demonstrating that in both Scripture and the Church Fathers, "baptism" frequently signifies affliction. Scriptural Evidence:

Mark 10:38 – Christ asks: "Can you drink the cup that I drink, or be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?"

Here, "baptism" refers to His coming suffering and affliction.

Luke 12:50 – Christ states: "I have a baptism to undergo, and how distressed I am until it is accomplished!"

Again, baptism is equated with suffering and distress.

Church Fathers' Testimonies: The Fathers frequently refer to penance as a "laborious baptism" or "second plank after shipwreck" (i.e., a second chance for those who fall into sin after baptism). St. Cyprian (Sermon on the Lord's Supper): "He baptizes himself with tears." St. Cyprian (Preface to the Books on the Exhortation to Martyrdom): He frequently calls dying for Christ a baptism.

St. Gregory Nazianzen (Oration on the Epiphany): "Know that there is a fourth baptism—that of martyrdom and blood. I also know of a fifth baptism—that of tears and penance."

LXXXVII. Interpretation of Matthew 3:11 Bellarmine further strengthens his argument by referencing Matthew 3:11:

"He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire."

Several Church Fathers interpret this fire as referring to purgatorial purification: St. Jerome explains:

"With the Holy Spirit in this life, but with fire in the next life."

St. Basil (On the Holy Spirit, Book 2, Chapter 15) had already given the same explanation. Bede follows this interpretation (Commentary on Luke 3).

Gregory Nazianzen (Oration on the Epiphany) even calls purgatorial fire the final baptism in the afterlife.

Thus, Bellarmine elegantly argues that Paul refers to those who afflict themselves with penance for the dead, sharing in that "baptism of fire" by which souls are purified in purgatory.

LXXXVIII. Second Proof: Bellarmine supports his interpretation by showing that it aligns perfectly with the following verse: 1 Corinthians 15:30 – "Why are we in danger every hour?" He explains that Paul is essentially saying: "Why do some afflict themselves through prayer and fasting for the dead, and why do I afflict myself by preaching the Gospel, if the dead do not rise?"

This demonstrates that both the suffering endured for the dead and Paul's own sufferings are grounded in belief in the resurrection.

Third Proof: Bellarmine further strengthens his case by comparing Paul's argument to 2 Maccabees 12:44: "If the dead do not rise, then it is useless and foolish to pray for them."

This passage explicitly links prayers and penance for the dead with belief in the resurrection, just as Paul does in 1 Corinthians 15.

Thus, Bellarmine argues that Paul's reference to being "baptized for the dead" supports the long-standing Christian practice of praying and offering penance for souls after death.

LXXXIX. Calixtus considers that the words of the Apostle may have a twofold meaning. The first, and simplest, if we understand that abuse and profanation of baptism, along with other errors of no small consequence, had crept into the Church of Corinth, so that if someone died without baptism, another was substituted to be baptized in place of the deceased. In this way, baptism for the dead would mean receiving baptism in the place or name of the deceased, so that the deprivation of baptism would not harm him in the resurrection. This would be an argument directed at them, as if the Apostle were saying: "I convict you from your own rite and custom. Are you so solicitous about securing baptism even for the dead if the dead do not rise?"

XC. Bellarmine attributes this opinion to some of the ancients, and after him, Crocius. However, Bellarmine himself, followed by Crocius, acknowledges that it has its difficulties. From this, it follows that although the Apostle does not approve of the error, he nevertheless approves of the intention they had to help the deceased, which is not to be rejected by Christians.

XCI. Another interpretation according to Calixtus is that among the Corinthians, or even among other believers of that time, baptism was administered over the tombs of the dead as a testimony and argument of the faith they held regarding the certain resurrection of the

dead. As if the Apostle were saying: "Whenever you administer holy baptism, you profess faith in the resurrection. For why is it conferred in cemeteries and over graves if you do not believe that those buried will rise again?"

XCII. But this interpretation also has its difficulties. For if such a custom had existed, the Apostle would not have said, "What shall they do who are baptized for the dead?" speaking of some, not of all. Rather, he would have said, "What shall we do, who are baptized for the dead?" as he immediately says, "Why do we also stand in jeopardy every hour?" Furthermore, among Christians, infants are usually baptized in temples as a testimony and argument of faith in God, who is worshiped in those temples, and which their sponsors profess. Yet no one would rightly say that infants are baptized "for God." Moreover, as Crocius states, there is no historical evidence that baptism was administered over the tombs of martyrs, as Luther, Piscator, Bucanus, and others claim; nor does there exist any historical proof of the practice upon which Calixtus bases his interpretation.

XCIII. Against Bellarmine's interpretation, Calixtus asks: "Whence is it established that 'to be baptized for someone' means to endure voluntary afflictions in another's name or to suffer on behalf of another? Surely, Scripture nowhere speaks this way. And who among us would say: 'To offer sacrifice, to pray, to fast, to give alms for someone' is the same as 'to be baptized for another'?"

XCIV. Response: It is established from Holy Scripture that "to be baptized" sometimes means "to be afflicted." And it is of no significance whether that affliction is imposed from without or voluntarily undertaken, since even externally imposed suffering should be endured willingly to be virtuous. Thus, when Christ says, "Can you drink the cup that I drink and be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with?" (Mark 10), he is not simply speaking of suffering affliction but of bearing it well after his example. This is why he says, "which I am about to drink," and "with which I am baptized." Similarly, when Christ says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with" (Luke 12), he speaks of a suffering that he willingly undergoes, as his following words testify: "and how I am straitened until it be accomplished!" From this, the holy Fathers came to call various virtuous sufferings by the name of baptism.

XCV. Crocius presses the issue, saying: "What proves this consequence? Just because 'baptism' is frequently used in this sense, does it follow that it is meant here? Is it not often taken literally to mean baptism by water?" He also argues: "Nazianzen speaks of the baptism of tears and repentance. Shall we then conclude that Paul is speaking of this? Why not rather say that since Nazianzen knows of water baptism, this must be what Paul means? Or, since he speaks of the baptism of martyrdom, Paul must be referring to that?"

XCVI. Response: Observe, dear reader, what Crocius is saying here, for it is of no small importance. He asserts that the conclusion should not be admitted: "Just because a term is frequently used in one sense, does it follow that it must be taken that way here?" He similarly argues: "If fire can be understood in different ways, who can conclusively prove that it must necessarily refer to purgatorial fire?" From this, Crocius establishes a general rule: Whenever words in Scripture can have multiple meanings, even if one meaning is commonly accepted, it cannot be conclusively determined that they must be understood in that sense. If this rule is accepted, then all his arguments against Catholic doctrine will, by his own judgment, be unsound and inadmissible.

CXVII. Seventh Passage. "Whom (Christ) God raised up, having loosed the pains of hell, since it was impossible for Him to be held by them."

These words, having loosed the pains of hell, cannot be understood as referring to the sufferings of Christ Himself, for Christ's sufferings ended on the cross, as is evident from His words in Luke 23: "Today you will be with me in paradise."

Nor can they refer to the pains of the damned, for they are consigned to eternal fire, as is clear. Nor can they refer to the pains of the holy Fathers, for they suffered no pains. It therefore remains that they refer to the sufferings of the souls in purgatory. Thus argues Bellarmine in De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapter 8, Section 9.

CXVIII. Calixtus objects: "In the Greek text, there is nothing about hell; the words are as follows: whom God raised up, having loosed the pains of death, that is, having overcome the painful death and endured the most extreme and exquisite sufferings which brought about Christ's death."

Response: This objection is taken from Bellarmine, but omits his response. For he states: "I respond, first, that the ancient Latin Vulgate translation supports our view. Secondly, so does the Syriac version, which likewise reads: God raised Him up and loosed the cords of hell. Thirdly, the most ancient Greek and Latin Fathers support this interpretation. For instance, Blessed Polycarp, at the beginning of his Epistle, citing this passage, writes: loosed the pains of hell. Similarly, Cyprian, in On the Lord's Supper, at the beginning, referring to this passage, states: But the pious Master wished to show that it was impossible for His soul to be held in hell. Epiphanius and Augustine likewise undoubtedly read it this way. Lastly, this interpretation is confirmed by the following words of Peter, where he proves what he has said from Psalm 15: Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor wilt Thou suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption."

CXIX. Eighth Passage. "That at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of those in

heaven, on earth, and under the earth."

By those in heaven, angels are understood; by those on earth, righteous men; and by those under the earth, none can be meant except the souls in purgatory. For this cannot apply to the damned, since they would not be granted this honor; nor to the Fathers who had been in limbo, since they were already liberated.

Thus argues Bellarmine in De Purgatorio, Book 1, Chapter 8, Section 9.

CXX. Calixtus objects: "The scope and intent of Paul are clear: after speaking of the humiliation and self-emptying of the Savior, he then describes His exaltation and the sublime name, dignity, and excellence granted to Him, so that Jesus the God-Man should be acknowledged and revered by all creatures. This applies not only to the angels in heaven and men on earth, but also to the damned spirits, who, though they do not willingly and devoutly submit, are nevertheless compelled—even unwillingly—to acknowledge Him as the universal Lord, their own Redeemer, and the righteous Judge and Avenger of all the wicked, trembling in fear before Him. This interpretation is so clear and evident that even Bellarmine admits that these words can not unreasonably be taken in this way."

Similar interpretations are found in Peter Martyr (Loci Communes, Class 3, Chapter 9, §31, p. 625), Calvin (Institutes, Book 3, Chapter 5, §8), and Sadeel (Adversus Humiliat. Satisfactionem, p. 118).

CXXI. Response: We argue the opposite: the scope and intent of the Apostle are clear. After speaking about the humiliation of Christ and His self-emptying at the hands of wicked men, he then declares His exaltation and the sublime name, dignity, excellence, and eminence bestowed upon Him, so that all—Jesus the God-Man's power and majesty—should worship with an act of piety, which is signified by kneeling. This includes not only angels in heaven and righteous men on earth but also the spirits of the faithful existing below the earth.

This interpretation is so clear and evident that even Chemnitz acknowledges that kneeling signifies an act of piety. Nor can Calixtus easily demonstrate that kneeling in Scripture ever refers to an involuntary action. Therefore, Bellarmine's explanation is more firmly grounded. And if neither interpretation should be rejected outright, then Calixtus should believe in purgatory with us; whereas we, in adhering to our interpretation, believe nothing contrary to our faith.

CXXII. It is probable that purgatory is implied in the words: "Remember me when You come into Your kingdom."

For he would not have said this unless he believed that some sins could be forgiven after

this life. We acknowledge that another interpretation could be applied to this passage, but since many things support this truth, none should be rejected without serious reason.

3. Catholic Proof from the Holy Fathers Explaining Sacred Scripture.

CXXIII. The first passage, Matthew 12:32, is explained by St. Augustine: "Some believe that temporal punishments are suffered only in this life, others believe they are suffered after death, and still others believe they are suffered both now and then; yet all agree that they are endured before that most severe and final judgment. However, not all who suffer temporal punishments after death enter into eternal punishments, which are to come after that judgment. For, as we have already said above, to some people that which is not remitted in this life is remitted in the future age—that is, in order that they may not be punished with the peculiar punishment of the age to come."

CXXIV. The same St. Augustine: "For certain of the departed, prayer is heard—either by the Church herself or by certain devout persons. But this applies to those among the regenerate in Christ, whose life in the body was not so poorly conducted that they should be judged unworthy of such mercy, nor so well conducted that they should be found not to require such mercy. For just as, after the resurrection of the dead, there will not be lacking those to whom, after the punishments endured by the spirits of the dead, mercy is granted so that they are not cast into eternal fire. For indeed, it would not be truthfully said of some, that forgiveness will not be granted either in this life or in the life to come, unless there were others for whom it would be granted not in this life, but in the life to come."

CXXV. The same St. Augustine: "No sins at all are remitted in the kingdom [of heaven]; but if none were to be remitted in that final judgment, I think the Lord would not have said of a certain sin: 'It shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come'—when that thief hoped for forgiveness, the one who said: 'Remember me when You come into Your kingdom.'"

CXXVI. Crocius objects: "Nor does Augustine in all things support the adversaries [i.e., the Catholics]. I prove it. He speaks of the remission of sins that takes place at the final judgment. Therefore, it does not pertain to purgatory. The Papists interpret it of a remission before the final day, etc. Moreover, either he speaks of sins of a venial nature—such as the Papists invent—or of mortal sins. If of the former, he departs from Christ, who is speaking of grave sins. If of the latter, he does not support the Papists, who assign purgatory solely for the expiation of venial sins."

CXXVII. Response: St. Augustine says that certain persons endure temporal punishments

after death, before the final judgment. Does this suit Crocius's taste?

St. Augustine says that prayers are heard for certain of the departed, whether by the Church or by certain devout persons. Does Crocius approve of this?

St. Augustine says that some sins are remitted in the next age that were not remitted in this life. So wherein lies the error?

Crocius says: "St. Augustine teaches that certain sins are remitted in the final judgment." But this is not contrary to us—who, along with him, think that at that time certain sins will be remitted: namely, the sins of those who at that time will be in purgatory and summoned to judgment. St. Augustine does not say that no sins are remitted after this life and before the final judgment. He even explains what sort of sins are remitted after this life:
—of those regenerated in Christ, whose life in the body was not so poorly lived as to be judged unworthy of such mercy, nor so excellently lived as to be found to have no need of such mercy.

But these sins are not, by their nature, mortal.

Nor does St. Augustine depart from Christ—since Christ, in speaking of the sin against the Holy Spirit as unforgivable, does not specify the severity of those other sins that are remitted.

CXXV. St. Gregory explains the first passage (Matt. 12:32) and the second (1 Cor. 3:15). The title of the chapter is: Whether after death there is a purgatorial fire?

He replies: "For certain light faults, purgatorial fire before the judgment is to be believed—because the Truth says: 'Whoever shall speak blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come.' From this statement it is to be understood that some faults may be forgiven in this world, and others in the world to come. For what is denied of one case implies—by logical consequence—that it is granted in others. Yet, as I said earlier, this is to be believed to apply only to small and very minor sins—such as idle chatter, immoderate laughter, or faults connected to care over temporal affairs (which are rarely without some fault, even by those who know how such faults ought to be avoided), or in serious matters, errors arising from ignorance, which still burden the soul after death—unless they were already especially relaxed while one was still in this life. For when Paul says that Christ is the foundation, and adds: 'If anyone builds upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw, each one's work will be tested by fire. If his work remains, he will receive a reward; if it is burned up, he will suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved—yet so as through fire.' Although this may be understood

of the fire of tribulation applied in this life, yet if someone takes it as referring to the fire of future purification, it deserves careful attention. For he says that one will be saved through fire—not one who builds upon this foundation with iron, bronze, or lead (that is, greater sins, and therefore harder to purge, and already insoluble)—but with wood, hay, and straw: that is, minor sins which fire can easily consume. Here Protestants should observe the distinction between mortal sin and venial sin.

CXXVI. On the second passage, 1 Corinthians 3:15, St. Augustine says: "In this life, purify me and make me into the kind of person who no longer has need of the purgatorial fire—on account of those who will be saved, yet so as through fire. For why, if not because they build upon the foundation wood, hay, and stubble? But they ought to have built gold, silver, and precious stones, and then they would be secure from both fires—not only from that eternal fire, which will torment the impious forever, but also from that fire which will purify those who are saved through fire. For it is said, 'He himself shall be saved, yet so as through fire.' And because it says 'he shall be saved,' that fire is despised. Yet clearly, although they are saved through fire, that fire will be more grievous than anything man can suffer in this life."

CXXVII. Crocius objects: "The text is corrupt. For emendatorio ['purgatorial'] one should read emendato ['corrected']. Further, I do not read that a fire is introduced which comes between this life and the final judgment. Augustine elsewhere refers the purgatorial fire to the time of the last judgment. As to the intermediate time, he hesitates."

CXXVIII. Response: On what grounds does Crocius assert that the text is corrupt? What proves that emendatorio should be read as emendato? Is it because the sense seems better if you read emendato rather than emendatorio? And by what judge?

Also, in the following sentences one reads of the fire "which will purify those who will be saved through fire." How do the "fire which purifies" and the "purgatorial fire" differ? St. Augustine is speaking of a fire which purifies after this life, a fire which does not last eternally. If Crocius were to believe the saint on this point, there would be no reason for him to worry or dispute whether it afflicts between this life and the last judgment or only at the time of the final judgment. On what basis does he claim that Augustine doubts the intermediate time?

CXXIX. The same St. Augustine: "This punishment (i.e., eternal punishment) awaits those who, having lost baptism and not having recovered it through penance, perish forever. Of them it is said: 'He will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire' (Matt. 3:12). But those who have done deeds worthy of temporal punishments, of whom the Apostle says: 'If anyone's work is burned up, he will suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as through fire'—these shall pass through the fiery river, of which the prophetic utterance speaks: 'A

river of fire was flowing and coming out from before him' (Dan. 7:10). Through this fiery river and the waves of seething, dreadful globes, they shall pass—according to the weight of their sin and the nature of their passing."

CXXX. Crocius objects to this passage: "That sixteenth homily—whether it is truly Augustine's is uncertain. It is not listed in Possidius's index."

Response: If the homily is by another author, it would certainly be someone ancient. Therefore, we also follow that other author's opinion on 1 Cor. 3.

"It does not express the intermediate time, but names the coming of Christ, etc." Response: And yet it names those who have done deeds worthy of temporal punishment—about whom the Apostle is said to speak. Why does Crocius not conclude the same? Let him say they are purgatorial punishments before the end of the final judgment, and he would be a Catholic. "The Apostle, by fire, means the fiery river, of which the prophetic utterance says: 'A river of fire was flowing before him.'" Response: Even St. Augustine understands this as the execution of God's judgments—when he affirms that those who have done deeds worthy of temporal punishments shall pass through the fiery river and linger in it in proportion to the gravity of their sins. But this occurs before the end of the judgment.

CXXXI. The same St. Augustine: "By that transitory fire, of which the Apostle said, 'He himself shall be saved, yet so as through fire,' not capital sins, but minor sins are purged." And later:"But if we do not give thanks to God in tribulation, nor redeem our sins by good works, we shall remain that much longer in that purgatorial fire, until the above-mentioned minor sins are consumed like wood, hay, and stubble."

Again: "Those who, though they do not commit capital crimes, are quick to commit minor ones and negligent in redeeming them, shall come to eternal life because they believed in Christ and did not commit capital sins; but first, either in this life, by God's justice or mercy (as already mentioned), they shall be melted by the most bitter tribulations; or they shall be delivered by many alms and especially by forgiving their enemies with compassion; or they shall be tormented for a long time in that fire mentioned by the Apostle, so that they may come to eternal life without spot or wrinkle."

He adds similar things in what follows.

CXXXII. Crocius objects: "In the text, I read 'minor sins'; I do not read 'venial.' That they are venial in themselves, I deny. What Augustine means, he himself lists there. Among other things, he refers to the case where someone, either voluntarily or out of necessity, flatters a superior; or fails to give food to hungry paupers; or readily and rashly curses, of which it is written, 'Nor revilers will inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Cor. 6:10); or swears carelessly,

and because of necessity cannot fulfill it, thereby committing perjury. These he classifies among minor sins. But are they venial in themselves? They are not. Furthermore, it is not clear that he is speaking of a fire of the intermediate time. Rather, he seems to speak of the time of judgment—for he names the day of judgment, the torment of soul and body. But that does not occur before the final judgment.

The words are: 'And since it is written about the day of judgment that it shall be one day like a thousand years, and a thousand years like one day—who knows whether each person shall pass through that fire in days, or months, or perhaps even years? And he who now will not place even a single finger into the fire, must surely fear being tormented then, even for a short time, with both soul and body!' Therefore, everyone must labor with all his might, that he may escape capital sins, and redeem minor ones by good works, so that nothing remains of them which that fire may consume."

CXXXIII. Response 1: We read in the text of minor sins—but those minor sins are, in themselves, venial. We prove this: because, as St. Augustine says, minor sins are purged after this life. Therefore, they are venial in themselves; for nothing that is not venial in itself is purged after this life. Again: St. Augustine says that some sins are minor, others capital. He calls capital sins those that are not remitted in the life to come; and minor, those that are remitted even in the life to come. Therefore, the minor sins of which he speaks are, in themselves, venial.

CXXXIV. Response 2: Even if St. Augustine believed that some sins are minor which in truth are capital, that would do no harm to the argument. For the question here is not which particular sins are minor, but whether there exist minor—or venial—sins that are remitted in the age to come.

Crocius ought not to reproach Augustine—who, after all, includes among capital sins the flattery of a superior done out of necessity. But Augustine refers to minor sins such as: —"As often as someone takes more food or drink than is necessary, let him know he has committed a minor sin. —As often as one speaks more than is fitting, or is silent more than is expedient." Is every unnecessary bite or sip of food matter for a capital sin? Is every word spoken more or less than necessary enough to make a man worthy of eternal punishment?

CXXXV. Response 3: St. Augustine is not speaking here of the fire of the intermediate time; nor is he speaking of a fire that is to come after the final judgment.

Let Crocius say that at the time of the final judgment some shall be tormented in soul and body for minor sins, and thus saved as through fire—and we shall rejoice in his admission of posthumous purgation.

CXXXVI. St. Gregory explains the text 1 Cor. 3:13: "Some, after the death of the body, are assigned to eternal punishment; others are led to life by purgation through fire. The faithful soul fears not only wrath but even abhors it. According to the blessed Augustine: All those who did not lay Christ as their foundation are rebuked in wrath—because they are tormented with eternal fire. But those who built wood, hay, and stubble on that foundation are corrected in anger—because, being purged by fire, they are brought back to the rest of blessedness." Let, therefore, the faithful soul, considering what it has done and what it is to receive, say: "O Lord, rebuke me not in Your fury, nor chasten me in Your wrath."

As if it were to say plainly: "This alone I urgently beg with all the intention of my heart; this I long for above all with constant prayers—that in that terrible judgment You strike me neither with the reprobate nor with the avenging flames prepared for the purging of souls."

CXXXVII. The same Gregory, on the same passage: "At the end of life, only those come to a truly salutary repentance who, through an inward visitation, perfectly love the good and hate the evils they had formerly loved. Even if they cannot adequately grieve for the iniquities they committed, yet they live in that hour in which they are converted. For those who have had a good will in confessing their sins but lacked sufficient love to wipe them away shall, after death, pass to life through purgatorial punishment. Therefore Paul says: 'They shall be saved, yet so as through fire.' But the sinner who is to be saved through fire should, here and now, through affliction of the flesh, fulfill what he knows is lacking in him through the power of love. And again: Whoever wishes to pass to salvation without the torment of fire should offer the round loaf with the silver coin—that is, let him destroy by vigorous affliction of the flesh those sins he has abandoned through good will."

CXXXVIII. St. Eligius explains the same passage, 1 Cor. 3: "Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, lest we be consumed either by the eternal fire (which may God forbid!) or by the transitory fire—of which the Apostle speaks, 'Each one's work shall be tested by fire.' That he said this of purgatorial fire is not to be doubted.

This fire affects the wicked, the saints, and the just in different ways.

The wicked are driven from its torments into the eternal flames; the saints, who will rise in their bodies without any stain of sin, because they built upon the foundation (which is Christ) gold, silver, and precious stones—that is, a clear understanding of faith, a bright word of salvation, and worthy deeds—will overcome that fire with the same integrity of faith and charity with which they observed Christ's commandments in this life.

But the just, who are still subject to certain slight sins—having built upon Christ with hay, wood, and stubble—are thereby shown to bear a diversity of lesser sins, from which they were not fully purged, though they were worthy of the glory of the heavenly city."

See St. Caesarius on the same passage, Homily 8, in Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. 5, part 3, p. 752 F, and others cited by Bellarmine in De Purgatorio, Book 1, ch. 5, § "Est igitur," etc.

CXXXIX. On the fourth passage, Matt. 5:25 and Luke 12:58, St. Cyprian says: "It is one thing to stand in hope of pardon, another to arrive at glory; one thing to be shut in prison and not go out until one has paid the last farthing; another to receive immediately the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to be corrected and purged by long anguish for sins; another to have purged all one's sins by suffering; another finally to await the Lord's sentence on judgment day, and yet another to receive crowns immediately from the Lord."

See more in Bellarmine, De Purgatorio, Book 1, ch. 7 and 9.

CXL. To the foregoing, let the testimony of St. Gregory be added, explaining the words: "O Lord, rebuke me not in Your anger, nor chasten me in Your wrath."

Where he says: "As if he were to say: I know that after this life, some will be purged by flames, others will undergo the sentence of eternal damnation. But because I deem that transitory fire more intolerable than any present tribulation, I do not only ask not to be rebuked in the fury of eternal damnation, but I even fear being purged by the wrath of that passing correction. Therefore You, O Lord, whom I serve in spirit, whom I acknowledge to be the Savior of all—rebuke me not in the fury of perpetual damnation, nor chasten me in the wrath of purifying vengeance." See also St. Augustine, explaining Malachi 3:3, in The City of God, Book 20, chapter 25 (Genese col. 1390).

4. Catholic Proof from the Holy Fathers Not By Interpreting Scripture.

CXLI. Augustine: "If someone perhaps did not cultivate his field and allowed it to be overrun with thorns, in this life he bears the curse of his land in all his works, and after this life he will have either the fire of purification or eternal punishment."

And elsewhere, speaking about infants and baptized children who die:

"They are not only not prepared for eternal punishments, but they shall not suffer even any purgatorial torments after death."

And toward the end of the chapter:

"Let no one think that purgatorial punishments will take place except before that last and dreadful judgment."

CXLII. St. Gregory of Nyssa: "Either in the present life, being purified by prayers and the pursuit of wisdom, or after death, being cleansed in the furnace of purging fire, one is restored to original blessedness."

And further on (p. 635 D):

"Once departed from the body, having come to know the difference between virtue and vice, one cannot become a partaker in divinity unless he removes the stains that have defiled the soul by the fire of purification."

And a little later: "There are those who, after this life, have their defilements and inclinations toward evil purged away by purgatorial fire," etc.

CXLIII. And let these things suffice for now; for the following material will confirm even more fully what we have said up to this point.

CHAPTER III. That the Catholic Doctrine Concerning Suffrages for the Deceased Is Not a Just Cause of Separation.

I. Elbrachtius calls this a fundamental controversy. He presents the Catholic position in these words: "The prayers and other works of piety which are customarily performed in the Roman Church by the faithful for the dead should in no way be condemned as superstitious or erroneous; but rather should be proclaimed and practiced as pious, holy, and salutary." The Reformed position as follows: All these things should be condemned as superstitious and erroneous.

II. We do not believe that the question of intercessions for the dead is, according to the opinion of either the Lutheran or Reformed Church, a fundamental matter. For if those who are considered orthodox among Protestants believed intercessions for the dead to be pious, taught them to be holy, and handed down that they are salutary, then according to their opinion it cannot be a fundamental error if someone proclaims that intercessions for the dead are pious, holy, and salutary. But there are those among the Protestants who are

considered orthodox who believed, taught, and handed down this. Therefore, according to their opinion, it cannot be a fundamental error.

III. Let us hear John Hus, who is considered orthodox among Protestants. "The blessed living help by their prayers, fasts, alms, and other holy works the holy sleeping members of the Church, so that they may exit from the pains of purgatory and be placed more quickly in their homeland." Likewise: "Some souls, such as those of holy Martyrs and Confessors, are so inflamed with love of Christ at the moment of death that they are immediately placed in their homeland, with no stain left to be purged. But other souls, having their love dispersed toward temporal things, although the love of Christ predominates in them, have venial sins to be purged," etc. And soon after: "From what has been said, we understand which of the dead are helped by intercessions toward a speedier liberation from punishments, namely those who are not very good nor very bad, but middling, who are neither eternally damned nor actually beatified in their homeland, but are to be purged by the intercessions of the Church Militant. For some who are to be saved depart in such sin that they had not made satisfaction for what they committed. Hence according to the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 3, they are like wood, hay, and stubble, by which some understand greater venial sins, middling, and lesser ones. But others understand the love of temporal things, the love of the flesh, and the love of vainglory. The first burns longest like wood, which is most compared to earthly things. The second, namely the hay of the flesh, burns in a middling way. But the third, the stubble of worldly fame that passes away, burns most quickly, just as it also passed quickly in the living person. And it is clear how well the Apostle speaks, in the passage cited above: "If anyone's work is burned up, he will suffer loss, but he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire." And because the very wicked are not to be purged, since one who actually remains in final impenitence will not be purged in purgatory after this life. For otherwise the Savior would not have said in Matthew 12 that the sin against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come. And afterward he praises the testimony of St. Thomas from book 7 of *De Veritate*: That the souls of the dead are released in four ways: either by the offerings of priests, or by the fasting of relatives. Moreover, according to the same doctor, these benefit them not for the merit of eternal life, because they merited that while they lived, but they benefit them for the mitigation of punishment and the hastening of glory. And soon after: But if it is asked which of the four enumerated is the greatest suffrage for the dead, it is said that it is the saving victim, who is Christ. For He Himself is the foundation and most sufficient reward for the redemption of all those being purged. But if it is asked about the more excellent manner of helping the dead on the part of the person helping, it is said that it is by living well and helping the living who are more in need, such as by sowing works of mercy, both spiritual and corporal, according to the spirit of counsel.

IV. Since therefore John Hus believed and taught that suffrages for the dead are pious and useful, that doctrine cannot, according to the opinion of Protestants, contain a fundamental error; for otherwise John Hus would not have been orthodox. Therefore the same doctrine with respect to Catholics cannot contain a fundamental error—unless the Protestants should say: when we wish it, it is a fundamental error; when we do not wish it, it is not.

V. Let the Protestants therefore declare whether the Catholic doctrine concerning suffrages for the dead is by its very nature a fundamental error; such that all who believe and teach that suffrages for the dead are pious, holy, and salutary should be deprived of eternal salvation and eternally damned. If they affirm this, see what follows, even by the judgment of the Protestants themselves. Calixtus writes: "Nor has our Church ever denied that the ancient Church was accustomed to pray for the dead and their souls; indeed, we freely grant that in the third and fourth centuries and thereafter this custom obtained almost universally, so that prayers and offerings for the dead were made not only at burial but also on the anniversary day." Therefore all those people must be excluded from eternal salvation and consigned to eternal damnation; since it is well known that those prayers for the dead were poured forth also for their benefit. O wretched faithful, from the third and fourth centuries onward, by the judgment of Protestants, eternally separated from God, who is charity, on account of works of charity!

VI. In Calvin we read: "When my adversaries object to me that for thirteen hundred years it has been the accepted practice that prayers be made for the dead, I in turn ask them by what word of God, by what revelation, by what example this was done." He does not therefore deny that prayers for the dead were customary in the Church for thirteen hundred years, just as Molinaeus does not deny it either. Wherefore, if it is a fundamental error, the entire Church apostatized for thirteen hundred years before Calvin; all perished eternally by praying for the dead.

VII. Peter Martyr proceeds further: "You are accustomed to object to us also that the Church has always prayed for the dead. This indeed I do not deny." Therefore, granted that prayer for the dead is a fundamental error, as some among the Protestants wish; it follows that the Church has always apostatized, because it has always prayed for the dead. But if the Church has always apostatized, there never was a true Church according to these rash judges.

VIII. But the Apology of the Augsburg Confession itself states thus: "As for what our adversaries allege from the Fathers concerning the oblation for the dead, we know that the ancients speak of prayer for the dead, which we do not prohibit." Chemnitz, wishing to excuse and defend this statement of the Apology, speaks thus: "The prayers of the ancients

for the dead were public celebrations and sealings of the divine promises concerning the remission of sins, rest, and salvation of the piously departed, etc. In this manner and in this sense the Apology of the Confession also says: We do not prohibit prayer for the dead." And Luther in his Confession says: "Concerning the dead, because Scripture mentions nothing, I think it is not a sin to pray thus or similarly out of free devotion, that God may have mercy on the soul, if it is in such a state." And here it must be noted that the Apology of the Augsburg Confession does not prohibit prayer for the dead, of which the Fathers speak; but they speak also of prayer for the benefit of the dead. Therefore the Apology does not prohibit prayer for the benefit of the dead. Therefore prayer for the benefit of the dead not only should not be condemned as subversive of the fundamental faith, but should not even be prohibited. Chemnitz wavers in ambiguity: for no one would doubt that the prayers of the ancients are rightly called public celebrations and sealings of the divine promises according to certain circumstances. But that they are applications of the divine promises concerning the remission of sins is understood either thus, that according to the divine promises the remission of sins is applied to the dead through prayer—and this is the true meaning; or it is taken thus, that the living by praying for the dead apply to themselves the remission of sins—and this the Lutherans would rashly assert. Meanwhile, if the Apology is to be explained according to the stated opinion of Luther (although it speaks clearly enough), we lawfully pray "that God may have mercy on the soul, if it is in such a state." Therefore we lawfully implore the mercy of God for the dead. Therefore the Apology speaks of prayer imploring the mercy of God for the dead. Therefore prayer imploring the mercy of God for the dead not only is not by its nature a fundamental error, but is a lawful thing according to the Apology and Luther.

IX. We confirm the same from the Ecclesiastical Ordinance of the Palatinate of the year 1556, which, dealing with burial, instructs ministers how to commend the deceased to divine mercy near the end of the funeral sermon. The same is established in the Ecclesiastical Ordinance of the Duchy of Neuburg of the year 1570, and is repeated in the later ordinance of the Palatinate of the year 1577. If therefore it is lawful to commend the souls of the dead to divine mercy, it certainly cannot be that prayer for the benefit of the dead is unlawful, much less that it subverts by its nature the foundation of faith.

X. The Reformed of France, under the pretext of pursuing greater purity, thus take precautions in their Ecclesiastical Discipline: "Let no prayers, sermons, or public almsgiving be made at burials, to prevent all superstition." But, what is most astonishing, when they commit the body to the earth, they are accustomed to say: "*Corps mort dor, jusqué à ce que le Seigneur te réveille*," that is, "Dead body, sleep until the Lord awakens you." Of this ceremony indeed no trace is found in Holy Scripture or in antiquity, and therefore it should similarly

be abolished. For why do they speak to a dead body, which cannot hear, while they prohibit the invocation of the Saints reigning with Christ, because they persuade themselves that our prayers poured out to the Saints are not understood by them? Moreover, we do indeed find in early Christian antiquity that the dead were greeted by the living at the funerals of those times, as St. Dionysius the Areopagite testifies; but we have not yet been able to discover that speech was directed to the bodies of the dead, either commanding or wishing rest to the bodies themselves. However, those words could have a not unsuitable meaning if they were conceived a little differently, as containing a desire and petition for the glorious resurrection; for, as Bellarmine says, even though the Saints reigning with Christ will certainly obtain that glory, nevertheless it is not absurd to desire and request this for them, so that what is owed to their merits may be owed in more ways and may come to the Saints. And Perkins not dissimilarly: "We can also pray in general for the dead; namely thus, that God may hasten their glorious resurrection and the consummated beatitude of both body and soul. Which indeed we also request when we say, 'Thy kingdom come'; namely, the kingdom not only of grace but also of heavenly glory."

XI. But to return to our subject, Zanchius teaches, treating of the custom of the Church of praying for the dead: "When, where, and by whom prayer for the dead first began, nothing certain has yet been able to be discovered. Nevertheless it is an ancient custom and doctrine." Indeed, so ancient that in the third and fourth centuries it obtained almost universally, as Calixtus admits; that thirteen hundred years ago it was received by custom, as Calvin acknowledges; that the Church has always prayed for the dead, as Martyr relates. What wonder then if the Reformed have been able to discover nothing certain about the beginning of this custom? Rightly therefore Grotius: "Nor is any writer of any authority found who contradicted that custom; which indeed is sufficient for me." And truly it is sufficient for any Christian who is not contentious to adhere to the universal custom of the Church, as St. Augustine relates in book 2 of *On Baptism against the Donatists*, chapter 7, page 42, and elsewhere.

XII. Consider, Protestant lords, whether the opinion of your Church has declared the Catholic doctrine concerning suffrages for the dead to be a fundamental error; weigh carefully whether it can be called a fundamental error by its nature. For if you affirm it, you will have excluded from heaven and thrust down to hell the entire Church prior to your novelty along with the Holy Fathers—besides being caught in the most manifest contradiction. But if you deny it, the aforesaid Catholic doctrine will not be a fundamental error, nor a just cause for the separation of Protestants from Catholic unity.

CHAPTER IV. Concerning the Various Prayers of the Ancients for the Deceased.

I. It is one thing to offer a sacrifice, another to pray. For the Saints reigning with Christ a sacrifice is offered; and to this end Calixtus (*Dissertation on Purgatory*, n. 62) quotes from St. Epiphanius: "Then concerning the fact that the names of the deceased are recited, what could be more excellent than this institution? What more opportune and admirable? Both because those who are present believe that the deceased live and are not in *ἀνυπαρξία* [non-existence], that is, in the condition of those things which have ceased to be, but that they exist and live with the Lord, and (as the most venerable proclamation declares) there is hope for those who pray for their brethren, as if they were on a journey." And a little later: "But we also make mention of the righteous and Fathers, and Patriarchs, and Prophets, and Apostles, and Evangelists, and Martyrs, and Confessors, and Bishops, and Anchorites, and the entire order, so that we may distinguish the Lord Jesus from the order of other men on account of the honor that is due to Him, and so that we may render glory to Him.

II. Bellarmine relates the same from the Liturgy of Chrysostom, where commemoration is made of all the Saints, and it is said: "We offer to You, Lord, sacrifice for the Patriarchs, Apostles, Martyrs, and especially for the most blessed Mother of God." That this sacrifice is not offered for sins, but for their glory, is clear: For the liturgy immediately adds: "By whose supplications look upon us, O God." And then prayer is added for other deceased: "And remember all the faithful departed who have fallen asleep in hope of resurrection, and make them to rest where the light of Your countenance is seen." The same can be recognized from Augustine, Tract 84 on John, and from Cyril, Catechesis 5 Mystagogical.

III. Crocius reports from the liturgy ascribed to James the Apostle: "Remember, O Lord our God, the spirits and all flesh, of whom we have made mention and of whom we have not made mention, of the orthodox and those who think rightly concerning the faith, from Abel the righteous until this day; make them rest in the region of the living, in Your kingdom and the delights of paradise, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." In the Liturgy ascribed to Basil, the priest prays thus: "Remember, O Lord, those who have departed and migrated from this life, and the orthodox Bishops who from Peter and James the Apostles until this day have clearly professed the right word of faith, and namely Ignatius, Dionysius, Julius, and the rest of the saints." In the order of oblation of Severus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the priest prays to God that He grant rest to Adam, Eve, the Virgin Mary, the Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, the righteous, Priests, and holy Fathers. In the Ethiopian Mass all who rest in the right faith are named, and God is asked to place their souls in the

bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Those who recorded these formulas taught prayer for the blessed resting in the bosom of Abraham, not those constituted in torment. Those who used them prayed for them. Thus Crocius.

IV. Response: It is certain that in the ancient Masses and liturgies the faithful commended all the deceased to God. The Liturgy of St. James asks from the Lord remembrance of the spirits and all flesh, that God may make them rest in the region of the living, in the bosom of Abraham, whence pain, sadness, and groaning are exiled; where the light of Your countenance presides and perpetually shines, as is said there. Thus the Liturgy of St. Mark says: "To the souls of our fathers and brethren who have fallen asleep before in the faith of Christ, grant rest, O Lord our God, mindful of our ancestors who have been from the beginning, the Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, Saints, the Righteous, every spirit deceased in the faith of Christ," etc., and soon after reading the catalog of the deceased: "To the souls of all these grant rest, O Master, Lord our God, in Your holy tabernacles, in Your kingdom, bestowing upon them the good things of Your promises, which eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, which You, O God, have prepared for those who love Your holy name: to their souls, I say, grant rest, and deem them worthy of the kingdom of heaven." And here it must be noted that rest is sought for the souls of the faithful, and remembrance is made of the Saints who have died in the faith of Christ. Not dissimilar is the prayer that Crocius reports from the liturgy of St. Basil.

V. In the order of oblation of Severus, Patriarch of Alexandria, it reads thus: "In memory of the Lord our God and Redeemer Jesus Christ, and of all His salvific dispensation which was made for us, and first and particularly for our father Adam and our mother Eve, and the most holy Mother of God Mary, and the Prophets, and Apostles, preachers and Evangelists, Martyrs and Confessors, the Righteous and Priests and holy Fathers, and men who were pastors and teachers of upright glory, and Monks and Anchorites," etc., "and finally all the faithful." And soon after: "Grant them rest and good remembrance, and especially to the most holy Mother of God Mary, in whose honor and grace this oblation is offered privately and separately, that she may be, O my Lord, a mediatrix for whoever flees to the aid of her prayer (it seems it should read 'of prayer')." And a little later: "Glorious and to be celebrated is He who has magnified the memory of His Mother in heaven and on earth, and has made the commemoration of His Saints victorious in all places and ways." And from this it is established that it is one thing to make memory of the Saints in the Mass, another to seek rest for the deceased. For memory is also made of the Lord our God and Redeemer Jesus Christ, for whom nevertheless nothing is asked. And therefore it is said in the cited words: "Grant them rest and good remembrance"—namely, rest to those lacking it; good remembrance to those reigning with Christ, that they may be our reconcilers with God

through their intercession. Thus it reads in what follows: "Peace to you, Mary full of grace; our Lord is with you. Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit who is in your womb, Jesus Christ. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, I say, sinners. Amen."

VI. What is read further must not be neglected: "Forgiver and purifier, remitter, deleter, eraser, and forgetter of our many and great sins without number, and of the sins of all Your faithful people. Forgive, O good one, and have mercy on us. Remember us, Lord God, in Your mercies which are from You. And remember our souls, and the souls of our Fathers and our brethren, and our teachers, and our deceased, and finally all the faithful departed, children of the holy and glorious Church. Grant rest, O Lord God, to their souls, and to their spirits, and to their bodies, and sprinkle the dew of Your compassions upon their bones: be compassionate and merciful to us and to them, O Christ our King." And soon after: "Granting rest to the dead, raising up the buried, You, O my Lord, receive the souls of Your servants whose memory we have made; and place them, O my Lord, in the blessed mansions of Your Father's house, with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob Your friends, and with all the Saints who have carried out Your will in true faith, and that of Your Father and Your Holy Spirit, for ever and ever, amen." Here indulgence of sins is openly sought for the living and the dead. Therefore these Christians believed that some of the deceased are in sins, and that the living may lawfully seek liberation of the deceased from their sins. Is this to the taste of Crocius, who cited this order of oblation, which is followed by the Rites of Baptism? It must also be considered that rest is sought for the spirits of the deceased and for their bodies; but that rest generally sought concerns souls which have not yet arrived at the rest of eternal happiness, and the bodies of all the faithful; whence it is also said: "raising up the buried." But what is peculiar is what is requested there: "Sprinkle the dew of Your compassions upon their bones." For in the cited order of oblation, at the commemoration of the Saints, it is stated: "He has distilled the dew of mercies and grace upon the bones of the faithful departed." And this indeed seems unable to be understood concerning the future resurrection, but rather concerning the grace of miracles which God works through the bones of the faithful. Whatever is made of this,

VII. This is certain, that the Ancients also sought from God the resurrection of bodies. Crocius says the Gothic Missal expressly seeks the glory of bodies which they will have on the day of resurrection. Among the Missal prayers it reads thus: "That God may deign to place the souls of those at rest in the bosom of Abraham, and admit them to a share in the first resurrection." And among the blessings of the candle is this prayer: "God, judge of the universe, God of heavenly, earthly, and infernal things, most beloved brethren, we entreat for the spirits of our dear ones who have preceded us in the Lord's peace, that the Lord may place them in rest and raise them up in the portion of the first resurrection. Through our

Lord," etc. Another follows: "Jesus Christ, our life and resurrection, grant to our fellow priests and our dear ones who have rested in Your peace, the refreshment of the desired dwelling. And if any of these, deceived by the fraud of demons, have stained themselves with many blemishes of errors, You, O Lord, who alone are powerful, grant them forgiveness of their sins, so that the devil, who boasted that he had made them partakers of their own damnation, may groan that through Your mercy they have become companions of Your beatitude. Through the Lord," etc. It is established from what has been said that the Ancients prayed for the indulgence of sins, for the conferring of eternal rest, for the resurrection of bodies; whence also their general prayers for the dead embrace all these things, so that according to the different states of the deceased, different benefits may befall different ones.

VIII. Similar things are found in the Mass which the ancient Christians of the Bishopric of Angamale in the Mountains of the Malabar kingdom among the East Indians use; for there it reads thus: "Let us commemorate the most blessed Lady Mary, mother of the living God and our Savior and Redeemer," etc. "Let us also venerate the memory of the Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, and Confessors: Let us pray that by their prayers and passions which they endured, God may make for us with them the best hope and salvation, and that we may also be made worthy of their blessed commemorations and the living and true promises in the kingdom of heaven." And soon after: "Let us pray that by their prayers the pure truth and sincere doctrine which they taught and professed may be preserved in all the holy Church until the consummation of the age." And for the deceased: "Let us also remember our fathers and faithful brethren who have passed from this world in the orthodox faith; let us pray, I say, to the Lord that He may absolve them and remit their sins and transgressions, and make them worthy to rejoice with the just and upright who have obeyed the divine will forever." And afterward: "May He bring about resurrection for your deceased on the last day, and may the Holy Spirit make them worthy of the incorruptible kingdom," etc. Such is the blessing in the Mass for the dead: "Hear, O Lord, the voice of our prayer, and let our supplication enter into Your presence, and receive our sacrifices and oblations, and be propitious to the offenses of our deceased." And soon after: "In Your mercy receive the prayer of Your servant, and make him worthy of the bridal chamber of the kingdom with all the just who have pleased You: receive, our Lord, his sacrifice, and be propitious, and remit his debts, and blot out all his iniquities and those of all his companions." Here there is one commemoration of the Saints, another of the remaining faithful departed: prayer is made for the remission of sins and for the resurrection of bodies on the last day.

IX. The passage which Crocius cites from the Library of the Ethiopian Mass, which is also called the universal canon, reads thus: "Remember, O Lord, all who sleep and rest in the faith of Christ; place their souls in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." In the same Mass it is

said: "Hail, Virgin Mary, Mother of God, you are the golden censer who carried the burning coal." And afterward: "Rejoice, O Lady, because we pray for holy salvation! O Virgin Mother of God and of Christ, at all times offer up and on high our prayer before the elect of your Son, that our sins may be forgiven. Rejoice, O Lady, because you have borne for us the true light, Jesus Christ our Lord. Pray for us before Him that He may have mercy on our soul; pray for us in the presence of the throne of your Son Jesus Christ. Rejoice, O immaculate one, truly Queen! Rejoice, glory of our parents, because you have borne Emmanuel for us! O truly mediatrix before our Lord Jesus Christ, we humbly beseech you to be mindful of us! Pray for us, that our iniquities may be blotted out." Again: "O good Minister, St. Paul, healer of the sick, who have received the crown; pray and intercede for us, that our soul may be freed through the multitude of the mercies of Jesus Christ and of His holy name." And generally: "Through the prayers and supplications of Your Saints." From what has been said it is established that the Christians of Ethiopia do not pray to the Saints for beatitude, which they call essential, since they believe that they have received the crown and reign with Christ. Yet they pray generally for all the faithful departed, as is also customary among us; and thus they say: "Remember those who sleep and rest in the right faith." Thus they say: "Have mercy, O Lord, on the souls of Your servants and handmaids who have eaten Your flesh and drunk Your blood, and have rested in Your faith." Thus they say: "O Lord, grant rest to the souls of our fathers and brethren who sleep and rest in the right faith." And yet in the same continuation they pray thus: "Guard them in the right faith and in glory at all times; and make them serve with ineffable and inconceivable charity, through the prayers and intercession which our Lady, the holy and immaculate Virgin Mary, makes for us; and through the prayers of the greater shining Angels, Michael, and Gabriel, and Raphael, and Uriel, and the four living creatures without flesh, and the twenty-four Elders; and of our holy Fathers the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the worthy former Fathers, and our fifteen Fathers the Prophets and Saint John the Baptist, and the fourteen thousand children of Bethlehem, and our Fathers the twelve chief Apostles, and the seventy-two disciples, and their five hundred companions; and the three youths, Ananias, Azarias, and Misael; and Saint Mark the Evangelist and Martyr, and Saint Stephen the Archdeacon, Protomartyr, and Saint George the star of honor, Theodore, Banadli, Claudius, Minas the elect, Cosmas and Damian, and our Fathers the chief Bishops, the three hundred and eighteen who were at Nicaea, and the one hundred and fifty who were at Constantinople, and the two hundred who were at Ephesus; and Tecla Aimanot, whose prayers and blessings and help and grace be with us forever and ever: Amen. Grant rest to the souls of them and all those, and have mercy on them, for indeed You sent Your Son from heaven into the womb of the Virgin." Whence it is established that they no more pray for the essential beatitude of holy men than of Angels; yet for all of them they ask rest. There is also another prayer of the Ethiopian Christians for the dead in their Order of Baptism: "Let us also ask Almighty God,

Father of the Lord, God, and our Redeemer Jesus Christ, for those who have fallen asleep. O Lord of the living, life of the dead, hope of the desperate, helper of those who labor, cleanser of sins, who have made death idle and, by cutting the snares of Satan, have conferred salvation on the human race: we ask You and beseech You, O immortal One, with whom is the treasure of life, for those who have fallen asleep and rested in the faith, the first fathers, the princes of Archbishops, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Antagonists, Virgins, Monks, doctors, married persons, those bereft of spouse, infants, orphans, and for the soul of Your servant N., and for the souls of all whom You Yourself have called from the people justly and rightly: make their souls rest in a pleasant place by the water of rest, in the bosom of Abraham with Isaac and Jacob, You in whom is the power of rest, O Lord our God." And soon after: "O Lord our God Almighty, we ask You and beseech You, receive the souls of Your servants who have fallen asleep and rested in the faith, together with the soul of Your servant N., and all the souls who here have died or are dying; nourish them in a pleasant place by the water of rest in the bosom of Abraham, together with Isaac and Jacob; grant them the passage of their souls without sin. Send the comforting and calming Spirit to their relatives." Here it must be noted that the Ethiopian Christians ask God for the forgivness of sins of the deceased.

X. The Order of the Gothic Divine Office of the Mozarabs has a Mass for the dead, for whom prayer is made there, just as prayer is made for them in the Mass which is celebrated on the feast of St. James. And thus in all Liturgies and Masses prayer is made for the dead, and the living faithful pray various things for them, according to the different states of the deceased, whether that they may be freed from sins, or that they may become partakers of the resurrection, or that the accidental glory of the Saints may be increased, which pleased Innocent III, as cited by Bellarmine, *On Purgatory*, book 2, chapter 18, § "As for the rest."

XI. Thus therefore we establish: the living faithful have at all times prayed for the dead, that God might free them from sins; therefore we lawfully ask God to free the dead from sins. If we lawfully ask God to free the dead from sins, it must be believed that God frees the dead from sins after this life. If God frees the dead from sins after this life, then there are deceased who have sins from which they are freed. If there are deceased who have sins from which they are freed, then those deceased are not in heaven, where there are no sins and to which sins do not reach; therefore the same deceased are not in hell, where no one is freed from sins; therefore they are in a third place, which we call Purgatory.

XII. Crocius says that the ancients in their prayers sought a mature resurrection. He reports that Ambrose thus closes his sermon on the death of Valentinian: "I ask You, most high God, that You raise up and resurrect these most dear youths with a mature resurrection, and that You compensate for this immature course of this life with a mature resurrection." He refers

to the same thing said by Tertullian writing about a widow: "Meanwhile, seek for him (your husband) refreshment and companionship in the first resurrection." From which Crocius concludes that it was once thought that the dead would not all rise at the same time, but some sooner, others later, and he names the Gothic Missal.

XIII. In the Gothic Missal, whose words we have cited, admission to the first resurrection is sought, and placement in the portion of the first resurrection. What the ancients understood by the first resurrection is not entirely clear to us. St. Augustine openly set forth his opinion in these words: "Therefore, just as there are two regenerations, of which I have already spoken above, one according to faith, which now takes place through baptism; the other according to the flesh, which will take place in its incorruption and immortality through the great and final judgment: so also there are two resurrections; one first, which also exists now and is of souls, which does not permit coming into the second death; the other second, which does not exist now but will be at the end of the age, not of souls but of bodies, which through the final judgment will send some into the second death, others into that life which has no death." Since St. Augustine calls the first resurrection that which is of souls, when they are purged from sins and thus are not permitted to come into the second death, you may not unsuitably understand the words of the Gothic Missal concerning the admission of souls to the indulgence of sins, and concerning their placement in the portion and number of those who have been made partakers of the first resurrection and full purgation from sins. Although meanwhile the first resurrection in St. Augustine signifies regeneration through baptism, which has no place in the future age. If Crocius should respond that the words of the said Missal can also be understood thus, that some are thought to rise sooner, others later, there is no reason we should resist, if he judges that both explanations should be admitted; which indeed being admitted, Catholic doctrine will be established from that source from which Crocius thought it could be somewhat undermined.

XIV (Latin Text Errs On Numbering) Regarding the saying of Tertullian: "Meanwhile, seek for him (your husband) refreshment and companionship in the first resurrection," it must be observed that here two things are prescribed to be sought: refreshment for the husband, and companionship in the first resurrection. He who seeks refreshment presupposes some punishment. Thus Tertullian elsewhere: "No one will doubt that the soul pays something in the underworld, saving the fullness of the resurrection, also through the flesh." Therefore Tertullian, commanding the widow to seek refreshment for her husband, refers to the punishments which souls pay in the underworld. Thus Crocius confirms Purgatory while he thinks to overthrow it. The first resurrection for Tertullian is that by which he believed the just would reign with Christ on earth for a thousand years after the resurrection of bodies, and he calls it "the prerogative of the first resurrection." And he thought that, when these

were completed, the universal resurrection would follow: "Hence also, when fire is given, the judgment of the universal resurrection will be judged from the books." He also recognizes the spiritual resurrection, which St. Augustine calls the first resurrection. For he speaks thus: "If the recognition of the Sacrament (that is, of the mysteries of faith or of baptism, which is the type of resurrection) is a resurrection, certainly that one is believed to be preserved which is preached at the end, and it follows that by the very fact that this spiritual one is vindicated, that corporeal one is prejudged: because if none were then announced, rightly this one alone, and only the spiritual, would be vindicated; but since it is also proclaimed for the final time, the corporeal is recognized, because the spiritual (through regeneration) is not also then announced. For why would the resurrection of the same condition, that is, spiritual, be announced again, when it would be fitting either now to expunge it without any difference of times, or then under every conclusion of times? Thus it is more fitting for us also to defend the spiritual resurrection from the entrance of faith, whose fullness we recognize at the exit of the age." Therefore the spiritual resurrection takes place in this life through the regeneration of baptism, which he calls the entrance of faith; the fullness of which resurrection is indeed to be recognized at the exit of the age, when the flesh itself also rises, as Tertullian was speaking in the earlier passages. When the widow seeks companionship in the first resurrection for her husband, if Crocius wishes this to be taken concerning companionship in the resurrection of the just, which according to Tertullian's opinion was to precede the universal resurrection, and about which Ludovicus de la Cerda disputes much, it will be the same as if she should seek to see the resurrection of her husband in the company of the just, which has nothing inconvenient about it. Nevertheless, Crocius does not thereby establish from Tertullian's opinion that some of those to be saved will rise sooner, others later; although even that itself would not be contrary to Catholic opinion and doctrine.

XX. The words of St. Ambrose, cited by Crocius, admit the same meaning, that he prays for a mature resurrection for those who died immaturely: namely, that resurrection which will be common to all the just, and which perhaps he believed would be before the universal resurrection.

XXI. Again Crocius says that the ancients prayed for the dead for the remission of sins, not of those sins which were not forgiven here, but of those same sins which were forgiven here. For those sins which are forgiven here are forgiven in the judgment, that is, they will be declared forgiven, and the full fruit of the remission received here will be granted in soul and body. Compare Acts 13:12 and 2 Timothy 1:18. This is clear from the formulas which are prescribed in the book *On Sacred Ceremonies*, section 15, chapter 15, for the Mass to be held for the soul of a Cardinal, and which are repeated thence by Molinaeus: "O Lord, when

You come to judge the earth, where shall I hide from the face of Your wrath? Because I have sinned exceedingly in my life, I tremble at my sins, and I blush before You; when You come to judge, do not condemn me. Absolve, we beseech You, the soul of Your servant from every bond of debts, that in the glory of the resurrection he may be raised up among Your Saints and elect and may breathe again." Likewise: "Deliver, O Lord, from eternal death on that dreadful day, when the heavens and earth are to be shaken, when You come to judge the world by fire."

XXII. Response 1. Concerning the texts of Scripture cited, see above on Purgatory. But it is astonishing that Crocius attributes to the ancients what he proves by no testimony of the ancients. We do not doubt that a declaration of the remission made here could be sought; for why should resurrection be lawfully sought if this declaration should not be lawfully sought? But that this declaration was sought, if it were established, would in no way help the cause of the Protestants: for they also sought other things for the dead which the Protestants do not admit. The same is clear from what has been said in this chapter, and will be more clear from what will be said.

XXIII. Response 2: With Bellarmine to a similar objection, saying: "Two solutions can be given. One is that the Church prays for souls who dwell in purgatory, that they may not be damned to the eternal punishments of Gehenna, not indeed because it is not certain that they will not be damned to those punishments, but because God wishes us to pray even for those things which we are certainly going to receive."

XXIV. But against this response it can be objected, because even though the Church sometimes prays for those things which it is certain to receive, nevertheless it does not pray for those things which it has already received: but it has already received that those souls not be damned, since they have had a certain sentence and are most secure; moreover, the mind of the faithful who pray for the dead, or desire prayer to be made, is certainly directed to this end, that they may help those souls and free them from the present punishments of purgatory.

XXV. But these objections are easily resolved: for even though the souls in Purgatory have already received the first sentence in the particular judgment, and by that sentence are free from Gehenna, nevertheless the general judgment still remains, in which they are going to receive a second sentence. Therefore the Church, praying that in the final judgment those souls may not fall into darkness nor be swallowed up by Tartarus, does not pray for that which it has received, but for that which it is going to receive.

XXVI. But to that about the intention of the faithful I respond that that intention also is satisfied: for by that prayer both things are sought: namely, that those souls may be freed from the punishments of the underworld, that is, of Purgatory, which they suffer in the present, and afterward may be freed from the sentence of damnation to be pronounced in the final judgment.

XXVII. The other solution is that the Church truly prays, as to its intention, that souls may be freed from the punishments of Purgatory, yet it uses that manner of speaking as if the souls were then departing from the body and were in danger of eternal salvation, because it commemorates and represents the day of deposition or death: for just as in the celebrations of the feasts of the Incarnation, Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Lord, the Church prays as if Christ should then be incarnated, or born, etc., because it represents those mysteries as present, and yet does not intend literally to pray that the Word assume flesh, or be born of the Virgin, etc., but that the fruit of those mysteries may be applied to us: so also in the sacrifice for the dead, because the day of their death is commemorated, the Church prays for them as if they were then dying, and yet intends to pray that they may be freed from the underworld in the manner in which they can be freed, that is, that they may not be detained longer in those punishments, or that some refreshment may be mingled with their pains. Finally, just as it is not absurd now, after fifteen hundred years, at the Advent of the Lord to say: "Drop down dew, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain the Just One; let the earth be opened and bring forth a Savior," and many other things of this kind; so it is not absurd to say for the dead: "Deliver them from the mouth of the Lion, lest they fall into darkness," etc. Thus Bellarmine. Apply this.

XXVIII. Another refuge of Crocius: "The ancients prayed for those who were not in torments but rested in peace, were with Christ and reigned. For scarcely will even the Papists themselves say otherwise about the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles," etc. Let Ambrose be an example, who prayed for Theodosius, etc. "Did he pray for one sweating in the furnace of purgatorial fire? Rather for one reigning in the heavenly Jerusalem," etc. "Similarly he prayed for Valentinian and Gratian, as he himself says in his work on the death of Valentinian," etc. "For did he think him groaning in subterranean fires? Thus the Papist. But he placed him in rest. The words are clear of one addressing Valentinian," etc. He has similar things Ibid. n. 6, p. 83, and Calixtus, *Dissertation on Purgatory*, n. 62.

XXVIII. Another refuge of Crocius: "The ancients prayed for those who were not in torments but rested in peace, were with Christ and reigned. For scarcely will even the Papists themselves say otherwise about the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles," etc. Let Ambrose be an example, who prayed for Theodosius, etc. "Did he pray for one sweating in the furnace of purgatorial fire? Rather for one reigning in the heavenly Jerusalem," etc. "Similarly he prayed

for Valentinian and Gratian, as he himself says in his work on the death of Valentinian," etc. "For did he think him groaning in subterranean fires? Thus the Papist. But he placed him in rest. The words are clear of one addressing Valentinian," etc. He has similar things Ibid. n. 6, p. 83, and Calixtus, *Dissertation on Purgatory*, n. 62.

CONTROVERSY II. Concerning Suffrages for the Deceased.

I. The question is between Catholics and Protestants: Whether the souls of the faithful departed existing in Purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the living.

II. The Augsburg Confession states thus: "Our teachers teach that this opinion about the merit and application of the Mass (made for the living and the dead) is false and impious." And a little later: "That application of the Lord's Supper for freeing the dead, without the authority of Scripture, indeed contrary to Scripture, is to be condemned as a new and impious worship."

III. Confession of Württemberg: "That the dead are helped by those customary vigils, prayers, and sacrifices, and by the merits of these are either freed from punishments or obtain greater happiness in heaven, there exists no testimony of truly Prophetic and Apostolic doctrine."

IV. Second Helvetic Confession: "We believe that the faithful migrate directly from bodily death to Christ, and therefore need nothing from the suffrages or prayers of the living for the dead, nor finally from those offices of theirs."

V. We in the profession of Catholic faith speak thus: "I firmly hold that Purgatory exists, and that the souls detained there are helped by the suffrages of the faithful."

VI. It is agreed between Catholics and Protestants:

1. That one should not pray for those deceased whose souls are established to be in hell, either that they may be freed from mortal sin or from eternal punishments. For there is no redemption in hell.
2. That one should not petition for the Saints reigning with Christ, either that they may be cleansed from the stain of any sin or that they may be exempted from inflicted punishments. Because nothing defiled enters heaven, and there is no punishment or sorrow there.
3. When the Ancients prayed for the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and other Saints, they did not pour forth those prayers that they might be freed from limbo; for the Lord Christ accomplished this after His descent to hell; nor that they might be freed

from the punishments of purgatory, which they did not believe them to suffer; but those prayers were thanksgivings for the divine benefits bestowed on the Saints (as Peter Martyr admits), to which were joined petitions that the merciful God, through their intercession, might grant His grace to the living, so that, having completed this course according to God's commandments, they might arrive at eternal rewards. See Apology of the Augsburg Confession in the Body of Christian Doctrine of Melanchthon, title on the word Mass, p. 214.

VII. It is not a question of faith: 1. Whether the suffrages of the living for the dead are satisfactions: for some wish that we do not properly make satisfaction, but only provide something in view of which God applies to us the satisfaction of Christ; and thus our works are not except conditions without which Christ's satisfaction would not be applied to us, or at most they are dispositions. Others wish that we properly make satisfaction, but that our satisfaction is joined with the satisfaction of Christ, on which it depends: and thus there is a twofold satisfaction. Others establish one satisfaction of ours in suffrages, which has power from the grace and satisfaction of Christ. Concerning which Bellarmine may be consulted. 2. It is not a question of faith whether the Sacrifice of the Mass by a certain law and promise always works the remission of punishment for the deceased existing in Purgatory. 3. Whether the suffrages which are made by the faithful for determined deceased profit them by a certain law. 4. Whether the Sacrifice of the Mass provides the same by the work worked (*ex opere operato*). 5. Whether the remission of punishment is made through the application of our satisfactions. Since there are various opinions of Catholic Doctors concerning the aforesaid matters, and neither the Council of Trent nor any other general council has pronounced for either side, these are not questions of Catholic faith; although some opinions are far more probable than others, which is not to be examined in this place. It should suffice for us that the souls detained in Purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, as the Council of Trent speaks. But whether, and in what other ways this happens than through the mode of suffrage and impetration, one teaches more probably than another, even though Catholic faith constrains us to none of these. See Veronius, *Epitome of Controversies*, Vol. 3, Part 5, Chapter 2, § 5.

VIII. Therefore the question of faith is: Whether the souls of the faithful departed existing in Purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the living?

FIRST PART

Proof of the Protestants from Sacred Scripture.

IX. Text 1: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive what he has done in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or evil" (2 Cor 5:10). Therefore nothing that others do for us after our death will profit us. For whence comes the utility of suffrages, or what need do the deceased have of sacrifices and other spiritual aids by which they may be freed from punishments after this life, if each one immediately after death receives what he has done in the body and obtains reward or punishment?

X. Response 1: We admit the words of Scripture, but we do not read that works of piety performed for the dead are a new and impious worship, or that the souls of no faithful departed need spiritual aids. The consequence, or interpretation, is insufficient to establish a dogma of faith, due to defects often repeated.

XI. Response 2: St. Augustine raises this text as an objection to himself and responds: "This question is solved thus, because by a certain manner of life it is acquired, while one lives in this body, that these things help the deceased somewhat; and through this, according to those things which they did through the body, they are helped by what has been done religiously for them after death. For there are some whom these things help not at all: either they are done for those whose merits are so bad that they are not worthy to be helped by such things, or for those whose merits are so good that they do not need such help. Therefore by the manner of life which each person led through the body, it is brought about that those things which are piously done for him profit or do not profit when he has left the body. For the merit through which these things profit, if none was acquired in this life, is sought in vain after this life. Thus it happens that neither does the Church or the care of her members vainly expend for the dead whatever she can of religious duty, and yet each one bears according to what he did through the body, whether good or evil, the Lord rendering to each according to his works. Therefore each one receives his own things of the body after this life, while according to the variety of merits he is either received into heaven, or consigned to eternal damnation, or subjected to temporary punishments. Each one receives after this life according to what he did, whether good or evil, when one lives here in such a way that the suffrages expended by the living can be useful; for this itself also pertains to the merit of the life previously lived, lest they be fruitless." Concerning the same text see St. Augustine, Question 2 to Dulcitius, Vol. 4, p. 284, and Enchiridion to Laurentius, chapter 110,

Vol. 3, p. 83, and St. Dionysius the Areopagite, book On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 7, Library of the Fathers, Vol. 1, p. 135f.

XII. Text 2: "They have no more portion forever in anything that is done under the sun" (Eccl 9:6). What utility therefore can the faithful departed hope for from the suffrages of the living? Response: The Wise Man teaches that the dead lack the uses of this life, that is, they do not eat, drink, etc. For thus he says: "Love also and hatred and envy have perished together, nor do they have a part in this age and in the body which is done under the sun. Go therefore and eat your bread with joy, and drink," etc. But we are treating of spiritual aid, not denying it to the souls of the piously departed.

XIII. Text 3: "Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might, for there is no work or thought or knowledge or wisdom in Sheol, to which you are going" (Eccl 9:10). Consequently no relief or comfort remains for the dead after death.

XIV. Response 1: Why does Solomon not speak in that text in the person of the impious, who denied both purgatory and hell as well as the future life? If you understand these words as Solomon reproving the lost life of men for whom hell is prepared, what do they have to do with this? For we say nothing else "except that souls detained in Purgatory receive help through the suffrages of the living, by the merits of Christ Jesus," because after departure from this life some debt remains to be paid, with the remaining life meanwhile having been lived so Christianly that they deserve to receive such help.

XV. Response 2: St. Jerome explains the aforesaid words thus: "Do whatever you can now and labor, because when you descend to hell, there will be no place for repentance." Therefore men are warned lest they neglect the space of repentance granted in this life. See St. Gregory, book 4 of Dialogues, chapter 39, Vol. 3, col. 337.

"See to it that no one deceives you through philosophy and vain deceit" (Col 2:8).

XVI. The first proof concludes from the affirmation of one thing the negation of another unconnected thing; for it does not follow that the suffrages of the living do not profit the dead because they receive according to what they did in the body; rather, they receive relief from this who have so acted in the body that they deserved to receive it. The second and third proofs commit the fallacy from what is said in a certain respect to what is said absolutely, as is self-evident.

SECOND PART.

1. Catholic Proof from Councils and the Practice of the Church.

XVII. Thus the Council of Florence: "We define that the souls are purged after death by the punishments of purgatory, and that in order that they may be relieved from punishments of this kind, the suffrages of the living faithful profit them, namely the sacrifices of Masses, prayers and almsgivings, and other offices of piety which are customarily done by the faithful for other faithful according to the institutions of the Church."

XVIII. The Council of Trent states thus: "Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, from the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, in sacred Councils, and most recently in this ecumenical Synod, has taught that purgatory exists, and that the souls detained there are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar, it commands," etc. To which add the practice of the entire Church, by which the faithful with great zeal come to the aid of the dead.

2. Catholic Proof from Sacred Scripture

XIX. In this place we set forth a general proof by which we teach that that is good, lawful, and useful which is not divinely prohibited and is exercised by faithful Christians for the honor of God and the spiritual benefit of neighbor. We have the very text of Scripture in Romans 4:15: "Where there is no law, neither is there transgression." Concerning this text see Examination of 3 Principles, § 9, p. 114, etc.

XX. The second proof, and one proper to this place, is taken from 2 Maccabees 12:43, etc., where Judas Maccabeus orders sacrifice to be offered for the dead, and whose deed is praised. "The most valiant Judas, having made a collection, sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem to offer sacrifice for sin, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection (for unless he had hoped that those who had fallen would rise again, it would seem superfluous and vain to pray for the dead), and because he considered that those who had received their sleep with piety had the best grace laid up for them. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins."

XXI. From this text we have: 1. That it is good and lawful to pray for the dead and to offer sacrifice to God, that they may be loosed from sins; for otherwise those works of piety would be useless and would be praised in vain by divine Scripture. 2. That sometimes after this life some lesser sins remain to be expiated, or some punishment to be endured for the

imperfect satisfaction of mortal sins remitted in this life, since those of whom we treat here received their sleep with piety. 3. That there is a certain place where the souls of the dead are freed from sins, wherever that may be, which we call Purgatory. 4. That this was practiced solemnly and publicly in the Church of the Old Testament, without any reproach from the Lord Christ, which here is called a holy and pious deed. 5. That Judas Maccabeus with his men believed that some sins can be remitted in the other life; for if they had not believed this, to what end would they have taken care that sacrifice be offered? And therefore, beyond the hope which they had of the resurrection against the Sadducees, these things were done for the dead, that [they might be loosed] from sins, etc. 6. That the sacrifice is not said to have been offered for the resurrection of the dead, but, as St. Augustine says, that the Lord might deal more mercifully with them, Sermon 32 on the Words of the Apostle.

XXII. Crocius raises a scruple against the books of Maccabees, as if they were not canonical; and similarly Calixtus in his Theological Dissertation on Purgatory, n. 41. But besides the fact that this question does not belong to this place, and that it should suffice that we adduce proofs from our own Bibles, supposing their truth, we give at present the testimony of St. Augustine saying: "Among which are also the books of Maccabees, which not the Jews (nor the Protestants) but the Church holds as canonical," book 18 of City of God, chapter 36, Vol. 5, col. 1215A, and book 2 of Christian Doctrine, chapter 8, Vol. 3, p. 11D.

XXIII. Calixtus objects: "It is not necessary to understand the deed of Judas Maccabeus as if he wished that sacrifice for sin to be offered in Jerusalem to free the slain soldiers from punishments, but for the remaining Church of the Jews, and indeed to this end, that the crime of some might be imputed to the whole people, especially if perhaps besides those fallen some still among the surviving Jewish soldiers had rendered themselves liable to the same sin. See verse 42 of the same chapter. But the author of the book interprets this deed of Judas far otherwise, and thus interposes a false judgment, though a private one, which did not prejudice the universal Church of the Jews. Finally, not even the author himself in this private judgment of his asserts purgatory, but he praises sacrifices or prayers for the dead because these prayers manifestly profess hope in the resurrection of the dead, which at that time was expressly denied by the Sadducees. Therefore he does not understand the prayers and sacrifices procured by Judas Maccabeus for the slain soldiers to have been done to that end, that they might be freed from torments to be endured before the resurrection, but lest the sin committed should harm them when the resurrection of the dead should come to pass."

XXIV. Response 1: Calixtus's reasoning does not cohere. For from the fact that he thinks it not necessary to understand the deed of Judas Maccabeus as if he wished that sacrifice for

sins to be offered to free the slain from punishments, he concludes that the sacrifice was offered for the remaining Church of the Jews; and thence that the author, interpreting this deed far otherwise, interposes a false judgment. But whence does Calixtus prove that the Author of the books of Maccabees interprets that deed far otherwise than it truly should be interpreted, and thus interposes a false judgment? We seek proof, we find none. Is it better and more certainly established for Calixtus to what end Judas Maccabeus took care that sacrifices be offered than it was established for the said Author? What if he should respond that it is not necessary that according to Calixtus's mind that sacrifice be judged to have been offered for the remaining Church of the Jews, and therefore that Calixtus interposes a false judgment, though a private one which does not prejudice the truth?

XXV. Response 2: Calixtus says the Author does not assert purgatory. What is the reason? Because he praises sacrifices or prayers for the dead because these prayers manifestly profess hope in the resurrection of the dead, which at that time was denied by the Sadducees. But what is the connection: "Sacrifices for the dead are praiseworthy because they profess hope in the resurrection; therefore the Author does not assert Purgatory"? The sense is what Bellarmine proposes, that Judas took care of sacrifices for the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection, and therefore fearing lest the souls of his slain soldiers, on account of some sin, be punished in the other age.

XXVI. Response 3: The words of Holy Scripture adduced declare the end for which the prayers were procured, namely "that the dead might be loosed from sin"; they do not deal immediately with liberation from torments to be endured before the resurrection, although those who are not loosed from sins cannot arrive at heaven, where nothing defiled is received, and thus they necessarily endure some punishment. But we set this aside now: whence does Calixtus prove that the sacrifices were procured to this end, "lest the sin committed should harm them when the resurrection of the dead should come to pass"? It is one thing to seek something with determination to a certain time; another thing absolutely, without that determination. Whence does Calixtus prove the determination to the time of the resurrection? On what foundation does he explain the absolute proposition through the determinate one? But he needed that determination lest he be compelled to concede that the loosing from sins happens to the dead before the time of the resurrection. "To pray for the dead that they may be loosed from sins" is not to pray that the sin committed may not harm in the resurrection: for if the sin committed harms in the resurrection, it also harms before the resurrection, since it cannot be that it begins to harm in the resurrection itself. If therefore sin harms before the resurrection, surely Judas Maccabeus prayed that sin might not harm before the resurrection. But he is not said to have prayed that sin might not harm, although he would lawfully have prayed for this; but it is said to be holy and wholesome to

pray for the dead that they may be loosed from sins; that is, that sin may be taken away and that there may no longer be anything to harm.

XXVII. Crocius objects 1: "You see, it is not said that sacrifice was offered for the dead. You will say that nothing other than the sin of the dead can be understood. I first deny this. For why should it not be understood of the living? They had not punished the sin of their companions with that severity with which they should have when it became known. For both the bodies and the anathemas should have been burned, Deuteronomy 7:25, 3:16, Joshua 7:21, 22, 23. This was not done. Therefore it was a sin. For this reason Judas exhorts them to keep themselves intact from sin henceforth. Therefore it is not wrongly understood of the sin of the living."

XXVIII. Response: Crocius acts a little more cautiously in this place than Calixtus, for he does not accuse the Author of falsehood. He says the sacrifice is not wrongly understood to have been offered for the sin of the living. But on what foundation? Is it because the survivors also had sinned? But what is the sequence: the survivors had sinned, therefore that sacrifice was offered for the survivors? Then, it is said in the text: "For unless he had hoped that those who had fallen would rise again, it would seem superfluous and vain to pray for the dead." Therefore prayer was made for the dead; for this is what the praise attributed to Judas contains. It is said in the text: "Judas sent [money] to offer sacrifice for sin, because he considered that those who had received their sleep with piety had the best grace laid up for them." How will this be drawn to the living? It is added in the text: "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead." How would this cohere with what precedes if sacrifice was not offered for the dead? Will you say with Calixtus that the Author interposes a false judgment? It is added that Calvin says the writer of the history draws Judas's deed to this end, that they might be companions of eternal life with the rest of the faithful who had died for their country and religion. Therefore, according to the opinion of the writer of the history, that sacrifice was not offered for the living. Will it be better established for Crocius to what end the sacrifice was offered? The same Calvin says: "This deed was not without superstition and misguided zeal." Therefore that deed either does not concern the living, or does not concern only the living: for if it concerned only the living, whence would Calvin fabricate superstition and misguided zeal? It is added that your Sadeël writes: "This Author sufficiently indicates that he understands nothing else by that prayer than that the sin committed not be imputed in the final resurrection." And du Plessis speaks in the same manner. Therefore, according to the Author's opinion, that prayer does not touch the living but the dead.

XXIX. Crocius objects secondly: "Even if you understand it of the sin of the dead, I deny that therefore the sacrifice was offered for the dead. For they had bound themselves by an

anathema because they had seized some of the votive offerings, of the idols of the Jamnians, against the express law, Deuteronomy 7:25, 26. But it is established from the law that for such persons sacrifice cannot be rightly offered. Indeed, none was instituted at all for the dead, nor should any be offered that was not instituted. Therefore either Judas did not offer for the dead, or he must have been exceedingly ignorant or impious. Ignorant, if he did not know that sacrifice for the dead was illicit; impious, if knowingly and willingly he did something other than what was permitted by the law. That is more true, that it was offered lest this sin be imputed to the surviving people. Which otherwise is customarily done, as Scripture testifies. Thus the sacrilege of Achan was imputed to the whole people. Hence it falls before the enemy. Joshua 6. And thus the sacrifice would agree with the law."

XXX. Response with Bellarmine: "Either the sin of those men was venial, because perhaps they were ignorant of the law's prohibition and did not take from those votive offerings in honor of idols but only out of a desire to become rich, which can be venial; or certainly if it was mortal, those soldiers in the moment of death grieved for their sin and it was remitted to them as to guilt, according to that of Psalm 77: 'When He slew them, they sought Him and turned back'; or at least Judas Maccabeus thought thus, otherwise Scripture would not say that he considered that those who had fallen asleep with piety had the best grace laid up for them. Add finally that at least their state was uncertain, and therefore it was lawful to pray for them, even if they had been damned."

XXXI. Crocius replies, and attempts with many arguments to prove that those dead had departed in grave sin, in sacrilege and mortal crime; but he dismisses Bellarmine's arguments to the contrary in such a way that he does not touch the solid foundation. Bellarmine said that Judas thought that those deceased had not died in mortal sin, because, according to the testimony of Scripture, he considered that those who had received their sleep with piety had the best grace laid up for them, and thence he took care that sacrifice be offered. Crocius trifles in responding: "Nor should Judas be thought so ignorant as either to number sacrilege among venial sins or to number those killed in flagrant sin among the repentant." Judas may not have been so ignorant as to number sacrilege among venial sins, yet it could have been uncertain to Judas whether what each and every one had committed was a mortal sin. Judas may not have been so ignorant as to number those killed in flagrant sin among the repentant, but neither was he so inhuman that he could not have presumed the repentance from sin of many. If he had presumed neither repentance nor venial sin of the deceased, on what foundation would he have procured sacrifice for them, because he considered that those who had received their sleep with piety had the best grace laid up for them?

XXXII. To this Crocius says: "But suppose Judas offered for the dead. Therefore there is no purgatory. They could have been in hell; but Judas would have testified to a pious affection. He would rather have thought about the resurrection, which is said in verses 43-44, and would have requested that God not impute sin to the deceased in the resurrection; finally, it would have been the deed of one man, neither a law nor a decree of the entire old Church."

XXXIII. Response: We marvel at Crocius's inconsistency, who a little before wanted Judas Maccabeus to be immune from all ignorance, and now thinks it can be conceded that Judas took care that sacrifice be offered for those whom he knew to be in hell, as having died in sacrilege without repentance. A fine defender of Judas indeed, who prefers to remove fabricated ignorance from the most valiant Judas rather than sacrifice for the damned! What? Even with this theologian approving, Judas would have testified to a pious affection. Thus among the Reformed it is a pious affection which is shown to the damned; it is impious if it is expended on those who have received their sleep with piety and have the best grace laid up for them. These are the monstrosities of new dogmas. Judas thought about the resurrection, but did he therefore rather request that God not impute sin to the deceased in the resurrection? What saint, what faithful person ever requested that mortal sins (of those deceased in flagrant sacrilege without repentance) not be imputed in the resurrection? But these men fabricate anything rather than acknowledge the open truth. Crocius also errs in that he here considers the deed of one man, for it should not be neglected that money was sent for sacrifice after a collection was made, and undoubtedly was accepted in Jerusalem for that end. Why say more? Crocius finally writes: "The judgment of the author seems, I confess, to favor prayers for the dead."

XXXIV. We take the third proof from the Apostles' Creed, where we believe in the communion of saints. For since the whole Church is one body, of which Christ is the head, the communication of the members among themselves is as necessary as that of the members with the head. See Romans 12:5 and 1 Corinthians 12:13. If therefore the members ought to be solicitous for one another and others suffering should sympathize with others, supposing, as we here suppose, that some members of the Church are suffering in purgatory, it is necessary that we sympathize with them and help them to the extent of our ability.

XXXV. Nor should Protestants say that the faithful departed existing in purgatory are not members of the Church, for why should the Saints reigning in heaven be members of the Church and not they? St. Augustine says: "Nor are the souls of the pious dead separated from the Church, which even now is the kingdom of Christ. Otherwise, their memorial would not be made at the altar of God in the communion of the Body of Christ." Here St. Augustine treats not only of the pious reigning with Christ, but of all whose memorial is made at the

altar in the communion of the Body of Christ. Hence he adds: "For this reason he commemorated only the souls of the Martyrs, because they especially reign though dead, who have contended unto death for the truth. But from the part we understand the whole, also the other dead belonging to the Church, which is the kingdom of Christ."

XXXVI. We adduced the fourth proof from Luke 16:9 and the fifth from 1 Corinthians 15:29 in the preceding controversy.

3. Catholic Proof from the Holy Fathers Explaining Sacred Scripture.

XXXVII. St. Augustine, treating of the aforementioned passage from Maccabees: "In the books of Maccabees we read that sacrifice was offered for the dead. But even if this were not read at all in the ancient Scriptures, nevertheless the authority of the universal Church, which is clear in 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." Behold the practice of the universal Church, strengthened by the example of Maccabees and approved by divine Scripture. The same example is cited by St. Augustine in book 1 *On the Soul and Its Origin*, chapter 11, Vol. 7, p. 483C, and by St. Prosper in the book *On the Promises and Predictions of God*, part 2, chapter 40, Library of the Fathers, Vol. 5, part 3, p. 36.

XXXVIII. St. Chrysostom draws proof from various sources. After he had taught that nothing else should be done for those who have died in unbelief except to mourn them, he adds concerning the baptized deceased: "Mourn those who have died in riches, since from their riches they procured no comfort for their souls; those to whom the power to wash away their sins was given and they refused. A little later: Let us mourn these, let us bring help according to our ability, let us procure for them some assistance, small indeed, but which nevertheless can help. How and in what manner? When we ourselves pour out prayers, then beseeching others to pour them out for them, and perpetually giving alms to the poor for them. This brings some comfort. For hear God speaking thus (1st proof from Scripture): 'I will protect this city for my sake and for the sake of my servant David' [2 Kings 19:34]. If the memory of the just one alone was so powerful, when moreover works are done for the dead, what will they not be able to do? (2nd proof from Apostolic tradition) These things were not established in vain by the laws of the Apostles: that in the venerable and awe-inspiring mysteries, I say, remembrance should be made of those who have departed. They knew that much profit comes to them from this, much utility. [3rd proof from the dignity of the sacrifice] For at that time when the whole people stands with hands outstretched, and the assembly of priests, and that awesome sacrifice full of veneration is presented, how will we not placate God by praying for them? And this indeed concerning those who departed in the faith. But catechumens are not deemed worthy even of this consolation but are destitute of

all help, having received only one thing. What is this? It is permitted to give to the poor for them, and from this they receive some refreshment. (4th proof from the nature of charity) For God wishes that we bring mutual help to one another. For what other reason did He command us to pray for the peace and good state of the world? Why for all men? For here among all are also robbers, sacrilegious persons, thieves, and others abounding in countless evils, and yet we pray for all: for perhaps there will be some conversion of them. Therefore, just as we pray thus for the living who differ nothing from those corpses, so it is permitted to pray also for them. (5th proof from the example of Job) Job made sacrifices for his sons and freed them from sins, lest perhaps, he said, they have thought something in their hearts."

XXXIX. The same Chrysostom: "For it is possible, if you wish, to make light the punishment for him (the deceased). Therefore if we make continual prayers for him, if we give alms, even if he is unworthy, God will be more placated toward us. If through Paul He saved others, and through others He spares others, how will He not do this same thing on account of us? From his resources, from yours, from wherever you wish, help him: pour in oil, or rather water. He cannot display his own alms, but he can display those of his relatives. He does not have those which were done by himself, although he has those done for himself. Thus the woman will then entreat him with confidence, laying down the price of redemption for him; the more sins he was liable for, the more he needs that alms. Likewise: Command that supplications and prayers be made for him; this will placate God, even if it was not done by him but another is the author of the alms on his account. And this is a dogma of divine mercy. Likewise: He will receive benefit through you, and you through him, being led to do something generous by despising riches; and you have become the author of salvation for him, and he of alms for you. Do not doubt that there will be some sweet fruit. Not simply does the minister proclaim: 'For those who have died in Christ, and for those who make their remembrance.'"

XL. The same Chrysostom: "Let us make generous alms for them (the deceased); let us send them most beautiful provisions for the journey. For if the memory of beloved men who have died benefits the living—'I will protect,' He says, 'this city for my sake and for the sake of my servant David' [2 Kings 19:34]—much more will alms do this. This raised the dead, when the widows stood around showing what Dorcas had done for them [Acts 9:39]."

XLI. The same Chrysostom: "It is necessary to help the deceased, not with tears but with prayers and supplications and alms and oblations. For these things have not been rashly devised, nor is it in vain that we remember those who have departed in the divine mysteries and approach for them, asking the Lamb who is set forth, who takes away the sins of the world, but that there may be some consolation for them from this; nor is it without reason

that he who stands at the altar, while the venerable mysteries are performed, proclaims: 'For all who have fallen asleep in Christ,' etc. For if the father's sacrifice expiated Job's sons, why do you doubt whether, when we offer for those who have departed, there exists some consolation for them? For God is accustomed to show favor to others also on account of others. And a little later: Let us not be reluctant to bring help to those who have departed and to offer prayers for them."

XLII. St. Jerome explains those words: "When an impious man dies, there will be no further hope" [Prov 11:7]. And he says: "Although for the impious after death there is no hope of pardon, nevertheless there are some who, from lighter sins with which they were bound when they died, can after death be absolved: either namely being punished by penalties, or by the prayers and alms of their own people and the celebrations of Masses; but these things, for whomever they are done, are done both before the judgment and for lighter faults."

4. Catholic Proof from the Holy Fathers Not Explaining Sacred Scripture.

XLIII. Ischyrion in the Fourth Ecumenical Council accuses Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, with these words: "Moreover, no one is ignorant of the affair of Peristeria of most illustrious memory, especially those who are known to dwell in this royal city, New Rome. For she, making a will for the salvation of her soul, ordered that a large quantity of money be given to the monasteries, etc. The Egyptian province, etc., which the same most reverend man bore with difficulty, caused the same money to be distributed as alms to prostitutes, etc., so that not even incense from the offering of that Peristeria of most illustrious memory, as far as it pertained to him, would be offered to God."

XLIV. The Third Council of Carthage, after it had forbidden that Mass be celebrated except by those who were fasting, immediately adds: "For if the commendation of any deceased persons, whether bishops or clerics or others, must be made in the afternoon time, let it be done with prayers only, if those who do it are found to have already eaten."

XLV. The Fourth Council of Carthage states thus: "Penitents who carefully carry out the laws of penance, if by chance they have died on a journey or at sea, where they cannot be assisted, let their memory be commended by remembrances and prayers and oblations."

XLVI. The First Council of Braga decrees that for those who kill themselves, no oblation nor any suffrage should be made. Where the exception presupposes the rule, according to what we said in the preceding controversy. In the same Council it is commanded that the

oblations which have been made by the faithful to this end, that prayer be made for the dead, be divided among the clergy.

XLVII. St. Ambrose: "We also ask You, holy Father, for the spirits of the faithful departed, that there may be for them eternal salvation and perpetual health, everlasting joy and refreshment; may this great sacrament of piety, O Lord my God, be for them today great and full joy from You, the living and true bread, who descended from heaven and give life to the world, from the holy and blessed flesh of the immaculate Lamb, who take away the sin of the world." And a little later: "So that You may receive the sacrifice calmly and kindly from my hands for the salvation of all, both the living and the dead."

XLVIII. The same Ambrose: "Christ, free from sin, when He descended to the depths of Tartarus, breaking the bars and gates of hell, called back to life from the jaws of the devil the souls bound by sin, the condemnation of death having been destroyed."

XLIX. The same Ambrose: "The poor also wept, and what is much more precious and much more abundant, they washed away his sins with their tears. These are the redeeming tears, these the groans which hide the sorrow of death, this the sorrow which with perpetual abundance of joy covers over the sense of former pain." Likewise: "Therefore there is no doubt that the patronage of the Apostles is obtained by your tears; there is no doubt, I say, that Christ, moved by mercy, when He saw you weeping—even if He did not now touch the bier, nevertheless He received the commended spirit. And if He did not call the deceased with the voice of the body, nevertheless by the authority of divine power He freed his soul from the torments of death and the assaults of spiritual wickedness."

L. St. Cyprian: "The bishops, providing wisely, decreed that no brother departing should name a cleric as guardian or curator; and if anyone should do this, no offering should be made for him, nor should sacrifice be celebrated for his falling asleep. For he does not deserve to be named at the altar of God in the prayer of the priests who," etc. Where the exception presupposes the rule.

LI. St. Chrysostom: "The priest as legate intercedes for the whole world and is a suppliant before God, that He may be propitious to the sins of all men, not only the living but also the dead." And elsewhere: "But if a sinner, and one who has often offended God, dies, he is to be mourned, or rather: not at all, since nothing brings him utility; but those things should be done which can confer something on him: alms, oblations," etc. And in the same place: "Do you wish to honor the dead? You must take the high road. Make alms. What utility is there in many tears?" Again elsewhere: "Why after the death of your own do you call together the

poor? Why do you beseech the presbyters to pray for him? I know you will respond: that the deceased may obtain rest, that he may find a propitious judge."

LII. Arnobius: "Why indeed did our writings (he speaks of the Sacred Books) deserve to be given to the flames? Why were the assemblies cruelly destroyed, in which the supreme God is prayed to, peace and pardon is sought for all magistrates, armies, kings, family members, enemies, both those still living life and those released from the bonds of the body?"

LIII. St. Dionysius the Areopagite: "He strives by prayers from divine kindness that all sins which were committed through human frailty and weakness may be remitted to him who has departed from life."

LIV. St. Gregory: "Those whom grave sins do not weigh down, this profits the dead if they are buried in the Church, that their relatives, as often as they gather at the same sacred places, remember their own whose tombs they behold, and pour out prayers for them."

LV. St. Fulgentius: "Just as (Christ) dead for us made all die with Him, so, having loosed the sorrows of hell, He freed all the faithful from those same sorrows." In the hell of the damned there are no faithful; therefore let the Protestants say where they were.

LVI. St. Augustine: "The time which is interposed between a man's death and the final resurrection contains souls in hidden receptacles, according as each is worthy of either rest or affliction, according to what it obtained in the flesh when it lived. Nor should it be denied that the souls of the departed are relieved by the piety of their living relatives, when the sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them or alms are made in the Church. But these things profit those who, when they lived, merited that these might afterward profit them. For there is a certain manner of living, neither so good that it does not require these things after death, nor so bad that these things do not profit it after death. But there is such a state in good that it does not require these things; and there is again such a state in evil that it cannot be helped by these when it has passed from this life. And a little later: When sacrifices, either of the altar or of any alms, are offered for all the baptized departed: for the very good, they are thanksgivings; for the not very bad, they are propitiations; for the very bad, even if they are no help to the dead, they are some consolations for the living. But for those whom they profit, they profit either to this end, that there may be full remission, or certainly that the damnation itself may be made more tolerable." Similar passages are found in the same Augustine, Question 2 to Dulcitius, Vol. 4, p. 284B, etc.

LVII. The same Augustine: "Supplications for the spirits of the dead are not to be neglected, which the Church receives to be made for all who have departed in the Christian and

Catholic society, even with the names unspoken, under a general commemoration; so that for those who lack parents or children or any relatives or friends for these things, they may be provided by the one pious common mother, the Church." See this same chapter, and chapter 14 of the same book, and the last chapter.

LVIII. The same Augustine: "Ecclesiastical discipline has this, which the faithful know, that when martyrs are recited in their place at the altar of God, prayer is not offered for them, but prayer is offered for the other departed who are commemorated. For it is an injustice to pray for a martyr, to whose prayers we ought to be commended." Here, besides prayers for the dead, is the intercession of the Saints.

LIX. The same Augustine: "By the prayers truly of the holy Church, and the salutary sacrifice, and the alms which are given for their spirits, there should be no doubt that the dead are helped, so that the Lord may deal more mercifully with them than their sins deserved. For the universal Church observes this, handed down from the Fathers, that for those who have departed in the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, when they are commemorated in their place at the sacrifice itself, prayer is made, and it is commemorated that this is offered also for them. But when works of mercy are celebrated for the sake of commending them, who would doubt that these benefit those for whom prayers are offered to God not in vain? It should not be doubted at all that these things profit the departed, but such persons who lived before death in such a way that these things can be useful to them after death."

LX. Peter Martyr objects (as cited by Bellarmine) that Purgatory cannot in any way pertain to a dogma of faith, because St. Augustine in express words asserts that he has only an uncertain opinion, not certain faith that there is a purgatory, in the Enchiridion, chapter 69. "That something of this sort," he says, "should happen even after this life is not incredible, and whether it is so can be investigated, and either found or remain hidden to some of the faithful, that through a certain purgatorial fire, the more or less they loved perishable goods, the more slowly or quickly they are saved." In the book of Eight Questions of Dulcitius, question 1: "Therefore whether," he says, "men suffer these things only in this life, or whether even after this life certain such judgments follow, this understanding of this sentence does not seem contrary to the principle of truth, as far as I judge." He has the same in the book On Faith and Works, chapter 16. Finally, in book 21 of the City of God, chapter 26, he says: "After the death of this body surely, until one comes to that final Day of damnation and reward which will be after the resurrection of bodies, if in this interval of time the spirits of the departed are said to undergo a fire of this sort which those do not feel who did not have such manners and loves in the life of this body that their wood, hay, and stubble should be consumed; but others feel it who carried with them buildings of this sort, whether only there, or here and there, or for this reason here, that they not there—may they

find the fire that consumes secular things, though venial not damnable, a fire of transitory tribulation—I do not contradict, because perhaps it is true."

LXI. It is answered with the same Bellarmine that we oppose other passages of St. Augustine. For in the same Enchiridion cited, chapter 9, he asserts: "Nor should it be denied that the souls of the departed are relieved by the piety of their living relatives, when the sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them or alms are made in the Church." And in question 2 to Dulcitius, he repeats these very words from the Enchiridion: "Nor should it be denied," etc. The same St. Augustine proves in the books of the City of God (adduced in the preceding controversy) through Sacred Scripture, as he also does in various other places. Thus he says in the book On Care to Be Taken for the Dead: "That prayer profits is not doubtful for those who, when they lived in the body, merited that such things should profit them after this life."

LVII. (Latin Text Errs on Paragraph Number, Should be LXII) Peter Martyr responds that these passages should be explained through those in which he doubts. But how, I ask, shall we explain "Nor should it be denied" and "It is not doubtful" through those words "it is not incredible" and "perhaps it is true"? It is therefore necessary to say that Augustine held something about Purgatory with certain faith and doubted about some matter. What it is that he doubted about, we shall easily explain. But he cannot thus express what it is about which he did not doubt. For nothing less can be granted than that he did not doubt about purgatory in general, that is, that there is some purgatory after this life. With which certain faith there can consist doubt about the quality of the punishment which is inflicted, about the quality of the sin which is punished, about the place, time, etc. But with doubt about purgatory in general, there cannot consist any certain faith concerning purgatory, which nevertheless Augustine says he has.

LXIII. I say therefore that Augustine in those four passages doubts only about the kind of sin which is punished. Namely, whether, just as in this life immoderate love toward temporal things is purged by God through various afflictions, such as the deaths of wife, children, etc., so also it is credible that after this life there still remain in the separated soul some remnants of such actual affections which ought to be purged by tribulations and troubles. For although souls vacant of body do not seem able to be touched by such corporal afflictions, nevertheless since they are forms of bodies and have long been in the body, and again desire to be joined to the body, it is not incredible that they still remember the pleasures which they perceived through corporal instruments and are held by some desire for them. But because this matter is most difficult, therefore Augustine rightly says that it

can be investigated and perhaps never found, etc. This more extensively from Bellarmine, since this objection is familiar to Protestants.

LXIV. Moreover, in what regard St. Augustine held the deniers of suffrages for the dead is clear from the catalogue of heretics which he composed, where he speaks thus of Aerius: "The Aerians are named from a certain Aerius, who, when he was a presbyter, is reported to have grieved that he could not be ordained a bishop, and having lapsed into the heresy of the Arians, also added certain proper dogmas of his own, saying that one ought not to pray or offer oblation for the dead."

LXV. Crocius responds: "I read that he added his own dogmas. But Augustine does not say whether all those things were condemned as heresy, and consequently whether those who taught them were heretics. It is attributed to him that one ought not to pray or offer prayer for the dead. This dogma runs contrary to no text of Scripture, to no article of faith. It had been condemned by the Church in no Council. Therefore on that account it does not incur the mark of heresy."

LXVI. Reply 1: St. Augustine was asked to write something worthy of reading for those desiring to avoid dogmas contrary to the Christian faith and deceiving by the overshadowing of the Christian name. He was asked to write about heretics, what they thought against the Catholic Church. Indeed, he was asked what God wills: that the opinions of each heresy be set forth, and what the Catholic Church holds against them, insofar as is sufficient for instruction, be added. St. Augustine, satisfying this petition, attributed to Aerius that dogma which we have related. And at the end of the book he says: "Nevertheless it is not of little profit to avoid these errors which I have woven into this work, having read and known them. For what the Catholic Church thinks against these things, which you thought should be said by me, is sought superfluously, while for this purpose it suffices to know that she thinks against these things, and that no one ought to receive any of these things into faith. But how the things which the truth holds against these are to be brought forward and defended exceeds the measure of this work. But it helps much for a faithful heart to know what ought not to be believed, even if it cannot refute it by the faculty of disputing. Therefore every Catholic Christian ought not to believe these things." You see, Reader, that the opinion of Aerius is contrary to the doctrine which the Catholic Church holds, and for this reason, according to the admonition of St. Augustine, is not to be received into faith by anyone, and every Catholic Christian ought not to believe it. And still Crocius pretends that Augustine does not condemn that opinion as heresy, nor therefore judge Aerius to be a heretic.

LXVII. Reply 2: Crocius errs when he says, "It is attributed to him that one ought not to pray or offer prayer for the dead," since St. Augustine says it was the opinion of Aerius "that one

ought not to pray or offer oblation for the dead." St. Augustine distinguishes between praying for the dead and offering oblation for the dead, for it is not the same thing to pray and to offer oblation, although Crocius interprets it as "to pray or to offer prayer." Whence the same St. Augustine says that the sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for the dead. The same one says: "When they are commemorated in their place at the sacrifice itself, prayer is made, and it is also commemorated that this is offered for them." You see, Reader, how Protestants recoil at the oblation for the dead, so that they change the oblation itself into prayer.

LXVIII. Response 3: Crocius says: "This dogma runs contrary to no text of Scripture, to no article of faith." But indeed all heretics say as much: that their dogmas run contrary to no text of Scripture, to no article of faith. Is it therefore true? Why is it not sufficient for us that, according to the testimony of St. Augustine, the Catholic Church thinks against this dogma, and for this reason it should not be received into faith by anyone? Would the Protestants more felicitously explain to us what runs contrary to the text of Scripture, what to an article of faith, than the Catholic Church, concerning whose opinion St. Augustine teaches? But, says Crocius, it had not been condemned by the Church in any Council. What of it? If the condemnation of a Council is necessarily required in order that some dogma be judged heretical, many dogmas that are truly heretical could not be judged such, because many were not condemned in any Council. Wherefore it suffices that some dogma be judged heretical if the Catholic Church thinks against it, just as the Catholic Church thinks against the dogma of Aerius, according to the testimony of St. Augustine.

LXIX. St. Epiphanius thus introduces Aerius speaking: "What reason is there," says Aerius, "to call out the names of the dead after their death? For if a living person prays or distributes his goods to the poor, what ultimately returns from that matter to the dead person? But if the prayers of the survivors can help those who have departed from this life, let no one henceforth act piously, nor do anything good," etc. Calixtus has similar things. But St. Epiphanius responds to both: "But as for what pertains to that rite by which the names of the dead are pronounced, what can be more useful than that?" There follow many things which we have related from Calixtus. But the same Calixtus, in the passage cited, being about to say for what end the ancient Church prayed for the dead, tosses out a simple response which nevertheless does not accord with good faith. For he is silent about what especially pertained to the matter, nor does he report what St. Epiphanius says a little later: "The prayers which are conceived for the dead are useful to them, although they do not extinguish all faults." You see, Calixtus, from the doctrine of St. Epiphanius, that prayers are useful to the dead, and that prayer is made for the dead to this end, that they may receive benefit from it—which you thought should be kept silent. You see, from the opinion of St.

Epiphanius, that prayers do not extinguish all the faults of the dead, and therefore they extinguish some, against your opinion and that of the Lutherans. He is silent about what follows next: "We make mention of sins, that we may implore mercy from the Lord for them." Why did Calixtus not reveal that end of prayers, who was undertaking to declare for what end the Church prayed for the dead, unless because the Lutherans with Arius, against St. Epiphanius and all antiquity, do not implore mercy from the Lord for the dead? St. Epiphanius adds that this practice of praying for the dead is a rite handed down by the elders of the Church, and, opposing tradition to Aerius, he assigns him to the number of heretics..

LXX. Crocius objects: "It is the private opinion of Epiphanius and perhaps certain others; it is not a public definition of the Church." And afterward: "Even if he were a heretic who once dissented from the Church on this point, nevertheless he would not therefore be a heretic who dissents today from the Papist. For the opinion of the Papists is one thing, that of the ancient Church was another: these pour out prayers for the benefit of those whom they imagine are being scorched by purgatorial fire. Nothing of this sort pleased the first ancient Church, as is established by certain testimony."

LXXI. Response 1: That opinion was not the private opinion of Epiphanius and a few others, because the holy man says that the rite of praying for the dead is one handed down to the Church by the elders; nor should it be presumed that St. Epiphanius thought otherwise about that rite and the opposing dogma than the whole Church. It is added that St. Augustine attributes the opinion opposed to Aerius to the Catholic Church and teaches that the dogma of Aerius should not be received into faith by anyone.

LXXII. Response 2: If he was a heretic who once dissented from the Church on this point, the Protestants will not escape the same mark. It is proved thus: because the ancient Church, according to the testimony of St. Epiphanius, taught that the prayers of the living are useful to the dead. The Protestants with Aerius say: "If a living person prays, what ultimately returns from that matter to the dead person?" The ancient Church prayed for the dead in order to implore mercy from the Lord for them. The Protestants with Aerius repeat: "If a living person prays, what returns from that matter to the dead person?" According to St. Augustine, Aerius was a heretic because he taught that one ought not to pray for the dead. How will the Protestants escape that condemnation, who with Aerius maintain that one should not pray for the dead? Aerius was a heretic because he taught that one ought not to offer oblation for the dead. The Protestants teach the same thing with Aerius, and yet they do not fear lest they become participants in condemnation. We teach with the ancient Church that the prayers of the living are useful to the dead: why should Aerius, dissenting from the ancient Church on this point, be a heretic, and the Protestants, dissenting from us

on the same point, be orthodox? We teach with the ancient Church that mention of the dead is lawfully made in order that we may implore mercy from the Lord for them. Why should Aerius, dissenting from the primitive Church on this point, be a heretic, and the Protestants, dissenting from us on the same point, be orthodox? We teach with the ancient Church that the sacrifice of the Mediator is lawfully offered for the dead. Why should Aerius, saying that this ought not to be done, be a heretic, and the Protestants, who say the same thing, be orthodox? Crocius pretends that our opinion is one thing, that of the ancient Church another, because we think the dead are scorched by purgatorial fire; but we think that Crocius is inflamed with sophistical malice, since it is not hidden from him that the question of fire properly so-called does not pertain to Catholic faith. If therefore Aerius was a heretic because he once dissented from the Church on the aforesaid point, how will the Protestants be orthodox?

CHAPTER VI. Conclusion

I. From what has been said it is established that there is no one, even among the Protestants themselves, who on any or even mediocre foundation can judge that Catholic doctrine is a just cause for the separation of Protestants from the former unity, whether it concerns the existence of purgatory or suffrages for the dead.

II. Let the Protestants weigh the testimonies of the divine Scriptures and of the primitive Church, and let them distinguish between those things which belong to the Catholic faith and others which do not ascend to that height; nor will it be difficult, through the grace of God, to judge on which side the truth stands.

III. St. Epiphanius says: "Christ came in order that to those who had once known Him and had not wandered from His divinity, and who were detained in the underworld on account of certain of their sins, He might grant forgetfulness of injuries, and that He might bestow this both upon those still living through repentance and upon those dwelling in the underworld through mercy and salvation." Thus the ancient Church prayed for the dead, whom it desired to be made partakers of the remission of sins, and whom it strove to help through prayers, through works of mercy, through oblations. Thus the Catholic Church still does even now, with the Arians protesting in vain of old, with the Lutherans and Reformed protesting in vain at this time.